
AP[®] Seminar End-of-Course Exam

Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary Set 2

Inside:

Part A

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

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	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.
Understand and Analyze Argument	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
(0-3 points)	Typical responses that earn 0 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are irrelevant to the argument (do not even relate to the topic or subject of the text) 	Typical responses that earn 1 point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>"Fossils are important."</i> Restate the title or heading <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>"Green energy faces a fossil problem."</i> 	Examples that earn 2 points Identify only part of the argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>"America needs more lines to carry electricity, but construction faces a problem with local communities and people that protect fossils."</i> Describe all parts, but either vaguely or with some inaccuracy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>"Green energy has a problem because there isn't enough capacity and building faces opposition."</i> 	Examples that earn 3 points: Include all parts of the argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>"Renewable energy projects are confronting a severe problem as there is an urgent need for more transmission lines. This need is in conflict with goals to preserve fossils – so careful planning of construction is needed."</i>
Additional Notes: The argument/thesis has three main parts: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Significantly more transmission lines are required to meet the needs of expanding green/renewable energy. There is a tension between the need for expansion and preservation (Accept any form of tension such as concerns, challenges, and/or varying perspectives). Careful planning will be needed to balance development and conservation. 				

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

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 2 Understand and Analyze Argument (0, 2, 4 or 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not identify any claims accurately. 	Typical responses that earn 2 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accurately identify only one claim. OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify more than one claim, but make no reference to connections between them. 	Typical responses that earn 4 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accurately identify some claims but there are some significant inaccuracies or omissions. AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide few or superficial connections between claims (demonstrating a limited understanding of the reasoning). 	Typical responses that earn 6 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accurately identify most of the claims. AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly explain the relationships between claims (including how they relate to the overall argument).
Additional Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> America’s renewable energy drive needs more transmission lines but faces resistance. (Begins by summarizing the argument.) Pushback has highlighted the challenge of how to build without facing problems from local communities/green groups. (Articulates the problem.) Capacity needs to increase a lot and quickly. (Outlines urgency and extent of the need.) The effort to increase capacity already faces opposition from various groups (Also accept various groups such as conservation groups, locals, and/or fossil fuel interests from New England to the Arizona desert). (Restates the problem.) Construction is needed to protect people and landscapes from global heating. (Highlights the dilemma facing opposition groups.) Developers of renewable energy projects face severe problems because of lack of capacity regardless of available funding. (Exemplifies consequences of not expanding transmission.) Smart planning can help reduce this tension. (Solution.) 				

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

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 3	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.
Evaluate Sources and Evidence	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
(0, 2, 4 or 6 points)	Typical responses that earn 0 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Misidentify evidence or exclude evidence from the response. AND Provide no evaluative statement about effectiveness of evidence. 	Typical responses that earn 2 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide detailed evaluation of how well the evidence presented supports the argument by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluating the strengths and/or weaknesses of the evidence. AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluating the relevance of specific evidence, and credibility of sources of the specific pieces of evidence presented.
	Additional Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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
Greenlink West project	Unknown	<p><i>The Greenlink West project would build a 470-mile-long transmission line...but cuts through an area containing everything from woolly mammoth tusks to giant sloths and ancient camels.</i></p> <p>Example of a project supports the claim there is a problem (there is opposition).</p>
Cara Marcy, US Energy Information Administration	June 2018	<p><i>If the US is to eliminate planet-heating emissions by 2050 it will need to increase its current 700,000 circuit-mile network of poles and wires by threefold,...</i></p> <p>Provides evidence to support the claim of a need for massive capacity increase.</p>
Eric Larson et al. Net – Zero America Report	Net-Zero Report is published by Princeton University October 2021	<p><i>“If the US is to eliminate planet heating emissions by 2050 it will need to increase its current 700,000 circuit-mile network of poles and wires by threefold.”</i></p> <p>Provides evidence to support the claim of a need for massive capacity increase.</p>
Jessica Wilkinson	North America renewable energy team lead at Nature Conservancy	<p><i>“We are seeing local concerns being raised and they are growing as these projects increase in size.”</i></p> <p>Supports the claim that there is opposition/resistance.</p> <p><i>Smart planning can avoid disturbing valued landscapes and help reduce this tension.</i></p> <p>Supports solution.</p>
Tim Latimer	Chief Executive of Fervo Energy, a developer of geothermal projects.	<p><i>“But this is the next big barrier to renewables. There really is no transition without transmission.”</i></p> <p><i>“We need to solve this problem if we are going to deal with climate change,”</i></p> <p><i>...other opportunities have been hampered by the lack of grid opportunities.</i></p> <p><i>“It’s difficult to get private finance for something where you can’t get revenues for nine more years, so you just give up.”</i></p> <p>Support the claim that lack of capacity puts renewable energy projects at risk.</p>
Sherri Grotheer	President of the Protectors of Tule Springs Fossil Beds	<p><i>“Sometimes kneejerk reactions can cause unintended consequences and we know there are innumerable fossils left here, there is evidence of fossils everywhere just under the surface,”</i></p> <p><i>“It’s one of the most significant fossil sites in the continental US and maybe beyond,”</i></p>

