

2023

AP<sup>®</sup>



---

# AP<sup>®</sup> Seminar End-of-Course Exam

## Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary Set 2

### **Inside:**

#### **Part A**

- Scoring Guidelines**
- Student Samples**
- Scoring Commentary**

© 2023 College Board. College Board, Advanced Placement, AP, AP Central, and the acorn logo are registered trademarks of College Board. AP Capstone is a trademark owned by College Board. Visit College Board on the web: [collegeboard.org](https://collegeboard.org).

AP Central is the official online home for the AP Program: [apcentral.collegeboard.org](https://apcentral.collegeboard.org).

**End-of-Course Exam: Part A**

**15 points**

**General Scoring Notes**

- When applying the scoring guidelines, you should award the score according to the preponderance of evidence (i.e. best fit).
- Except where otherwise noted, each row is scored independently.

**0 (Zero)**

Scores of 0 are assigned to all rows of the rubric when the response is off-topic; a repetition of a prompt; entirely crossed-out; a drawing or other markings; or a response in a language other than English.

**NR (No Response)**

A score of NR is assigned to responses that are blank.

**Question 1: Argument, main idea, or thesis**

**3 points**

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
<p>Row 1</p> <p>Understand and Analyze Argument</p>	<p><b>0 points</b></p> <p>Does not meet the criteria for one point.</p>	<p><b>1 point</b></p> <p>The response misstates the author’s argument, main idea, or thesis.</p>	<p><b>2 points</b></p> <p>The response identifies, in part and with some accuracy, the author’s argument, main idea, or thesis.</p>	<p><b>3 points</b></p> <p>The response accurately identifies the author’s argument, main idea, or thesis.</p>
<p>(0-3 points)</p>	<p><b>Decision Rules and Scoring Notes</b></p>			
<p><b>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are irrelevant to the argument (do not even relate to the topic or subject of the text)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Typical responses that earn 1 point:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Misidentify the main argument or provide little or no indication of understanding of any part of the main argument.</li> <li>Just state the topic of the argument.</li> <li>Restate the title or heading.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Typical responses that earn 2 points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accurately identify only part of the argument (part is omitted or is overgeneralized).</li> <li>Describe all parts, but either vaguely or with some inaccuracy.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Typical responses that earn 3 points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correctly identify all of the main parts of the argument.</li> <li>Demonstrate understanding of the argument as a whole.</li> </ul>	
	<p><b>Examples that earn 1 point:</b></p> <p><b>Misidentify the main argument</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>“Anti-microbial and anti-odor clothing are an important new trend.”</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Restate the title or heading</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>“Our polyester clothing is destroying the environment.”</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Examples that earn 2 points</b></p> <p><b>Identify only part of the argument</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>“Synthetic microfibers are contributing to a lot of water pollution in oceans and even tap water.”</i></li> <li><i>“Fashion corporations must change their practices and fabrics to increase sustainability and limit synthetic microfibers.”</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Describe all parts, but either vaguely or with some inaccuracy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>“Fibers from clothes are causing pollution and both companies and people have a part to play in solving the problem.”</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Examples that earn 3 points:</b></p> <p><b>Include all parts of the argument</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>“Because synthetic microfibers are increasing water pollution, fashion companies should implement more sustainable practices and consumers should buy used when possible, wash clothes less frequently, and recycle.”</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Additional Notes</b></p> <p><b>The Argument/thesis has three main parts:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Microfibers (synthetic fibers, microplastics) are significantly contributing to pollution (i.e. damaging the environment/ecosystem).</li> <li>Fashion companies should implement more <u>sustainable practices</u> such as <u>textile recycling</u>, <u>reducing production</u>, or <u>creating sustainable fabrics</u>. (One of these examples, or similar, is acceptable.)</li> <li>Consumers also bear responsibility and should try to buy less or used/ thrift, wash clothes less frequently, or recycle old clothes.</li> </ol>				

