AP

AP® Seminar
End-of-Course Exam
Scoring Guidelines
Set 1

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			
Row 1 **Understand and Analyze Argument** **(0-3 points)**	**0 points** Does not meet the criteria for one point.	**1 point** The response misstates the author's argument, main idea, or thesis.	**2 points** The response identifies, in part and with some accuracy, the author's argument, main idea, or thesis.	**3 points** The response accurately identifies the author's argument, main idea, or thesis.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: Are irrelevant to the argument (do not even relate to the topic or subject of the text)	**Typical responses that earn 1 point:** - Misidentify the main argument or provide little or no indication of understanding of any part of the main argument. - Just state the topic of the argument. - Restate the title or heading.	**Typical responses that earn 2 points:** - Accurately identify only part of the argument (part is omitted or is overgeneralized). - Describe all parts, but either vaguely or with some inaccuracy.	**Typical responses that earn 3 points:** - Correctly identify all of the main parts of the argument. - Demonstrate understanding of the argument as a whole.
		Examples that earn 1 point: **Misidentify the main argument** *"The press and politicians lie to the public."* **Restate the title or heading** *"Full-day kindergarten is failing our children."*	**Examples that earn 2 points** **Identify only part of the argument** *"Studies showed that full-day kindergarten programs benefited disadvantaged students in some categories."* *"Full-day kindergarten programs are too expensive to implement based on study results."* **Describe all parts, but either vaguely or with some inaccuracy** *"There's disagreement over whether kids need kindergarten because it doesn't benefit everyone and it's too expensive."*	**Examples that earn 3 points:** **Include all parts of the argument** *"Despite the big demand for it, a study showed that full day kindergarten is not worth the expense. While it may benefit disadvantaged students, it had either no effect or negative outcomes for most students, including those with special needs, so should not be implemented."*

Additional Notes

The Argument/thesis has three main parts:

1. Full-day kindergarten provides no advantage for most children compared to half-day programs. (Accept: should not be implemented, not feasible, unnecessary, effectiveness lacks evidence, government should eliminate–or any other similar indication that a universal change from half-day/traditional kindergarten should not happen).
2. In the long term, full-day kindergarten does not benefit children. (Accept: is worse for students, no long-term benefits, negligible or negative impact, can create social and emotional obstacles, benefits some children and not others, cognitive skills deterred; any similar wording).
3. Universal full-day kindergarten is not worth the expense. (Accept: not economically sound, not cost effective, funding should be used for children at risk, too expensive, unnecessary tax; any similar wording.)

Question 2: Explain line of reasoning   6 points

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 2 **Understand and Analyze Argument** **(0-6 points)**	**0 points** Does not meet the criteria for two points.	**2 points** The response correctly identifies at least one of the author's claims.	**4 points** 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.	**6 points** The response provides a thorough explanation of the author's line of reasoning by identifying relevant claims and clearly explaining connections among them.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: ● Do not identify any claims accurately.	**Typical responses that earn 2 points:** ● Accurately identify only one claim. OR ● Identify more than one claim, but make no reference to connections between them.	**Typical responses that earn 4 points:** ● Accurately identify some claims but there are some significant inaccuracies or omissions. AND ● Provide few or superficial connections between claims (demonstrating a limited understanding of the reasoning).	**Typical responses that earn 6 points:** ● Accurately identify most of the claims. AND ● Clearly explain the relationships between claims (including how they relate to the overall argument).

Additional Notes

● 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.

