

Individual Written Argument (IWA)**48 points****General Scoring Notes**

When applying the rubric for each individual row, you should award the score for that row based solely upon the criteria indicated for that row, according to the preponderance of evidence.

0 (Zero) Scores

- 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; a presentation (or other off-task format); or a response in a language other than English.

Off-Topic Decision:

For the purpose of the IWA, if the response is not in any way related to a theme connecting at least two of the stimulus materials it will be counted as off-topic and will receive a score of 0.

- Considering the student-oriented scoring approach of the College Board, readers should reward the student who derives their ideas from at least two of the stimulus materials, even if they wandered away from them as they pursued their topic.
- If you can infer any connection to a theme derived from two or more stimulus materials, the response should be scored. A failure to adequately incorporate the stimulus materials falls under rubric row 1, not here.
- A response that cites sources from a previous year’s stimulus packet and does not cite stimulus material from the current year, should be considered off-topic.

A READER SHOULD NEVER SCORE A PAPER AS OFF-TOPIC. INSTEAD, DEFER THE RESPONSE TO YOUR TABLE LEADER.

NR (No Response)

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

Individual Written Argument (IWA)

48 points

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria	
<p>Row 1</p> <p>Understand and Analyze Context</p> <p>(0 or 5 points)</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>The response does not incorporate any of the stimulus material, or, at most, it is mentioned in only one sentence.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The response includes a discussion of at least one of the stimulus materials; however, it does not contribute to the argument.</p>	<p>5 points</p> <p>The response demonstrates the relevance of at least one of the stimulus materials to the argument by integrating it as part of the response. (For example, as providing relevant context for the research question, or as evidence to support relevant claims.)</p>
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes		
<p>Typical responses that earn 0 points include a reference to the stimulus material that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is tangential. • May misrepresent what the sources are discussing/arguing or may use the source in such a way that ignores its context. • Is only used for a definition or facts that could be obtained from other, more relevant sources. • Is no more than a jumping-off point for the student’s argument, no more than a perfunctory mention. • Could be deleted with little to no effect on the response (i.e., it does not serve a purpose that enhances, forwards and/or directly supports the argument). 		
<p>Typical responses that earn 5 points include a reference to the stimulus material that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflects an accurate understanding of the source and demonstrates an understanding of its context (e.g., date, region, topic). <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performs a relevant and authentic function within the argument (i.e., it serves a purpose that enhances, forwards and/or directly supports the argument). 		
<p>Additional Notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References to stimulus materials may be included multiple times in the response; only one successful integration of stimulus material is required to earn points. 		

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
<p>Row 2</p> <p>Understand and Analyze Context</p> <p>(0 or 5 points)</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>The response either provides no context. OR The response makes simplistic references to or general statements about the context of the research question.</p>	<p>5 points</p> <p>The response explains the significance or importance of the research question by situating it within a larger context.</p>		
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes				
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify too many aspects of the topic to address complexity (e.g. “air, water, and land pollution”). • Provide unsubstantiated assertions without explanations (e.g., “this is important”). • May provide contextual details, but they are tangential to the research question and/or argument • Provide overly broad, generalized statements about context. • Provide context for only part of the question or argument. </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Typical responses that earn 5 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address an area of investigation that is narrow enough to address the complexity of the problem or issue (e.g. “water pollution in India”). The context, once established, remains relevant throughout the argument. • Provide specific and relevant details (i.e., who, what, where, when) for all elements of the research question and/or argument. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make a specific and compelling case for the urgency or the importance of the research question and/or argument. </td> </tr> </table>			<p>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify too many aspects of the topic to address complexity (e.g. “air, water, and land pollution”). • Provide unsubstantiated assertions without explanations (e.g., “this is important”). • May provide contextual details, but they are tangential to the research question and/or argument • Provide overly broad, generalized statements about context. • Provide context for only part of the question or argument. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 5 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address an area of investigation that is narrow enough to address the complexity of the problem or issue (e.g. “water pollution in India”). The context, once established, remains relevant throughout the argument. • Provide specific and relevant details (i.e., who, what, where, when) for all elements of the research question and/or argument. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make a specific and compelling case for the urgency or the importance of the research question and/or argument.
<p>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify too many aspects of the topic to address complexity (e.g. “air, water, and land pollution”). • Provide unsubstantiated assertions without explanations (e.g., “this is important”). • May provide contextual details, but they are tangential to the research question and/or argument • Provide overly broad, generalized statements about context. • Provide context for only part of the question or argument. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 5 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address an area of investigation that is narrow enough to address the complexity of the problem or issue (e.g. “water pollution in India”). The context, once established, remains relevant throughout the argument. • Provide specific and relevant details (i.e., who, what, where, when) for all elements of the research question and/or argument. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make a specific and compelling case for the urgency or the importance of the research question and/or argument. 			
<p>Additional Notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context is usually (but not always) found in the first few paragraphs. 				

