

2025



AP[®] Seminar Performance Task 2: Individual Research-Based Essay and Presentation Scoring Guidelines

© 2025 College Board. College Board, Advanced Placement, AP, AP Central, and the acorn logo are registered trademarks of College Board. AP Capstone is a trademark owned by College Board. Visit College Board on the web: collegeboard.org.

AP Central is the official online home for the AP Program: apcentral.collegeboard.org.

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	
Row 1 Understand and Analyze Context (0 or 5 points)	0 points The response does not incorporate any of the stimulus material, or, at most, it is mentioned in only one sentence. OR The response includes a discussion of at least one of the stimulus materials; however, it does not contribute to the argument.	5 points 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.)
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes	
	Typical responses that earn 0 points include a reference to the stimulus material that: <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).	Typical responses that earn 5 points include a reference to the stimulus material that: <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). AND <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).
	Additional Notes: <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	
Row 2 Understand and Analyze Context	0 points The response either provides no context. OR The response makes simplistic references to or general statements about the context of the research question.	5 points The response explains the significance or importance of the research question by situating it within a larger context.
(0 or 5 points)	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes	
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: <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. 	Typical responses that earn 5 points: <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. AND <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.
	Additional Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Context is usually (but not always) found in the first few paragraphs. 	

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria		
Row 3 Understand and Analyze Perspective (0, 6, or 9 points)	0 points The response provides only a single perspective. OR The response identifies and offers opinions or unsubstantiated statements about different perspectives that may be overly simplified.	6 points The response describes multiple perspectives and identifies some relevant similarities or differences between them.	9 points The response evaluates multiple perspectives (and synthesizes them) by drawing relevant connections between them, considering objections, implications, and limitations.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes		
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: <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. 	Typical responses that earn 6 points: <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. 	Typical responses that earn 9 points: <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). Scoring note: There must be clear attribution or citation linking perspectives to sources consistently to score high.
	Additional Notes: <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		
Row 4 Establish Argument (0, 8, or 12 points)	0 points The response provides only unsubstantiated opinions or claims. OR The response summarizes information (no argument). The response employs inadequate reasoning due to minimal connections between claims and evidence.	8 points The argument presents a claim with some flaws in reasoning. The response is logically organized, but the reasoning may be faulty or underdeveloped OR The response may be well-reasoned but illogical in its organization. The conclusion may be only partially related to the research question or thesis.	12 points The response is a clear and convincing argument. The response is logically organized and well-reasoned by connecting claims and evidence, leading to a plausible, well-aligned conclusion.
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: <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.). Completely lack a conclusion or offer an overly-general, vastly-simplified conclusion Provide an argument that is very difficult to discern, that contradicts itself, or is invalid. Provide an argument or claims that do not allow for alternate views. 	Typical responses that earn 8 points: <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. 	Typical responses that earn 12 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organize the argument 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>
Additional Notes: *The conclusion of the argument may also take the form of a resolution or solution, depending upon the nature of the question/argument.			

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		
Row 6 Apply Conventions (0, 3, or 5 points)	0 points The response is missing a bibliography/works cited OR the response is largely missing in-text citations/ footnotes.	3 points 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.	5 points 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.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes		
	Typical responses that earn 0 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). 	Typical responses that earn 3 points: <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. 	Typical responses that earn 5 points: <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>
	Additional Notes: <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		
Row 7 Apply Conventions (0, 2, or 3 points)	0 points The response has many grammatical flaws, is difficult to understand, or is written in a style inappropriate for an academic audience.	2 points The response is mostly clear but may contain some flaws in grammar or a few instances of a style inappropriate for an academic audience.	3 points 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.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes		
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: <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. 	Typical responses that earn 2 points: <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. 	Typical responses that earn 3 points: <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.
	Additional Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Readers should focus on the sentences written by the student, not those quoted or derived from sources. 		

Individual Multimedia Presentation (IMP) and Oral Defense (OD)

48 points

General Scoring Notes

- Do not repeatedly rewind or re-listen to recorded presentations.
- There is a time limit. **Only the first 8 minutes** of any presentation are scored (excluding the oral defense).
- The defense is scored only after the presentation proper is scored. The defense does not impact the scores in the presentation.

Additional Scores

In addition to the scores represented on the rubrics, readers can also assign scores of **0 (zero)** and **NR (No Response)**.

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.