**Question 2: Explain line of reasoning****6 points**

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria											
<b>Row 2</b>  <b>Understand and Analyze Argument</b>  <b>(0-6 points)</b>	<b>0 points</b> Does not meet the criteria for two points.	<b>2 points</b> The response correctly identifies at least one of the author’s claims.	<b>4 points</b> The response provides a limited explanation of the author’s line of reasoning by accurately identifying some of the claims AND identifying the connections or acknowledging a relationship among them.	<b>6 points</b> The response provides a thorough explanation of the author's line of reasoning by identifying relevant claims and clearly explaining connections among them.								
<b>Decision Rules and Scoring Notes</b>												
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="306 597 716 634">Typical responses that earn 0 points:</th> <th data-bbox="716 597 1129 634">Typical responses that earn 2 points:</th> <th data-bbox="1129 597 1535 634">Typical responses that earn 4 points:</th> <th data-bbox="1535 597 1948 634">Typical responses that earn 6 points:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="306 634 716 919"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Do not identify any claims accurately.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="716 634 1129 919"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Accurately identify only one claim.</li> </ul>           OR           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Identify more than one claim, but make no reference to connections between them.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1129 634 1535 919"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Accurately identify some claims but there are some significant inaccuracies or omissions.</li> </ul>           AND           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provide few or superficial connections between claims (demonstrating a limited understanding of the reasoning).</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1535 634 1948 919"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Accurately identify most of the claims.</li> </ul>           AND           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Clearly explain the relationships between claims (including how they relate to the overall argument).</li> </ul> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Typical responses that earn 0 points:	Typical responses that earn 2 points:	Typical responses that earn 4 points:	Typical responses that earn 6 points:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Do not identify any claims accurately.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Accurately identify only one claim.</li> </ul> OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Identify more than one claim, but make no reference to connections between them.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Accurately identify some claims but there are some significant inaccuracies or omissions.</li> </ul> AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provide few or superficial connections between claims (demonstrating a limited understanding of the reasoning).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Accurately identify most of the claims.</li> </ul> AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Clearly explain the relationships between claims (including how they relate to the overall argument).</li> </ul>
Typical responses that earn 0 points:	Typical responses that earn 2 points:	Typical responses that earn 4 points:	Typical responses that earn 6 points:									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Do not identify any claims accurately.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Accurately identify only one claim.</li> </ul> OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Identify more than one claim, but make no reference to connections between them.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Accurately identify some claims but there are some significant inaccuracies or omissions.</li> </ul> AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provide few or superficial connections between claims (demonstrating a limited understanding of the reasoning).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Accurately identify most of the claims.</li> </ul> AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Clearly explain the relationships between claims (including how they relate to the overall argument).</li> </ul>									
<p><b>Additional Notes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A response may evaluate sources and evidence in the second part (Row 2), and/or analyze the argument in the third part (Row 3). Credit should be awarded for this.</li> </ul> <p><b>Author’s claims</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Microfibers from synthetic clothing are an abundant form of plastic pollution in many water sources (waterways, oceans, and tap water). (Establishes this is a significant problem.)</li> <li>2. Microfiber pollution is linked to wastewater from developed nations. (Establishes the origin of the problem.)</li> <li>3. Shifting away from synthetic clothing would reduce microfiber pollution. (Sets up possible solution by asking a hypothetical question.)</li> <li>4. Buying environmentally friendly clothing is less sustainable than sticking with the clothes we already have. (Demonstrates limits of solution in claim 3.)</li> <li>5. The microfiber problem is amplified by the increasing volume of clothing production and consumption (fast fashion). (Explains why the problem is increasing.)</li> <li>6. “Fashion corporations must be held accountable for implementing sustainable practices across their supply chains, including developing and using fabrics that do not emit microfibers.” (Proposes solution 1.)</li> <li>7. Consumers can play a part by thrifting, consigning, washing less frequently and recycling. (Proposes solution 2.)</li> <li>8. Effort and innovation can reduce microfiber pollution and other environmental problems caused by the fashion industry. (Conclusion)</li> </ol>												