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria					
<p>Row 3</p> <p>Understand and Analyze Perspective</p> <p>(0, 6, or 9 points)</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>The response provides only a single perspective.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The response identifies and offers opinions or unsubstantiated statements about different perspectives that may be overly simplified.</p>	<p>6 points</p> <p>The response describes multiple perspectives and identifies some relevant similarities or differences between them.</p>	<p>9 points</p> <p>The response evaluates multiple perspectives (and synthesizes them) by drawing relevant connections between them, considering objections, implications, and limitations.</p>			
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes						
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 483 808 987" style="width: 33%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide only one perspective. • May use a lens or lenses that all work to convey the same point of view. • Convey perspectives as personal opinions or assertions without evidence (it is unclear whether or not they are from sources because of vague or missing attribution). • Provide perspectives that are isolated from each other without explicit comparison. • Provide perspectives that are oversimplified by treating many voices, stakeholders, or stances as one. </td> <td data-bbox="808 483 1369 987" style="width: 33%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Typical responses that earn 6 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make general comparisons between perspectives describing only basic agreement or disagreement. • Explain that disagreement/agreement exists, but do not develop a nuanced, detailed discussion of how they relate. • At times present perspectives that are clearly derived from specific sources, but may lapse into opinions or stakeholder perspectives that are not clearly linked to specific sources. </td> <td data-bbox="1369 483 1950 987" style="width: 33%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Typical responses that earn 9 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elaborate on the connections among different perspectives. • Use the details from different sources’ arguments to explain specific relationships or connections among perspectives (i.e., evaluate comparative strengths and weaknesses of different perspectives by placing them in dialogue). <p>Scoring note: There must be clear attribution or citation linking perspectives to sources consistently to score high.</p> </td> </tr> </table>				<p>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide only one perspective. • May use a lens or lenses that all work to convey the same point of view. • Convey perspectives as personal opinions or assertions without evidence (it is unclear whether or not they are from sources because of vague or missing attribution). • Provide perspectives that are isolated from each other without explicit comparison. • Provide perspectives that are oversimplified by treating many voices, stakeholders, or stances as one. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 6 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make general comparisons between perspectives describing only basic agreement or disagreement. • Explain that disagreement/agreement exists, but do not develop a nuanced, detailed discussion of how they relate. • At times present perspectives that are clearly derived from specific sources, but may lapse into opinions or stakeholder perspectives that are not clearly linked to specific sources. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 9 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elaborate on the connections among different perspectives. • Use the details from different sources’ arguments to explain specific relationships or connections among perspectives (i.e., evaluate comparative strengths and weaknesses of different perspectives by placing them in dialogue). <p>Scoring note: There must be clear attribution or citation linking perspectives to sources consistently to score high.</p>
<p>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide only one perspective. • May use a lens or lenses that all work to convey the same point of view. • Convey perspectives as personal opinions or assertions without evidence (it is unclear whether or not they are from sources because of vague or missing attribution). • Provide perspectives that are isolated from each other without explicit comparison. • Provide perspectives that are oversimplified by treating many voices, stakeholders, or stances as one. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 6 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make general comparisons between perspectives describing only basic agreement or disagreement. • Explain that disagreement/agreement exists, but do not develop a nuanced, detailed discussion of how they relate. • At times present perspectives that are clearly derived from specific sources, but may lapse into opinions or stakeholder perspectives that are not clearly linked to specific sources. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 9 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elaborate on the connections among different perspectives. • Use the details from different sources’ arguments to explain specific relationships or connections among perspectives (i.e., evaluate comparative strengths and weaknesses of different perspectives by placing them in dialogue). <p>Scoring note: There must be clear attribution or citation linking perspectives to sources consistently to score high.</p>				
<p>Additional Notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A perspective is “a point of view conveyed through an argument.” (This means the source’s argument). Facts, topics, lenses, and general stakeholder points of view are not perspectives. • Throughout the essay pay attention to organization of paragraphs and to headings (if present). Both may serve as common ways to group perspectives. However, note that presence of multiple perspectives in a single paragraph does not automatically imply a connection among them. • Readers should pay attention to transitions as effective transitions may signal connections among perspectives. 						