AP® Seminar 2025 Scoring Guidelines

		<p><i>“It’s just very cool. I just want them to look at alternative routes. There is also the concern of putting projects like this in national parks, because then you think ‘where does this end?’”</i></p> <p>Supports reasoning of opponents to Greenlink project.</p>
Unknown [The Guardian]		<p><i>Even as clean energy projects have gathered pace, turbocharged by last year’s \$370bn in climate spending...they face frustrating waits...</i></p> <p>Supports the claim that lack of capacity puts renewable energy projects at risk.</p>
Joseph Rand	Energy Markets & Policy, Berkeley Lab, 2023.	<p><i>The typical wait is now four years...</i></p> <p>Supports the claim that lack of capacity puts renewable energy projects at risk.</p>
US Department of Energy		<p><i>...said there is a “pressing need” for new infrastructure, with California alone needing to add more than \$9bn-worth of new transmission to avoid rolling power blackouts</i></p> <p>Supports the claim that lack of capacity puts renewable energy projects at risk.</p>
The Nature Conservancy Report	Report from 2023	<p>...found that while an area the size of Texas is needed for new renewable projects and their power lines in the US, this can be shrunk by more than half if sited in an efficient way, avoiding sensitive habitats and prized cropland.</p> <p>Supports solution.</p>

Sample A

---Response A1---

In an excerpt from Oliver Milman's "America's Big Shift to Green Energy Has a Woolly Mammoth Problem," published in *The Guardian* on May 22 of 2023, the author argues that the US's transition to clean energy presents a significant national problem, as a result of the size and associated costs of building more than one million miles of new transmission lines, as well as significant opposition from locals who face a disrupted community, conservation groups, and fossil fuel interests, as these lines are installed. In response, Milman argues that "smart planning" should be implemented to utilize land more efficiently, allowing such developments to avoid habitats, croplands, and other environments that many opposition groups are concerned clean energy projects will disrupt.

---Response A2---

Overall, the author employs an affect mix of evidence and analysis to support their argument and create a sound line of reasoning.

The author's first claim is about the Greenlink West project in Nevada, explaining how it has faced significant pushback because it cuts through areas of ancient fossils. The author uses this claim as an example of the problem in bringing clean energy to the US, helping contextualize the argument and draw the reader in. By starting with an example that perfectly aligns with the subject of the article, Milman is able to effectively explain the background for this article and give a specific example of how it has appeared in recent events.

In Milman's second claim, the author steps back to take a look at the broader context and explore why the construction of new transmission lines is needed. The author explains how this is integral in order to electrify more aspects of American life and to transport renewable energies to areas where they cannot be produced. This claim builds off of the initial contextualization example by helping situate that example within the larger context of American trends towards clean energy. This helps the reader understand why projects like the Greenlink West project have to occur. In terms of the author's line of reasoning, this contributes to the author's explanation of this large American problem.

The third claim that Milman makes is an employment of two experts in the field, Jessica Wilkinson and Tim Latimer, who help explain why expanding transmission lines faces so much opposition. They explain how such developments impact many people, and how opposition seems to grow as projects are introduced and sped up. But most importantly, they also explain how there is no path toward renewable energy without increasing transmission. This claim builds off of the second claim, by providing personal insight into why there is so much opposition to the much-needed transmission line development. Additionally, it quashes any potential counter argument that the US should focus on another renewable development instead of transmission lines. By using a quote that explains how transmission is the only path forward, it strengthens the author's argument and line of reasoning.

The fourth claim the author makes is about how many individuals care about the climate crisis but also want alternatives to projects like Greenlink which could severely damage special Nevada sites. By using a source from someone who is a member of an opposition group which Milman has talked so much about, the author is able to strengthen his position and show that he included a wide variety of perspectives and is taking many concerns into

account. Milman uses this claim to help provide more information regarding the idea that the expansion of transmission faces so much opposition and backlash. In addition to simply stating it, Milman has now walked the reader through an example of an opponent's thinking, helping enhance the strength of the argument and the author's claims.