**Question 3: Evaluate effectiveness of the evidence****6 points**

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
<b>Row 3</b>  <b>Evaluate Sources and Evidence</b>	<b>0 points</b> Does not meet the criteria for two points.	<b>2 points</b> The response identifies little evidence. It makes a superficial reference to relevance and/or credibility but lacks explanation.	<b>4 points</b> The response explains various pieces of evidence in terms of credibility and relevance, but may do so inconsistently or unevenly.	<b>6 points</b> The response evaluates the relevance and credibility of the evidence and thoroughly evaluates how well the evidence is used to support the author's argument.
<b>(0-6 points)</b>	<b>Decision Rules and Scoring Notes</b>			
	<b>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Misidentify evidence or exclude evidence from the response.</li> <li>AND</li> <li>● Provide no evaluative statement about effectiveness of evidence.</li> </ul>	<b>Typical responses that earn 2 points:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Identify at least one piece of evidence (or source of evidence) but disregard how well it supports the claims.</li> <li>OR</li> <li>● Offer broad statements about how well the evidence supports the argument without referencing ANY specific evidence.</li> </ul>	<b>Typical responses that earn 4 points:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provide a vague, superficial, or perfunctory assessment of how well at least two pieces of evidence support the argument.</li> <li>OR</li> <li>● Explain the relevance of evidence or credibility of sources presented, but explanations lack detail.</li> </ul>	<b>Typical responses that earn 6 points:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provide detailed evaluation of how well the evidence presented supports the argument by               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evaluating the strengths and/or weaknesses of the evidence.</li> </ul> </li> <li>AND</li> <li>● Evaluating the relevance of specific evidence, and credibility of sources of the specific pieces of evidence presented.</li> </ul>
	<b>Additional Notes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A response may evaluate sources and evidence in the second part (Row 2), and/or analyze the argument in the third part (Row 3). Credit should be awarded for this.</li> <li>● Responses which solely evaluate sources of information and not specific pieces of evidence presented from those sources cannot score 6 for Row 3.</li> </ul>			

AP Seminar 2023 Scoring Guidelines

Summary of Evidence		
Source (as provided in text)	Credibility	Evidence/Relevance to claims
The Guardian	British Newspaper (origin of data not stated – references self as source)	<i>13.3 quadrillion microfibers were released into the California environment in 2019</i> Establishes context (significance of the problem).
Mark Browne	Ecologist. Article published in <i>Environmental Science &amp; Technology Journal</i> .	<i>Discovery of microfibers in 2011</i> Supports the claim that this water pollution by microfibers is a significant problem.
No source	No source	<i>Synthetic microfibers are a product of the petrochemical industry and are a type of plastic...and therefore microfibers are a form of microplastic pollution.</i> Makes claim that microfibers are form of plastic pollution (hence a problem that needs solving).
“California study”	No details provided	<i>Microfibers are a “disturbingly abundant” part of the Earth’s ecosystem</i> Establishes how widespread the problem is (which supports the line of reasoning going on to address potential solutions).
[Unclear if this is meant to also be attributed to “California Study”]	Article published in <i>Journal Marine Pollution Bulletin</i> .	<i>Microfibers make up 90% of microplastic pollution in the Atlantic Ocean and are ingested by fish and plankton.</i> Establishes how widespread the problem is (which supports the line of reasoning going on to address potential solutions).
“Article recently published”	American Association of Textile Chemists and Colorists	<i>Microfiber pollution is predominantly linked to wastewater from developed nations</i> Establishes the source of the problem setting up subsequent claims about solutions.
[Unclear if this should be attributed to the aforementioned article]	No source	<i>Machine-washing causes clothing to release the most microfibers, which bypass filtration and end up in waterways and oceans</i> Evidence to support later claims on potential solutions (e.g., shifting away from synthetic materials, need for more sustainable fabrics).
“One study”	Article published in <i>PLOS ONE Journal</i> .	83% of tap water samples contained microfibers Evidence of the extent of the problem.
Dr. Brian Hunt	Biological oceanographer, University of British Columbia	<i>Shifting away from synthetic fabrics and decreasing demand will help reduce microplastics in oceans</i> This evidence makes the claim.
Dr. Brian Hunt	Biological oceanographer, University of British Columbia	<i>Even natural clothing (depending on treatment) might contribute to ocean pollution</i> Supports the claim: Buying environmentally friendly clothing is less sustainable than sticking with the clothes we already have.