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria					
<p>Row 4</p> <p>Establish Argument</p> <p>(0, 8, or 12 points)</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>The response provides only unsubstantiated opinions or claims.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The response summarizes information (no argument). The response employs inadequate reasoning due to minimal connections between claims and evidence.</p>	<p>8 points</p> <p>The argument presents a claim with some flaws in reasoning.</p> <p>The response is logically organized, but the reasoning may be faulty or underdeveloped</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The response may be well-reasoned but illogical in its organization. The conclusion may be only partially related to the research question or thesis.</p>	<p>12 points</p> <p>The response is a clear and convincing argument.</p> <p>The response is logically organized and well-reasoned by connecting claims and evidence, leading to a plausible, well-aligned conclusion.</p>			
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes						
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 646 806 1344" style="width: 33%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Base the argument on opinion(s). • Seek to explain a topic, rather than take a position (e.g., report, summary, chronicle, etc.). • Provide a contrived solution to a non-existent problem or completely lack a conclusion. • Provide an argument that is very difficult to discern, that contradicts itself, or is invalid. </td> <td data-bbox="806 646 1392 1344" style="width: 33%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Typical responses that earn 8 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organize the argument well OR link evidence and claims well in discrete sections, but do not do both. In other words, the response may fail to explain how evidence supports a claim—i.e., it lacks commentary—OR the overall organization of the response is difficult to follow, even though it has done an adequate job of commenting on the evidence. • Provide evidence that often drives the argument, rather than contributing to the response’s argument. • Present an argument that simply repeats but does not develop. • Present claims that lack cohesion. There is no single articulated controlling argument (i.e., claims appear as multiple vaguely-related arguments). • Provide a conclusion* that lacks either enough detail to assess plausibility or is not fully aligned with the research question. • At times lack clarity on what is student generated and what is derived from sources. </td> <td data-bbox="1392 646 1950 1344" style="width: 33%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Typical responses that earn 12 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organize information in a way that is often signposted or explicit. • Provide commentary that explains fully how evidence supports claims (i.e., the commentary will engage with the content of the evidence to draw conclusions). • Provide an argument that is driven by student voice (commentary). • Integrate alternate views, perhaps by engaging with counterclaims or using them to demonstrate a nuanced understanding. • Provide a conclusion* that is fully aligned with the research question. • Present enough detail to assess the plausibility of the conclusion* (perhaps with an assessment of limitations and implications). <p>Scoring note: To score high, there must be clear attribution for paraphrased material consistently (to make clear what is the student’s voice and what comes from sources).</p> </td> </tr> </table>				<p>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Base the argument on opinion(s). • Seek to explain a topic, rather than take a position (e.g., report, summary, chronicle, etc.). • Provide a contrived solution to a non-existent problem or completely lack a conclusion. • Provide an argument that is very difficult to discern, that contradicts itself, or is invalid. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 8 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organize the argument well OR link evidence and claims well in discrete sections, but do not do both. In other words, the response may fail to explain how evidence supports a claim—i.e., it lacks commentary—OR the overall organization of the response is difficult to follow, even though it has done an adequate job of commenting on the evidence. • Provide evidence that often drives the argument, rather than contributing to the response’s argument. • Present an argument that simply repeats but does not develop. • Present claims that lack cohesion. There is no single articulated controlling argument (i.e., claims appear as multiple vaguely-related arguments). • Provide a conclusion* that lacks either enough detail to assess plausibility or is not fully aligned with the research question. • At times lack clarity on what is student generated and what is derived from sources. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 12 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organize information in a way that is often signposted or explicit. • Provide commentary that explains fully how evidence supports claims (i.e., the commentary will engage with the content of the evidence to draw conclusions). • Provide an argument that is driven by student voice (commentary). • Integrate alternate views, perhaps by engaging with counterclaims or using them to demonstrate a nuanced understanding. • Provide a conclusion* that is fully aligned with the research question. • Present enough detail to assess the plausibility of the conclusion* (perhaps with an assessment of limitations and implications). <p>Scoring note: To score high, there must be clear attribution for paraphrased material consistently (to make clear what is the student’s voice and what comes from sources).</p>
<p>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Base the argument on opinion(s). • Seek to explain a topic, rather than take a position (e.g., report, summary, chronicle, etc.). • Provide a contrived solution to a non-existent problem or completely lack a conclusion. • Provide an argument that is very difficult to discern, that contradicts itself, or is invalid. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 8 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organize the argument well OR link evidence and claims well in discrete sections, but do not do both. In other words, the response may fail to explain how evidence supports a claim—i.e., it lacks commentary—OR the overall organization of the response is difficult to follow, even though it has done an adequate job of commenting on the evidence. • Provide evidence that often drives the argument, rather than contributing to the response’s argument. • Present an argument that simply repeats but does not develop. • Present claims that lack cohesion. There is no single articulated controlling argument (i.e., claims appear as multiple vaguely-related arguments). • Provide a conclusion* that lacks either enough detail to assess plausibility or is not fully aligned with the research question. • At times lack clarity on what is student generated and what is derived from sources. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 12 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organize information in a way that is often signposted or explicit. • Provide commentary that explains fully how evidence supports claims (i.e., the commentary will engage with the content of the evidence to draw conclusions). • Provide an argument that is driven by student voice (commentary). • Integrate alternate views, perhaps by engaging with counterclaims or using them to demonstrate a nuanced understanding. • Provide a conclusion* that is fully aligned with the research question. • Present enough detail to assess the plausibility of the conclusion* (perhaps with an assessment of limitations and implications). <p>Scoring note: To score high, there must be clear attribution for paraphrased material consistently (to make clear what is the student’s voice and what comes from sources).</p>				
<p>Additional Notes</p> <p>*The conclusion of the argument may also take the form of a resolution or solution, depending upon the nature of the question/argument.</p>						