The fifth claim Milman makes is about the lack of transmission capacity and the major challenge that that presents in developing necessary infrastructure for renewable energy. Milman uses multiple pieces of evidence to explain how current American electricity grids are fragmented and congested, so expanding transmission has become a lengthy process with wait times of around four years or longer. In order to address this issue, significant funding is required across the nation. This claim builds off of the now-well-established problem the author discussed with the first four claims. By introducing this additional challenge at the end of the problem section, the author is able to contribute to the urgency and severity of the issue, by providing yet another issue after well-explaining the bulk of the main issue. By this point, the reader has most likely well understood the main issue, so adding on this new position is a digestable point that is more impactful.

The sixth and final claim the author makes is his solution to the problem, which is about utilizing "smart planning" for transmission projects. The author recommends that efficient planning in a smart manner can help cut down the amount of land that would be needed for the new renewable projects and transmission, which would help avoid the significant backlash that current projects face, since they cut through important environmental zones. This final claim is perfectly situated at the end of the argument because it builds off of the preceeding five claims which thoroughly establish the argument and the solution. This solution is well-grounded in the argument and effectively addresses the points regarding opposition.

---Response A3---

Overall, the author uses an effective set of evidence to support the claims made in the argument.

For example, one piece of evidence used in the article is about how the US would need to increase the capacity of its transmission network by threefold in order to bring about more renewable electrification. This piece of evidence is from Larson et al., published by Princeton University in October of 2021. This evidence is relevant to the argument because it demonstrates how gargantuan this effort is, by giving a key statistic related to the massive growth that would be required. Additionally, the evidence is credible because it came from a research university and was published roughly two years before the article was published, suggesting it was still current. This piece of evidence is effective since it was credible and also directly related to the author's argument.

Another piece of evidence used in this article is from Sherri Grotheer, who discusses how she is simultaneously concerned by the climate crisis but also doesn't want to support renewable electrification processes that cut across important and historical land. Milman provides credibility for Grotheer, stating that she is "president of the Protectors of Tule Springs Fossil Beds," which is a relevant position that makes her credible to speak on the issue.

Additionally, the piece of evidence is relevant because it provides perspective of the "opposition" groups that are mentioned frequently and are at the core of the article. This piece of evidence is effective since it came from an expert source and was related to the

article's content in an effective manner. While one might say it is biased because it came directly from a member of such opposition groups, it simply provides a diversity in perspectives.

Finally, a third piece of evidence utilized is from Tim Latimer, who initially discusses how the primary constituents were "energy nerds," and later says that transmission is necessary in order to transition to more renewable energies. The credibility for this source is that he is a "chief executive of Fervo Energy, a developer of geothermal projects," which is a credible position to speak on this issue. However, in terms of relevance, one could argue that the initial quote about "energy nerds" served little purpose in propelling the argument forward. Despite this, when looking at the argument as a whole and how Latimer's quotes are situated within it, they still effectively contribute to the article and serve as a credible expert opinion.

Sample B

---Response A1---

The authors main idea is that despite a need for more transmission lines as renewable energy sources, this act could lead to harm in the ice age fossils, affecting the project as many people voice concerns for this project.

---Response A2---

Millman opens his article with his main claim, stating how many voice concerns for the ice age fossils due to a need for the expansion of transmission lines. He backs this up by using the Greenlink West project, which brings clean electricity north of Las Vegas, however it cuts through areas containing many ice age fossils, as people were not happy with that as they believed the area should have been preserved.

This leads to his second claim, stating that those who want to prevent deterioration of valued areas are stuck deciding between whether or not they should continue with these projects or not. As he starts mentioning the president of the protectors of tule springs fossil beds, she wants federal authorities to find alternative routes, instead of disturbing these old fossils, supporting his second claim as they attempt to find new pathways for transmission lines, avoiding ice age fossils in an attempt to avoid the hate.

He continues on in his article with his final claim, conveying that it is a matter of choosing to respond to climate change, or biodiversity loss, and that no matter what, one person will not always be happy. There may be someone who wants to build geothermal energy sources, however in order to get there, they must disrupt the fossils, as he showed in support to this claim. He ends with a hope to find a solution to the problem, mentioned by Wilkinson which states that time and patience is what is the most necessary, and there must be a way to balance building these infrastructures while conserving the old fossils.

