AP CollegeBoard

AP® Seminar
End-of-Course Exam
Scoring Guidelines

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		Examples that earn 1 point: **Misidentify the main argument** ● *"Public libraries are outdated."* **Restate the title or heading** ● *"Public libraries matter."*	**Examples that earn 2 points** **Identify only part of the argument** ● *"Libraries are important because they provide resources like the internet for people that otherwise would not have access."* ● *Libraries are falling apart because they are underfunded and so can't serve their important function."*	**Examples that earn 3 points:** **Include all parts of the argument** ● *"Failure to adequately support libraries undermines a fundamental democratic institution that bridges race and class divides and undercuts the financial health of communities."*

Additional Notes

The Argument/thesis has three main parts:

1. Public libraries are important social institutions.
2. Reductions in funding of public libraries need to be addressed/there has been a failure to adequately support them.
3. Public libraries are important resources for reasons of equity (bridging digital divide).

Scoring note: Equity can refer to any of class/race/ex-criminal status/immigrants/poor. Responses must indicate a distinction between people who have access and who do not for this part.

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 one point.	**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. ● 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. Libraries are essential social/democratic institutions – available to everyone (universal access).
2. There is inequality of access to technology/internet that libraries help bridge (i.e. digital divide).
3. America is starving its libraries, i.e. underfunding them.
4. Libraries are falling apart (poor infrastructure).
5. Libraries provide critical services (such as ESL programs, internet access, literacy programs) for all.
6. Inattention to libraries denies people access to basic necessities. Underfunding causes libraries to offer reduced hours, making them less accessible for working people.
7. Libraries add economic value to communities.

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 one point.	**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 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 and credibility of the evidence 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 and credibility 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.			

Summary of Evidence

Source (as provided in text)	Credibility	Evidence/Relevance to claims
No Author	(No source)	More libraries than McDonalds *Provides context (ubiquitous) and supports claim they are important*
American Library Association	Relevant professional organization **Possible bias:** *Goal of promoting libraries*	Core principle "equity of access" *Reinforces claim that it's wrong to starve them of resources as it deprives people of basic information (access)*
2010 story by Chicago's Fox affiliate, "Are Libraries Necessary, or a Waste of Tax Money?"		(No content; just the title) *Counterclaim (libraries may be a waste of money) that the author responds to via Mary Dempsey's testimony*
Mary A Dempsey	Commissioner of the Chicago Public Library **Possible bias:** *professional interest in library funding*	Digital divide exists along lines of race/class, and 60% of users are searching or applying for jobs *Supports equity argument*
No Author	(No source)	NYC library funding 65 million down since 2008 Waiting lists One-third of city residents no internet access Queens library highest circulation rate of any library Brooklyn and Bronx libraries falling apart – request 1.4B funding (3 boroughs) Mayor pays only lip service to supporting libraries *Supporting claim of high demand/popularity and inadequate funding*
New York Times	Major media source (albeit an editorial)	People use libraries to learn English, hone resumes, use internet, etc. *This crosses the digital divide: equality of access.*
No author	(No source)	Library hours are only 10 to 6, or even 1 to 6 *Suggests specific harm done by underfunding*
No source	(No source)	City of Philadelphia, when they spent money – home value rose which increased revenue from property taxes. *Gives a new reason to support libraries: an argument from self-interest/economic benefits to communities. **Possible weakness:** correlation doesn't equal causation; doesn't provide justification for causal relationship*
"Other studies"	(No source)	Tax dollars return $2.38 – $6.54 per dollar spent *Argues that library funding is a good investment*

[Missing evidence/possible weakness]	N/A	*No mention of library services in suburban and rural areas; limited scope*

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. • Demonstrates 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. • Offer a reasonable understanding of the provided sources. • Are student driven but 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 as necessary and uses quotation marks or paraphrases appropriately. The response may partially contextualize the sources.	**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. • Accurately cite sources (use quotation marks and paraphrases correctly). Provide a clear introduction of a source that communicates an understanding of the context of the source--time, place, point of view, etc.
	Additional Notes			