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria		
Row 5 Select and Use Evidence (0, 6, or 9 points)	0 points Any evidence presented in the response is predominantly irrelevant and/or lacks credibility.	6 points The response includes mostly relevant and credible evidence.	9 points The response includes relevant, credible and sufficient evidence to support its argument.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes		
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include many sources that are not credible for the context in which they are used. • Include no well-vetted sources (i.e., scholarly, peer-reviewed, credentialed authors, independently verified, or from government or other reputable organizations) beyond the stimulus materials. • May include a well-vetted source that is not used effectively (e.g., trivial selection, not aligned with claim, misrepresented). 	Typical responses that earn 6 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include research sources that are mostly relevant to the topic, only some of which are appropriate for an academic argument (e.g., may be overly reliant on journalistic sources). • Establish credibility of the sources of evidence (through effective citation, attribution or explanation) but do so inconsistently. At times the response may <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include many sources that are merely referenced when they require justification. • Draw upon outdated research without providing a rationale for using that older evidence. • Demonstrate consideration of the author or the evidence, but not the source (may treat all sources of evidence as equal when they are not). • May cite several scholarly works, but select excerpts that only convey general or simplistic ideas OR include at least one piece of scholarly work that is used effectively. • Provide evidence that at times fully supports claims (e.g., there are sometimes gaps) or provides evidence that only generally supports claims. 	Typical responses that earn 9 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include research sources that are relevant to the topic and appropriate for an academic argument on this topic. • Establish credibility of the sources of evidence (through effective citation, attribution or explanation) consistently. • Provide purposeful analysis and evaluation of evidence used. • Make effective use of well-chosen evidence from scholarly work. • Provide relevant and credible evidence that fully supports claims.
Additional Notes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the Bibliography or Works Cited. • Review individual instances of selected evidence throughout (commentary about the evidence). • General reference guides such as encyclopedias and dictionaries do not fulfill the requirement for a well-vetted source. 			