AP Seminar 2023 Scoring Guidelines

Ellen MacArthur Foundation	An environmental charity	<i>Clothing production has doubled in the last 15 years because of a growing middle class</i> Lays groundwork for the claim that the microfiber problem is amplified by volume of clothing production and consumption (and establishes urgency of needing a solution).
[Unclear if this should also be attributed to Ellen MacArthur Foundation]		<i>Global clothing industry expected to grow from \$1.9tn in 2019 to over \$3tn by 2030.</i> Lays groundwork for the claim that the microfiber problem is amplified by volume of clothing production and consumption (and establishes urgency of needing a solution).
[Unclear if this should also be attributed to Ellen MacArthur Foundation]		Textile production – world’s 2 <sup>nd</sup> most polluting industry (behind oil) – each year \$400 billion in clothing is prematurely discarded Supports the claim that the microfiber problem is amplified by volume of clothing production and consumption (and that fashion corporations should take action).
No source	No source	Hong Kong textile mill in 2018 developed a technology recycling waste textiles into new yarn – which was noticed by H&M Supports claim: old clothing can be recycled similar to recycling cans and bottles.

Write your response to PART A, QUESTION 1 on this page only. Do not skip lines.

In Adrienne Mate's article for The Guardian, she claims that microfibers are wide-spread pollutants that originate from clothing and textiles. She argues that fashion companies, specifically fast-fashion companies that utilize synthetic fibers, and consumers perpetuate this problem, which she suggests sustainable practices by companies and less consumption, reuse, recycling, and fewer clothing washes, by consumers to help mitigate and reduce the effects of microfibers in earth's ~~ecosystem~~ ecosystems.



Begin your response to PART A, QUESTION 2 on this page. Do not skip lines.

In Adrienne Matesi's article for The Guardian they argue that fashion companies, specifically fast fashion companies, need to be held accountable for their polluting ways, and consumers should buy fewer clothes, resale, sustainably made, or recycled clothing if they do have to, in order to reduce microfiber pollution in the oceans. The author begins with an ~~attention~~ alarming statistic that "13.3 quadrillion microfibers ... were released into the California environment in 2019." This opening statement grabs the attention of the reader, hooking them for the rest of the article. The author goes on to explain why this is a prominent issue, as all fabrics release microfibers. She further states that ~~more~~ the most commonly released fiber is plastic through the use of a paraphrased remark by ecologist Mark Bowne. She goes on to claim that microplastics are the most abundant source of pollution in Earth's ecosystems, which she supports with the statistic that microplastics from fibers "make up 90% of the microplastic pollution in the Atlantic Ocean," which is especially harmful to small marine organisms. Then, she ~~states~~ <sup>claims</sup> that microplastics from fibers are mainly from developed nations that consistently machine-wash their clothes; the author connects this to the rest of her argument with a rhetorical question: "Is the solution to stop buying synthetic clothing?" She goes on to claim that eco-conscious and organic materials, as well as those that require fewer washes are better for the environment, which builds off her main claim. However, she acknowledges that even this better option will have an affect that is polluting. This leads her to claim that consumers should buy fewer clothing items, as she reasons, "the problem of microfibers is amplified by the amount of clothing we're producing and buying on a macro-level." She then introduces the issue of fast fashion that produces cheap, synthetic clothes on a massive scale, that has ~~been~~

Continue your response to PART A, QUESTION 2 on this page. Do not skip lines.

~~Hand M~~ "helped clothing production double in the last 15 years." This builds off her earlier claim that clothing production harms the environment and is an issue in itself. She adds even further concern with the statement that the clothing industry is only expected to grow. From this monumental problem, she claims that fast fashion companies must be held accountable to reduce pollution. She proposes sustainable practices applied across the supply chain and utilization of better materials to achieve this. In connecting to her claim pertaining to consumers, she claims that consumers need to practice thrifting and resale, as well as donating, recycling, and washing clothes less frequently and in cold water to reduce plastic shedding. Finally, she reasons that it is possible to do this, citing H and M as a fast fashion company that is taking steps. As a conclusion, she appeals to one's morality by saying that one should pause ~~before~~ impulse shopping, <sup>and</sup> consider the ramifications of the outfit and if "you have enough already."

Write your response to PART A, QUESTION 3 on this page only. Do not skip lines.