---Response A3---

Milman's evidence includes numerous examples of effective evidence for his article and topic. To begin, his evidence from Eric Larson about "Net-Zero America: Potential Pathways, Infrastructure, and Impacts, Final Report Summary" written on October 29th of 2021 from Princeton University is a credible article. This article represents effective evidence because the article comes from an informative report written at a prestigious university, demonstrating the credibility, as it avoids bias and is mainly facts taken from the article. This article is also written in 2021, proving it was written recently, supporting Milman's claims with more recent, and thus more credible evidence. Another effective evidence Milman uses is from Joseph Rand, as he talks about the characteristics of power plants seeking transmission, from Berkeley Lab, written in 2023. This article is effective because it shows it was written by someone from Berkeley, thus making it credible, factual information that was also written in recent years, proving that it is not old information, and was most likely gathered recently. Finally the last piece of evidence is from the Nature Conservancy. This article is credible as it is written by a woman who co-authored a report on this, showing the credibility of this article. She does not include bias in her article, mainly mentioning possible solutions to solve the problems of conserving these areas while allowing for more

EOC A Sample B 2 of 2

infrastructure to be built, this is overall a credible source, avoiding bias and stating facts, backing up Milmans claim.

Sample C

---Response A1---

The main idea in this passage is that although it feels that the action for climate change comes at the expense of something else, there is a way to move forward.

---Response A2---

The author mentions the push back of the 470-mile long transmission line in Las Vegas and Reno (which would bring clean energy to said places), because it would involve disturbing an area with tons of ancient fossils. The author brings up the other point that it will benefit for cleaner, more renewable energy. These are the sides of the same coin, no matter what, someone will be disappointed.

---Response A3---

I think the author used a lot of different evidence, but none really tied to the final claim as much, leaving the argument to be left more to interpretation than I liked.

End-of-Course Exam

Part A: Short Answer

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

Overview

NEW for 2025: The question overviews can be found in the *Chief Reader Report on Student Responses* on [AP Central](#).

Sample: A

1 Understand and Analyze Arg Score: 3

2 Understand and Analyze Arg Score: 6

3 Evaluate Sources and Evidence Score: 6

Row 1: Understand and Analyze Argument

The response earned **3** points for accurately identifying all 3 parts of the argument: “the US’s transition to clean energy presents a significant national problem, as a result of the size and associated costs of building more than one million miles of new transmission lines” (part 1) while also facing “significant opposition from locals who face a disrupted community, conservation groups, and fossil fuel interests, as these lines are installed” (part 2). However, “smart planning should be implemented to utilize land more efficiently, allowing such developments to avoid habitats, croplands, and other environments” (part 3).

Row 2: Understand and Analyze Argument

The response earned **6** points for identifying most of the claims (e.g., “Greenlink West project in Nevada...faced significant pushback,” the increase in capacity “is integral in order to electrify more aspects of American life and to transport renewable energies,” “developments impact many people, and...opposition seems to grow as projects are introduced and sped up,” “there is no path toward renewable energy without increasing transmission,” “many individuals care about the climate crisis but also want alternatives to projects like Greenlink which could severely damage special Nevada sites,” transmission capacity is a “major challenge that...presents in developing necessary infrastructure for renewable energy,” and “efficient planning in a smart manner...would help avoid the significant backlash that current projects face”).

The response also recognizes the relationships between the claims, highlighting that the first claim acts as “an example of the problem” while following claims “[build] off of” the original claims. In addition, the line of reasoning is analyzed in terms of how well the claims work to build the author’s central argument. The response recognizes the way in which the claims fit into the overall argument by “helping to contextualize the argument,” “build[ing] off of the initial contextualization example by helping situate...within the larger context,” “quash[ing] any potential counter argument,” and introducing an “additional challenge...to contribute to the urgency and severity of the issue.” Because the response provides a thorough evaluation of the author’s line of reasoning by accurately identifying relevant claims and clearly explaining the connections among the claims, it earned 6 points.

End-of-Course Exam

Part A: Short Answer (continued)

Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence

The response earned **6** points for thoroughly evaluating multiple sources and pieces of evidence in terms of relevance and credibility. The response discusses evidence from Sherri Gother, paraphrasing that she is “simultaneously concerned by the climate crisis but also doesn’t want to support renewable electrification processes that cut across important and historical land.” The source is evaluated in terms of credibility, highlighting that Gother is “president of the Protectors of Tule Springs Fossil Beds,” and therefore in a “relevant position that makes her credible to speak on the issue.” The relevance of the evidence is also evaluated within the response, explaining that “it provides perspective of the ‘opposition’ groups that are mentioned frequently and are at the core of the article.” While discussing the opposition groups, the response recognizes that one weakness of the source: “one might say it is biased because it came directly from a member of such opposition groups.” Following this recognition, the response refutes the potential weakness, considering that this choice is purposeful and “provides a diversity in perspectives.” The response also evaluates the evidence of Tim Latimer “who initially discusses how the primary constituents were ‘energy nerds.’” Latimer is identified as someone in “a credible position to speak on this issue” due to his job title as “chief executive of Fervo Energy, a developer of geothermal projects.” However, the response does recognize weaknesses in Latimer’s evidence, critiquing the relevance of the discussion of “energy nerds” as it “served little purpose in propelling the argument forward.” Because the response provides a thoughtful evaluation of the effectiveness of the evidence in supporting the author’s argument and the credibility of the provided sources, it earned 6 points.