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria								
<p>Row 6</p> <p>Apply Conventions</p> <p>(0, 3, or 5 points)</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>The response is missing a bibliography/works cited OR the response is largely missing in-text citations/ footnotes.</p>	<p>3 points</p> <p>The response attributes or cites sources used through the use of in-text citations or footnotes, but not always accurately. The bibliography or works cited references sources using a generally consistent style with some errors.</p>	<p>5 points</p> <p>The response attributes, accurately cites and integrates the sources used through the use of in-text citations or footnotes. The bibliography or works cited accurately references sources using a consistent style.</p>						
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes									
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="331 532 821 568" style="width: 33%;">Typical responses that earn 0 points:</th> <th data-bbox="821 532 1379 568" style="width: 33%;">Typical responses that earn 3 points:</th> <th data-bbox="1379 532 1948 568" style="width: 33%;">Typical responses that earn 5 points:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 568 821 1088"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include internal citations, but no bibliography (or vice versa). • Demonstrate no organizational principle in bibliography/works cited (e.g., alphabetical or numerical). • Provide little or no evidence of successful linking of in-text citations to bibliographic references (e.g., in-text references are to titles but bibliographic references are listed by author; titles are different in the text and in the works cited). • Include poor or no attributive phrasing with paraphrased material (e.g., “Studies show...”; “Research says...” with no additional in-text citation). </td> <td data-bbox="821 568 1379 1088"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide some uniformity in citation style. • Provide an organizational principle in bibliography/works cited (e.g., alphabetical or numerical) which may be uneven in some places. • Include unclear references or errors in citations, (e.g., citations with missing elements or essential elements that must be guessed from a url). • Provide some successful linking of citations to bibliographic references. • Provide some successful attributive phrasing for paraphrased material and/or in-text parenthetical citations. </td> <td data-bbox="1379 568 1948 1088"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contain few flaws. • Provide a clear organizational principle in bibliography/works cited. • Provide consistent evidence of linking internal citations to bibliographic references. • Include consistent and clear attributive phrasing for paraphrased material and/or in-text parenthetical citations. <p>Scoring note: The response cannot score 5 points if essential elements of citations (i.e., author/organization, title, publication, date) are consistently missing.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Typical responses that earn 0 points:	Typical responses that earn 3 points:	Typical responses that earn 5 points:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include internal citations, but no bibliography (or vice versa). • Demonstrate no organizational principle in bibliography/works cited (e.g., alphabetical or numerical). • Provide little or no evidence of successful linking of in-text citations to bibliographic references (e.g., in-text references are to titles but bibliographic references are listed by author; titles are different in the text and in the works cited). • Include poor or no attributive phrasing with paraphrased material (e.g., “Studies show...”; “Research says...” with no additional in-text citation). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide some uniformity in citation style. • Provide an organizational principle in bibliography/works cited (e.g., alphabetical or numerical) which may be uneven in some places. • Include unclear references or errors in citations, (e.g., citations with missing elements or essential elements that must be guessed from a url). • Provide some successful linking of citations to bibliographic references. • Provide some successful attributive phrasing for paraphrased material and/or in-text parenthetical citations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contain few flaws. • Provide a clear organizational principle in bibliography/works cited. • Provide consistent evidence of linking internal citations to bibliographic references. • Include consistent and clear attributive phrasing for paraphrased material and/or in-text parenthetical citations. <p>Scoring note: The response cannot score 5 points if essential elements of citations (i.e., author/organization, title, publication, date) are consistently missing.</p>
Typical responses that earn 0 points:	Typical responses that earn 3 points:	Typical responses that earn 5 points:							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include internal citations, but no bibliography (or vice versa). • Demonstrate no organizational principle in bibliography/works cited (e.g., alphabetical or numerical). • Provide little or no evidence of successful linking of in-text citations to bibliographic references (e.g., in-text references are to titles but bibliographic references are listed by author; titles are different in the text and in the works cited). • Include poor or no attributive phrasing with paraphrased material (e.g., “Studies show...”; “Research says...” with no additional in-text citation). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide some uniformity in citation style. • Provide an organizational principle in bibliography/works cited (e.g., alphabetical or numerical) which may be uneven in some places. • Include unclear references or errors in citations, (e.g., citations with missing elements or essential elements that must be guessed from a url). • Provide some successful linking of citations to bibliographic references. • Provide some successful attributive phrasing for paraphrased material and/or in-text parenthetical citations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contain few flaws. • Provide a clear organizational principle in bibliography/works cited. • Provide consistent evidence of linking internal citations to bibliographic references. • Include consistent and clear attributive phrasing for paraphrased material and/or in-text parenthetical citations. <p>Scoring note: The response cannot score 5 points if essential elements of citations (i.e., author/organization, title, publication, date) are consistently missing.</p>							
<p>Additional Notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In AP Seminar, there is no requirement for using a particular style sheet; however, responses must use a style that is consistent and complete. • Check the bibliography for consistency in style and inclusion of essential elements. • Check for clarity/accuracy of in-text citations. • Check to make sure all in-text citations match the bibliography (without extensive search). In order for links to work in print, there must be a clear organizational principle arranging the elements on the bib/works cited. 									