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 1 Understand and Analyze Context (0, 2, 4 or 6 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for two points.	2 points The presentation identifies a problem or issue but places the research question in a very limited context and offers little or no explanation of how it is connected to the stimulus materials.	4 points The presentation makes general statements about the context of the research question, including how it is connected to the stimulus materials.	6 points The presentation clearly explains the relevance of the research question (situates the perspective within a larger context) AND how it is connected to the stimulus materials.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
		Typical responses that earn 2 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offer almost nothing in the way of rationale for the question or topic. Rely on use of a stimulus source or the overarching stimulus theme in place of explaining the context or significance of a research question. 	Typical responses that earn 4 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offer statements about context that are general (provide an answer to “so what?” but without specific details or supporting evidence). May provide a rationale for the broad problem or issue, but not for the specific research question. 	Typical responses that earn 6 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make the significance of the question clear and explain it within a specific context (the “so what?” is explained with specific details and supporting evidence). Provide a research question that arises logically from the context provided.
Additional Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To score above 2 points, presentations must make a connection to the stimulus materials (either through explanation or incorporation of stimulus materials as relevant evidence to support the argument.) 				

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 2 Establish Argument (0, 2, 4 or 6 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for two points.	2 points The presentation summarizes information instead of offering an argument.	4 points The presentation connects evidence and claims. The argument is mostly clear and organized, but at times the reasoning may be faulty OR the reasoning may be logical but not well organized.	6 points The presentation is logically organized, well-reasoned, and complex. It persuasively connects the evidence to claims to clearly and convincingly establish an argument.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
		Typical responses that earn 2 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Predominantly summarize information instead of offering an argument with claims and evidence. Present an argument that is very weak (mostly unsubstantiated claims). Present a topic that does not allow a position to be taken (it is not a contested real-world or academic issue) and so cannot generate a successful argument. 	Typical responses that earn 4 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present a discernable argument but may be unclear in places, contain faulty reasoning or contain a lot of extraneous detail. Include links between claims and evidence that lack explanation. May be oversimplified in places (lack complexity) or detail needed to make the argument may be missing. 	Typical responses that earn 6 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make a convincing argument that is logically organized and fully explains how evidence supports the claims. Provide sufficient detail to support the argument and address the complexity of the issue.
	Additional Notes:			

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 3 Select and Use Evidence (0, 2, 4 or 6 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for two points.	2 points The presentation incorporates evidence from a minimal range of perspectives OR information is provided but not used as evidence to support the argument.	4 points The presentation incorporates evidence from various perspectives to develop and support the argument.	6 points The presentation incorporates and synthesizes relevant evidence from various perspectives to develop and support the argument.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide no evidence. Scoring note: If there are either oral or visual citation(s), or works cited at the end, cannot score 0.	Typical responses that earn 2 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide some evidence but it is not used to support the argument (it is not relevant or credible, or is just summarized). Contain multiple examples/pieces of evidence from one single perspective. Are overly reliant on anecdotal or hypothetical examples. 	Typical responses that earn 4 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present evidence, but it is not consistently relevant or credible. Incorporate various perspectives but they are not connected or linked; connections between pieces of evidence are not clearly articulated. 	Typical responses that earn 6 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use relevant and credible evidence to support claims in the argument. Draw evidence together from different perspectives (put them in conversation with each other) to develop and support the argument.
Additional Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevance and credibility of evidence is demonstrated through attribution or citation (either oral or visual) 				

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 4 Establish Argument (0, 2, 4, or 6 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for two points.	2 points The presentation offers information without offering specific resolutions, conclusions, and/or solutions OR they are unsubstantiated or oversimplified.	4 points The presentation offers specific resolutions, conclusions, and/or solutions that at least partially address the research question.	6 points The presentation offers detailed, plausible resolutions, conclusions and/or solutions, and considers the limitations and implications of any suggested solutions.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
		Typical responses that earn 2 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide no resolution, conclusion or solution. • Provide a resolution, conclusion or solution that is oversimplified or unsubstantiated (or a contrived solution to a nonexistent problem.). 	Typical responses that earn 4 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offer specific resolution(s), conclusion(s) or solution(s) but lack the detail to demonstrate plausibility or are not entirely realistic. • Only partially address the research question. 	Typical responses that earn 6 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide resolution(s), conclusion(s) or solution(s) that are realistic and consider limitations and implications. • Provide resolution(s), conclusion(s) or solution(s) that fully align with the research question.
	Additional Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations only need to offer one resolution, conclusion, or solution. 			