Author's claims

1. Historically the first kindergartens were seen as controversial/something to be suspicious of. (Sets up historical context for contrast with present.)
2. Today there is increasing demand from governments, parents, and teachers' unions for full-day kindergarten. (Provides context of widespread demand.)
3. Actual benefits of full-day kindergarten are hotly debated. (Introduces the controversy.)
4. The Ontario government touted the benefits of full day kindergarten based on academic studies it commissioned. (Provides examples of positive claims by public officials.)
5. When the full studies were released, results were a "grave disappointment". (Provides stark contrast to positive claims in previous section.)
6. Studies showed improvement for some students (low income and/or poor test scores) but for others results ranged from "negligible to abysmal". (Concedes some advantages for some students but rebuts claim it is good for all.)
7. For many students, the half-day kindergarten system was more advantageous than spending all week at school. (Provides specific examples of policy failure to rebut argument it is good for all.)
8. Full-day kindergarten impedes the social and emotional development of some children by removing them from family care too early. (Provides specific examples of policy failure to rebut argument it is good for all.)
9. Gains identified for some children attending full-day kindergarten are likely temporary. (Provides supporting evidence for another reason to question the efficacy of the policy.)
10. It doesn't make financial sense to provide full-day kindergarten to all families universally (should be more targeted). (Conclusion)

Question 3: Evaluate effectiveness of the evidence   6 points

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 3 **Evaluate Sources and Evidence** **(0-6 points)**	**0 points** Does not meet the criteria for two points.	**2 points** The response identifies little evidence. It makes a superficial reference to relevance and/or credibility but lacks explanation.	**4 points** The response explains various pieces of evidence in terms of credibility and relevance, but may do so inconsistently or unevenly.	**6 points** 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.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: - Misidentify evidence or exclude evidence from the response. AND - Provide no evaluative statement about effectiveness of evidence.	**Typical responses that earn 2 points:** - Identify at least one piece of evidence (or source of evidence) but disregard how well it supports the claims. OR - Offer broad statements about how well the evidence supports the argument without referencing ANY specific evidence.	**Typical responses that earn 4 points:** - Provide a vague, superficial, or perfunctory assessment of how well at least two pieces of evidence support the argument. OR - Explain the relevance of evidence or credibility of sources presented, but explanations lack detail.	**Typical responses that earn 6 points:** - Provide detailed evaluation of how well the evidence presented supports the argument by - Evaluating the strengths and/or weaknesses of the evidence. AND - Evaluating the relevance of specific evidence, and credibility of sources of the specific pieces of evidence presented.

Additional Notes

- 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.
- Responses which solely evaluate sources of information and not specific pieces of evidence presented from those sources cannot score 6 for Row 3.

Summary of Evidence		
Source (as provided in text)	**Credibility**	**Evidence/Relevance to claims**
No source	No source	German educator Friedrich Fröebel opened the world's first kindergartens in the mid-1800s. Prussia banned his schools in 1851 because of socialist subversion and radicalism. *Used as evidence to introduce topic/ contextualize*
No source	No source	Five-year-olds in British Columbia, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island all attend full-day kindergarten. *Supports the claim that today most governments want more kindergarten, not less.*
No source	No source	Ontario is currently in the fourth year of a five-year rollout for full-day junior and senior kindergarten. *Supports the claim that demands for full-day kindergarten in Canada are heard regularly in provinces that do not provide it.*
Provincial news release	Unspecified source	"In every area, students improved their readiness for Grade 1 and accelerated their development," *Supports the claim that actual benefits of full-day kindergarten are hotly debated (sets up the grand claims made by the press to contrast with the actual results of the study).*
Liz Sandals	Education Minister	The results, which tracked students in both half-and full-day kindergarten over two years, [were] "nothing short of incredible." *Supports the claim that actual benefits of full-day kindergarten are hotly debated (sets up the grand claims made by public officials to contrast with the actual results of the study).*
Charles Pascal	"The driving force behind Ontario's full-day program"	"It [the studies] shows the program is truly a life-changer." *Supports the claim that actual benefits of full-day kindergarten are hotly debated (sets up the grand claims made by public officials to contrast with the actual results of the study).*
Globe and Mail	Newspaper – front page story	"Landmark study" *Supports the claim that actual benefits of full-day kindergarten are hotly debated (sets up the grand claims made by the press to contrast with the actual results of the study).*
According to full reports of the studies mentioned in the text	No direct source	Ontario's full day kindergarten experiment cost $1.5-billion-a-year full-day kindergarten experiment *Supports claim that it doesn't make financial sense to provide full-day kindergarten to all families universally.*