Adrienne Matei draws on a variety of sources and professions to support her claim that fashion companies and consumers are negatively impacting the environment through the ~~plastic~~ microfibers that are released from clothes. She begins with a statistic from a ~~pre~~ previous report from The Guardian that states that quadrillions of ~~plastic~~ microfibers entered California environments in 2014 alone because of this issue. This is a credible source because it is from The Guardian, but it lacks ~~an~~ an author. It is also relevant as it provides background information as to why fashion is an environmental issue. The author goes on to cite ecologist Mark Browne, using his article for the academic journal, Environmental Science and Technology, to focus on that microplastics are the biggest issue. Another ~~source~~ scholarly source from the Marine Pollution Bulletin backs this up. Together the author ~~uses~~ uses this ~~sources~~ credible sources effectively to provide the rationale for why fashion and clothing consumption needs to be addressed. She goes on to quote biological oceanographer Dr. Brian Hunt to provide ~~an~~ a possible solution of less synthetic fabric consumption, as well as items that require fewer washes. This is relevant because Hunt is an expert about the ocean and marine life. She goes on to paraphrase the Ellen MacArthur Foundation that supports her previous claim that fast fashion companies and mass-scale production are extremely damaging. However, she lacks a date for when this statement was made, leaving the reader to assume it was in 2019. After her claims that consumers need to buy fewer items, ~~use~~ <sup>reuse</sup> and wash clothing less, which lacks a citation, but is still relevant to her claim, she ~~int~~ introduces a Hong Kong <sup>textile</sup> mill that recycles clothing and textiles. She claims that H and M has noticed this and implemented it into their own practices, but she lacks an

Continue your response to PART A, QUESTION 3 on this page. Do not skip lines.

attribution for this fact. Despite the lack of credibility, it is still relevant because it shows that her argument is based in reality and is feasible. Lastly, she appeals to the consumer to buy fewer things, stop overconsumption, and work to reduce pollution. Overall, the author utilizes multiple academic sources to ~~throughout~~ thoroughly support her claims, only lacking a few citations ~~with~~ with information that is relevant to her ~~subjective~~ argument.

Write your response to PART A, QUESTION 1 on this page only. Do not skip lines.

The author's main idea is microfibers found in clothing that are usually influenced from the fashion industry damages the environment by increasing pollution, specifically the ecosystem.

Begin your response to PART A, QUESTION 2 on this page. Do not skip lines.

The author creates this main idea that microfibers found in clothing increases pollution by first stating that all fabrics release microfibers later states how microfibers are a huge part of pollution and has the same effects as plastic garbage in oceans. The author comparing plastic garbage to microfibers suggests how serious microfibers effect the environment. Many throw how harmful plastic garbage is to the environment, so by comparing something to something many know about gives the audience an understanding of how serious the issue is. The author later ~~proposes~~ states how fast fashion has a major effect on the increase of pollution. The use of cheaply made clothing has doubled the amount of pollution, the idea of finding the problem gave the author the ability to know propose the solution that consumers could decrease the amount of pollution by reusing clothing to avoid wasting fabrics additionally the idea of caring for the clothing by washing the clothing with cold water helps retain the clothes quality. However that the author has made claims about how dangerous microfibers found in clothing could be to the environment, the author gives the solution.

Write your response to PART A, QUESTION 3 on this page only. Do not skip lines.

The author makes strong claims by comparing the effects of microfibers to plastic garbage but effectively backs up the claims by stating the resource credibility for example "ecologist Mark Browne" because the author states the credibility the author is successfully able to make those claims with an expert on the field to back it up. Additionally the author uses researches as evidence like "The California Study" by using a study the author proves their claims that microfibers do have a huge impact on the environment. by using data like "they make up 90% of the microplastic pollution" <sup>this</sup> allows the audience to understand and believe the authors claims. Overall the author uses strong proof of evidence to back up their claims by using credible resources like ecologists, foundations, textile mills. Along with data from researches that prove the authors claims. All evidence used backed up a claim which makes them relevant along with credible.

**Write your response to PART A, QUESTION 1 on this page only. Do not skip lines.**

The authors argument or main point that he was trying to make was that, if ~~synthetic~~ wearing ~~synthetic~~ and buying synthetic clothing should be bought or not.