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 5 Engage Audience (Design) (0, 2, 4, or 6 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	2 points The presentation’s design does little to effectively convey the information. There is little evidence of purposeful selection or emphasis of information to suit audience, situation, medium, or purpose (e.g. too much of the essay is included on slides, too much for given time limit).	4 points The presentation’s design aligns with the information and selects and emphasizes key information.	6 points The presentation’s design aligns well with and effectively contextualizes the information. The presentation, including its selection and emphasis of information, is designed for audience, situation, medium, and/or purpose.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
		Typical responses that earn 2 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide visuals but almost none do work to guide the audience through the argument (e.g. most headings are topical rather than signposting argument). • Include many visuals that are unreadable or full of errors. • Include many visuals that serve no argumentative purpose (are random, misaligned to speaking, or irrelevant). • Include many visuals that have distracting pointless elements, confusing formatting, or disconnected elements. • Provide visuals that are just a list of keywords (no selection or use of design elements). The visuals may be predominantly speaker notes rather than audience aids. 	Typical responses that earn 4 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide visuals that guide the audience through the argument but may be at times illogical, confusing, or otherwise ineffective (headings signal an argument but visuals do little more than outline). • May include visuals that contain some noticeable, significant errors. • Include several visuals that display information overload or a poor selection of supporting words and images (decorative but not argumentatively purposeful, or unreadable in the time frame they are shown). • Demonstrate inconsistent visual and design cohesion across the presentation (e.g., hierarchy of information, cohesion of imagery, metaphor, parallel structure). 	Typical responses that earn 6 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide visuals that overall serve a clear purpose in organizing or advancing the argument (such as signposting, emphasis). • Include well-chosen words and images throughout to highlight key points or information. • Present visuals that contain little clutter or visual “noise”; they enhance rather than compete with the speaker’s message, there are no extraneous images or “data dumps”. • Create cohesion through consistency of design across the presentation. • Demonstrate effective use of design elements like charts and pictures (they add value), selection and emphasis of information help the audience understand the argument.
Additional Notes:				

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 6 Engage Audience (Performance) (0, 2, 4, or 6 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	2 points The selection and execution of delivery or performance techniques (e.g., eye contact, vocal variety, movement, energy) severely limit the presentation’s impact.	4 points The selection of delivery or performance techniques (e.g., eye contact, vocal variety, movement, energy) OR execution of those techniques, supports communication of the argument.	6 points A careful selection of delivery or performance techniques (e.g., eye contact, vocal variety, movement, energy), coupled with a dynamic execution of those techniques, strongly supports the communication of the argument.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
		Typical responses that earn 2 points The presenter: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Speaks in monotone, reads without expression; contains frequent stumbles; losing place; frequent “um” “ah” or “like”; or includes inappropriate ad-libbing. Spends most of the time looking down, at notecards, or at slides. Makes no gestures for emphasis; include fidgeting; defensive posture. 	Typical responses that earn 4 points The presenter: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses a voice that has some variety, with basic delivery of information, not much to add interest; could be memorized so feels like recitation; few stumbles. Speaks so rapidly as to hinder enunciation or make the information difficult for the audience to process. Makes eye contact some of the time; sometimes lapses into reading slides or looking at notecards. Generally adopts an open posture, a bit stiff at times; gestures used but not always effectively. Inconsistently uses tone and word choice appropriate for an academic presentation. 	Typical responses that earn 6 points The presenter: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses a voice that is varied to provide emphasis and interest; conveys own interest in the topic, lively, engaging. Speaks at a pace that allows for clear enunciation with appropriate pauses to allow the audience to process information. Makes eye contact throughout – like talking to an actual person. Adopts an open, relaxed posture; uses gestures for emphasis, refers to visuals. Uses tone and word choice appropriate for an academic presentation.
	Additional Notes:			

Oral Defense (OD)

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 1 Reflect (0, 2, 4, or 6 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	2 points The oral defense addresses the question in a way that is simplistic or unsubstantiated OR describes a process that does not answer the question.	4 points The oral defense responds to the question asked and provides some evidence that may be general rather than specific about the research process.	6 points The oral defense articulates a detailed response to the question posed supported by relevant and specific evidence.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
		Typical responses that earn 2 points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not answer the question asked. Contradict or do not align with the argument presented. Are so general as could be about any project/essay or are so vague as to be meaningless. Are nonsensical or are unrelated to the research. Are an exact restatement of what was said in the presentation (nothing is added). 	Typical responses that earn 4 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least partially address the question asked. Provide some evidence relating to the particular project/research but lack specific examples. Provide the required information but without the why, how or rationale (the convincing details). 	Typical responses that earn 6 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully answer the question asked. Provide relevant and specific details in the context of the question (provide the why, or how, or rationale with specific instances).
Additional Notes:				

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 2 Establish Argument (0, 2, 4, or 6 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	2 points The oral defense addresses the question in a way that is simplistic or unsubstantiated OR describes a process that does not answer the question.	4 points The oral defense responds to the question asked and provides some evidence that may be general rather than specific about the research process.	6 points The oral defense articulates a detailed response to the question posed supported by relevant and specific evidence.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	Typical responses that earn 0 points:	Typical responses that earn 2 points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not answer the question asked. Contradict or do not align with the argument presented. Are so general as could be about any project/essay or are so vague as to be meaningless. Are nonsensical or are unrelated to the research. Are an exact restatement of what was said in the presentation (nothing is added). 	Typical responses that earn 4 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least partially address the question asked. Provide some evidence relating to the particular project/research but lack specific examples. Provide the required information but without the why, how or rationale (the convincing details). 	Typical responses that earn 6 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully answer the question asked. Provide relevant and specific details in the context of the question (provide the why, or how, or rationale with specific instances).
Additional Notes:				