Provincial studies	No direct source	children attending schools marked by low income and/or poor test scores showed improvement in some categories after participating in full-day kindergarten. *Supports the claim that aside from disadvantaged students, the Ontario results ranged from negligible to abysmal for everyone else.*
James Heckman	Nobel laureate economist	early intervention can improve school readiness for disadvantaged children *Supports the claim that aside from disadvantaged students, the Ontario results ranged from negligible to abysmal for everyone else.*
The [provincial] report	No direct source	"To be clear, some children appear to have done worse with [full-day early learning kindergarten]." *Supports the claim that aside from disadvantaged students, the Ontario results ranged from negligible to abysmal for everyone else.*
The [provincial] report	No direct source	The biggest failings were in the categories of emotional maturity, communication skills and general knowledge. *Supports claim that full-day kindergarten impedes the social and emotional development of some children by removing them from family care too early.*
Researchers [of the report]	No direct source	"The children with special educational needs showed superior outcomes on the measures of social competence and emotional maturity in non-[full-day early learning kindergarten] programs." *Supports claim that for many students, the half-day kindergarten system was more advantageous than spending all week at school.*
Philip DeCicca	McMaster University economist	Any positive academic effects arising from full-day kindergarten are largely gone by the end of Grade 1 *Supports claim that gains identified for some children attending full-day kindergarten are likely temporary.*
Charles Milligan, "Full-Day Kindergarten Effects on Later Academic Success."	SAGE Open, 2012 (study on California's school system)	"There were no significant differences in students who attended the all-day kindergarten program and students who attended a traditional kindergarten program." *Supports the idea that there are no benefits to full-day versus half-day kindergarten programs.*
No direct source	No direct source but easily verifiable	Alberta announced tabling plans for province-wide kindergarten because of budgetary constraints. *Supports claim that it doesn't make financial sense to provide full-day kindergarten to all families universally.*

End-of-Course Exam: Part B   **24 points**

General Scoring Notes

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

0 (Zero)

A score of 0 is assigned to a single row of the rubric when the response displays a below-minimum level of quality as identified in that row of the rubric.

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.

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 1 **Establish Argument** **(0, 2, 4 or 6 points)**	**0 points** Does not meet the criteria for 2 points.	**2 points** Misstates or overlooks a theme or issue that connects the sources. The response's perspective is unclear or unrelated to the sources.	**4 points** Identifies a theme or issue that connects the sources. The response derives its perspective from only one of the sources.	**6 points** The response identifies a theme or issue connecting the provided sources and presents a perspective that is not represented in one of the sources OR brings a particularly insightful approach to one of the perspectives OR makes a strong thematic connection among perspectives.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: • Are not related in any way to a theme that connects the provided sources (off-topic).	**Typical responses that earn 2 points:** • Offer a perspective that is unclear. • Demonstrate a simplistic or mistaken understanding of the provided sources. • May be dominated by summary rather than being driven by the student's perspective.	**Typical responses that earn 4 points:** • Offer a clear perspective that is derived from a single source or present a perspective that juxtaposes topics pulled directly from sources. • Offer a reasonable understanding of the provided sources. • Present a perspective that is trite, obvious, or overly general.	**Typical responses that earn 6 points:** • Offer a clear perspective that is either original or insightful. • Offer a perceptive understanding of the provided sources used. • Are driven by the student's perspective.
	Additional Notes • A perspective is a "point of view conveyed through an argument."			