Begin your response to PART A, QUESTION 2 on this page. Do not skip lines.

The main argument that the author had was if wearing synthetic clothing & buying synthetic clothing should be done or not. Some pieces of evidence that he used to portray this idea was making examples by using different things. One example he made was by using the British Newspaper upon the subject of Microfibers being released in the California environment. Another way he uses his reasoning in finding evidence is by saying the decrease of ~~st~~ using synthetics could stop production. He uses the point of wool & cotton being chemically processed. How good of an effect recycling clothes can have on things like stopping pollution. Which concludes the evidence that was being used.

**Write your response to PART A, QUESTION 3 on this page only. Do not skip lines.**

When reading the passage that the author ~~gave created~~ created it can be kind of difficult to understand the message that he was trying to give. The evidence that he used did sound very accurate but I don't think that it was one of the most effective ways to get his message across. I feel that he should have used more than one perspective of explaining his evidence because not everyone comprehends things the same. His main point ~~was~~ was being shown through the example of pollution that was being spread in the ocean but I feel that there were plenty of other ways that could have been shown. So maybe if he used different senses his point could have been more clear when reading it the first time around. Instead of having to go back & force reading the passage in order to know the exact point he was trying to make. But other than that the information that the author did use was very affective and clear. I just wished he would have used more than one view of evidence.

**End-of-Course Exam  
Part A: Short Answer**

**Note:** Student samples are quoted verbatim and may contain spelling and grammatical errors.

**Overview**

This task asked students to read and understand an argument, identify the line of reasoning and evaluate the credibility and relevance of the evidence advanced by the author in support of that argument.

**Sample: A**

**Score: 3**

**Score: 6**

**Score: 6**

**Row 1: Understand and Analyze Argument**

The response earned **3** points because it accurately identifies all parts of the author’s argument:

1) “microfibers are wide-spread pollutants that originate from clothing and textiles” that can be reduced by 2) “fast fashion companies that utilize synthetic fibers” implementing more “sustainable practices” and 3) consumers practicing “less consumption, resale, recycling, and fewer clothing washes.”

**Row 2: Understand and Analyze Argument**

The response earned **6** points because it correctly identifies most of the major claims (e.g., “fibers are mainly from developed nations,” “consumers should buy fewer clothing items,” and “fast fashion companies that produce cheap, synthetic clothes on a massive scale” are partially responsible for microfiber pollution). The response also uses clear language to showcase the line of reasoning, emphasizing the link between each claim. The response explains how the evidence at the beginning of the article is used to “grab the attention of the reader” before explaining “why this is a prominent issue.” To connect claims of the “massive scale” of the fast fashion industry and the consumer purchasing habits, the response identifies that “this builds off her earlier claim that clothing production harms the environment and is an issue in itself.” The response recognizes the purposeful use of rhetorical questions such as “is the solution to stop buying synthetic clothing?” as a method to introduce opposing perspectives, showcasing a nuanced understanding of the organization of the article. Finally, the response recognizes that the author “appeals to one’s morality” by speaking directly to the reader to “consider the ramifications of the outfit and if ‘you have enough already.’” Because the response provides a thorough evaluation of the author’s line of reasoning while accurately identifying the relevant claims and clearly explaining connections among the claims, it earned 6 points.

**End-of-Course Exam**  
**Part A: Short Answer**

**Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence**

The response earned **6** points because it provides a detailed evaluation of the evidence and sources used to support the author’s main argument. The response discusses the credibility of the sources while also providing analysis of relevance of specific pieces of evidence from those sources. For example, the response introduces specific evidence explaining how “quadrillions of microfibers entered California” and then notes that it is from *The Guardian*, which is “a credible source” but also acknowledges that “it lacks an author.” However, the response notes the relevance of the evidence “as it provides background information as to why fashion is an environmental issue.” The response also discusses the Hong Kong textile mill’s innovation that “recycles clothing and textiles” that H&M “implemented ... into their own practices.” The response recognizes the author “lacks an attribution for this fact” but, despite the weakness in credibility, the evidence “is still relevant because it shows that her argument is based in reality and is feasible.” Overall, because the response showcases the effectiveness of various sources and pieces of evidence by highlighting the strengths and weaknesses in terms of both credibility and relevance, it earned 6 points.