Sample B

1 Understand and Analyze Arg Score: 2

2 Understand and Analyze Arg Score: 4

3 Evaluate Sources and Evidence Score: 4

Row 1: Understand and Analyze Argument

The response earned **2** points for identifying two parts of the argument: there is “a need for more transmission lines” (part 1) which “many people voice concerns” because the project could “lead to harm [of] ice age fossils” (part 2). Though the response seems to conflate transmission lines and renewable energy, the misunderstanding does not detract from the recognition of the need for more transmission lines in relation to renewable energy sources. The response did not identify part 3 of the argument, about the need for careful planning to balance development and conservation. Because only part of the argument was accurately identified, the response earned 2 points.

Row 2: Understand and Analyze Argument

The response earned **4** points for accurately identifying some of the claims (e.g., “many voice concerns for the ice age fossils due to a need for the expansion of transmission lines,” “those who want to prevent deterioration of valued areas are stuck deciding between whether or not they should continue with these projects or not,” and “there must be a way to balance building these infrastructures while conserving the old fossils”).

The response uses superficial sequential language such as “[o]pens his article with his main claim,” “[t]his leads to his second claim,” and “[h]e continues on in his article with his final claim.” This superficial language demonstrates a limited understanding of the author’s line of reasoning. When the response states, “[h]e backs this up by using the Greenlink West project,” “he starts mentioning the president of the protectors of tule springs fossil beds,” and “mentioned by Wilkinson,” it is actually referencing connections between claims and evidence (row 3) rather than explaining the connections between the claims or connecting the individual claims to the overall argument. Because the response correctly identifies some of the claims and provides only superficial connections between them, it earned 4 points.

End-of-Course Exam

Part A: Short Answer (continued)

Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence

The response earned **4** points for providing a simplistic evaluation of how well the evidence supports the argument. The response references various sources such as Eric Larson’s “Net-Zero America: Potential Pathways, Infrastructure, and Impacts, Final Report Summary,” Joseph Rand from Berkeley Lab, and an article from “the Nature Conservancy.” Each source is discussed broadly in terms of credibility. For example, Larson’s report is cited as being “written on October 29th of 2021 from Princeton University,” which the response identifies as “a prestigious university, demonstrating the credibility, as it avoids bias and is mainly facts taken from the article.” In addition, the response considers the publication date of the report as being “written in 2021,” which “[supports] Milmans claims with more recent, and thus more credible evidence.” The response also evaluates the source Nature Conservancy, stating that the “article is credible as it is written by a woman who co authored a report on this.” This evaluation does not showcase an understanding of credibility but rather relies primarily on simplistic statements of credibility. However, the response does provide an evaluation of the evidence the source uses, stating that the author “does not include bias in her article, mainly mentioning possible solutions to solve the problems of conserving these areas while allowing for more infrastructure to be built.” This statement provides a vague assessment of how well the evidence from Nature Conservancy supports the argument. Because the response demonstrates an uneven application of the evaluation skills, it earned 4 points.

Sample C

1 Understand and Analyze Arg Score: 1

2 Understand and Analyze Arg Score: 2

3 Evaluate Sources and Evidence Score: 2

Row 1: Understand and Analyze Argument

The response earned **1** point because it misidentifies the argument as “although it feels that the action for climate change comes at the expense of something else, there is a way to move forward.” Because the response is on topic but does not accurately identify any part of the argument, the response cannot earn more than 1 point.

Row 2: Understand and Analyze Argument

The response earned **2** points for accurately identifying one claim: “[t]he author mentions the push back of the 470-mile long transmission line... because it would involve disturbing an area with tons of ancient fossils.” The response makes no reference to the connections between claims, identifying only that “the author brings up the other point.” Because only one claim is accurately identified and there is no meaningful reference to the connections between the claims, the response cannot earn more than 2 points.

Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence

The response earned **2** points because it offers broad evaluative statements of the evidence but does not reference any specific evidence. The response states that the author “used a lot of different evidence” but also recognizes that “none really tied to the final claim as much, leaving the argument to be left more to interpretation.” Because the response does not identify any specific sources or pieces of evidence and provides superficial evaluation of the evidence, it cannot earn more than 2 points.