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria		
<p>Row 7</p> <p>Apply Conventions</p> <p>(0, 2, or 3 points)</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>The response has many grammatical flaws, is difficult to understand, or is written in a style inappropriate for an academic audience.</p>	<p>2 points</p> <p>The response is mostly clear but may contain some flaws in grammar or a few instances of a style inappropriate for an academic audience.</p>	<p>3 points</p> <p>The response creates variety, emphasis, and interest to the reader through the use of effective sentences and precision of word choice. The written style is consistently appropriate for an academic audience, although the response may have a few errors in grammar and style.</p>
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
<p>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contain multiple grammatical errors that make reading difficult. Use an overall style that is colloquial or in other ways not appropriate for an academic paper. Provide too few sentences to evaluate or the student’s own words are indistinguishable from paraphrases of sources. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 2 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contain some lapses in sentence control (e.g., run-ons, fragments, or awkward syntax when integrating quoted material). Lapse into colloquial language. Demonstrate imprecise word choice insufficient for communicating complex ideas. Use overly dense prose at the expense of coherence and clarity. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 3 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contain few flaws which do not impede clarity for understanding complex ideas. Demonstrate word choice sufficient to communicate complex ideas. Use clear prose that maintains an academic or scholarly tone. 	
<p>Additional Notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Readers should focus on the sentences written by the student, not those quoted or derived from sources. 			