## End-of-Course Exam Part A: Short Answer

### Sample: B

Score: 2

Score: 4

Score: 4

### Row 1: Understand and Analyze Argument

The response earned **2** points because it accurately identifies part of the author’s argument:

1) microfibers found in clothing “damages the environment by increasing pollution, specifically the ecosystem” and “microfibers found in clothing...are usually influenced from the fashion industry.” The response does not clearly indicate the other parts of the author’s main idea

2) a solution in connection with the fashion industry or 3) the responsibility of the consumer.

Because the response only accurately identifies one part of the argument, the response earned a 2.

### Row 2: Understand and Analyze Argument

The response earned **4** points because it accurately identifies some of the claims (e.g., “microfibers are a huge part of pollution,” “fast fashion has a major effect on the increase of pollution,” and “that consumers could decrease the amount of pollution by reusing clothing”.) The response makes a superficial attempt at explaining the line reasoning when recognizing the pollution of microfiber as the problem and identifies fast fashion as a cause; however, the descriptive language is vague in connecting the ideas with “The author later states how fast fashion has a major effect on the increase of pollution.” Further identifying the line of reason, the response introduces the third claim as a direct response to the first two claims, “The idea of finding the problem gave the author the ability to...prepare the solution,” showing a superficial understanding that the author organized their claims. Finally, the response sums up the entirety of the line of reasoning, providing a summative statement that the claims show “how dangerous microfibers found in clothing could be to the environment,” connecting the individual claims to the overall argument. Due to the lack of a thorough and detailed explanation of the line of reasoning, the response only earned 4 points.

### Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence

The response earned **4** points because it provides vague discussion of credibility for two sources and a superficial evaluation of relevance for only one piece of specific evidence. The response notes the use of “ecologist Mark Browne” but only evaluates credibility by explaining that “the author states the credibility ... to make these claims with an expert in the field to back it up.” While the ecologist is an expert in the field, the response does not provide detailed evaluation of his credibility and no specific evidence for this source is provided. The “California study” is also identified as evidence; however, the response only identifies credibility as “research” and “a study” without providing a detailed analysis of why a study or research may be credible in relation to the topic. While the response states that the study contributes to “90% of the microplastic pollution,” there is only a limited evaluative statement that “the author uses strong pieces of evidence to back up their claims by using credible resources like ecologists, foundations, textile mills.” Because there is a lack of detailed evaluation of the sources and specific pieces of evidence, the response earned 4 points.

**End-of-Course Exam  
Part A: Short Answer**

**Sample: C**

**Score: 1**

**Score: 2**

**Score: 2**

**Row 1: Understand and Analyze Argument**

The response earned **1** point because it misidentifies the author’s argument. While the response does identify “synthetic clothing” as a part of the argument, the discussion is overgeneralized concerning its purpose in the argument and ignores the link between pollution and microfibers. Because the response does not correctly identify any part of the argument, it could not earn higher than a 1.

**Row 2: Understand and Analyze Argument**

The response earned **2** points because only one claim was accurately identified with no discussion of the line of reasoning. Though identified as evidence, the claim that “good ... effect recycling clothes can have on things like stoping pollutants” is accurately summarized toward the end of the response. The remainder of the response provides reference to evidence with “the British newspaper,” vague evaluative statements that are off topic to the claims supporting the argument “he uses the point of wool and cotton being chemically processed,” or inaccurate and unclear statements “the decrease of synthetics could stop production.” Because the response only accurately identifies one claim, it earned a score of 2 points.

**Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence**

The response earned **2** points because it makes broad statements regarding the sources and evidence. The response also primarily includes the student’s interjected opinion. For example, the response includes opinionated statements such as “I don’t think that it was one of the most effective ways to get his message across,” “I feel that he should have used more than one perspective of explaining his evidence,” and “I just wish he would have used more than one view of evidence.” The response provides a broad evaluative statement that “the information that the author did use was very affective and clear,” but it does not connect this statement to any specific piece of evidence. Because the response makes no evaluative statements of relevance or credibility, the response could not score higher than 2 points.