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 2 Establish Argument (0, 2, 4, or 6 points)	**0 points** Does not meet the criteria for 2 points.	**2 points** The line of reasoning is disorganized and/or illogical. The response lacks commentary, or the commentary incorrectly or tangentially explains the links between evidence and claims.	**4 points** The argument is mostly clear and organized, but the logic may be faulty OR the reasoning may be logical but not well organized. The commentary explains the links between evidence and claims.	**6 points** The line of reasoning is logically organized and well-developed. The commentary explains evidence and connects it to claims to clearly and convincingly establish an argument.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: • Are not related in any way to a theme that connects the provided sources (off-topic).	**Typical responses that earn 2 points:** • Summarize the provided sources without linking them to one another or to an argument. • Offer very general or confusing commentary, if any, connecting evidence and claims. • Have a line of reasoning that fails.	**Typical responses that earn 4 points:** • Are organized well enough to discern the argument. • Provide inconsistent or incomplete explanations linking evidence and claims. • Make a claim that may be only partially supported. • Have a line of reasoning that is difficult to follow at times.	**Typical responses that earn 6 points:** • Are driven by the argument; points are intentionally ordered AND the links between claims and evidence are logical and convincing. • Are thoughtful or sophisticated (e.g., may address a counterargument) • Have a sound line of reasoning.
	Additional Notes • Line of Reasoning is "an arrangement of claims and evidence that leads to a conclusion." • Commentary is "a discussion and analysis of evidence in relation to the claim which may identify patterns, describe trends, and/or explain relationships."			

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 3 **Select and Use Evidence** **(0, 2, 4, or 6 points)**	**0 points** Uses one or none of the provided sources.	**2 points** Repeats or misinterprets information from at least two of the provided sources, or the information lacks relevance thereby providing little support for an argument.	**4 points** Accurately uses relevant information from at least two of the provided sources to support an argument.	**6 points** Appropriately synthesizes relevant information drawn from at least two of the provided sources to develop and support a compelling argument.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: • Use only one of the provided sources. • Do not make use of any of the provided sources.	**Typical responses that earn 2 points:** • Draw obviously mistaken conclusions from the sources. • Mismatch claims and evidence. • Offer evidence that has no bearing on the claims made.	**Typical responses that earn 4 points:** • Present evidence that adequately supports assertions. • Use quotations or paraphrases that generally match the claims. • Interpret the sources in a way that does not substantially contribute to the argument; may pull data or information from the sources but do not utilize that information in a thoughtful or insightful way.	**Typical responses that earn 6 points:** • Fully integrate the source materials into the argument and put the sources into conversation with one another. • May use a source to clarify points made in a second source, or to make a contrasting point, which is woven into the argument. • Present evidence invoked to support the writer's argument; the evidence is not the argument itself. • Interpret the evidence in a way that adds substantially to the argument.
	Additional Notes			

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 4 **Apply Conventions** **(0, 2, 4 or 6 points)**	**0 points** Does not meet the criteria for 2 points.	**2 points** Contains many flaws in grammar and style that often interfere with communication to the reader OR the response incorrectly or ineffectively attributes knowledge and ideas from sources.	**4 points** Is generally clear but contains some flaws in grammar and style that occasionally interfere with communication to the reader. The response accurately attributes knowledge and ideas from sources.	**6 points** Communicates clearly to the reader (although may not be free of errors in grammar and style) AND the response effectively integrates material from sources into the argument (e.g. it is clearly introduced, integrated, or embedded into the text) and accurately attributes knowledge and ideas.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: • Are not related in any way to a theme that connects the provided sources (off-topic).	**Typical responses that earn 2 points:** • Use grammar and syntax that is so clumsy as to make the meaning difficult to decipher. Require multiple readings to uncover meaning or intent. • Use blatant unattributed paraphrases and/or there is an absence of sources/quotation marks/reference to sources or their authors.	**Typical responses that earn 4 points:** • Are written in a style that is adequate, if sometimes clunky, but conveys basic meaning. • May contain multiple misspellings or other errors, but not so many as to impede understanding. May attempt elevated word choice but may be incorrect, or may lapse into colloquial language. • Refer to sources/authors and use quotation marks or paraphrases appropriately.	**Typical responses that earn 6 points:** • Feature writing that enhances the argument, are easy to read, and concise. Grammar and syntax need not be perfect. • May demonstrate an understanding of the context of the provided sources. • Weave source material effectively into the argument's composition. • Accurately cite sources (use quotation marks and paraphrases correctly).
	Additional Notes			