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## AP® SEMINAR — PERFORMANCE TASK 1
### 2019 SCORING GUIDELINES

**Individual Research Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row/Proficiency</th>
<th>Points earned for...</th>
<th>MAX Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 UNDERSTAND AND ANALYZE CONTEXT</strong></td>
<td>The report identifies an overly broad or simplistic area of investigation and/or shows little evidence of research. A simplistic connection or no connection is made to the overall problem or issue.</td>
<td>6 Pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The report identifies an adequately focused area of investigation in the research and shows some variety in source selection. It makes some reference to the overall problem or issue.</td>
<td>6 Pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The report situates the student's investigation of the complexities of a problem or issue in research that draws upon a wide variety of appropriate sources. It makes clear the significance to a larger context.</td>
<td>6 Pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 UNDERSTAND AND ANALYZE ARGUMENT</strong></td>
<td>The report restates or misstates information from sources. It doesn't address reasoning in the sources or it does so in a very simplistic way.</td>
<td>6 Pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The report summarizes information and in places offers effective explanation of the reasoning within the sources' argument (but does so inconsistently).</td>
<td>6 Pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The report demonstrates an understanding of the reasoning and validity of the sources' arguments. This can be evidenced by direct explanation or through purposeful use of the reasoning and conclusions.</td>
<td>6 Pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 EVALUATE SOURCES AND EVIDENCE</strong></td>
<td>The report identifies evidence from chosen sources. It makes very simplistic, illogical, or no reference to the credibility of sources and evidence, and their relevance to the inquiry.</td>
<td>6 Pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The report in places offers some effective explanation of the chosen sources and evidence in terms of their credibility and relevance to the inquiry (but does so inconsistently).</td>
<td>6 Pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The report demonstrates evaluation of credibility of the sources and selection of relevant evidence from the sources. Both can be evidenced by direct explanation or through purposeful use.</td>
<td>6 Pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 UNDERSTAND AND ANALYZE PERSPECTIVE</strong></td>
<td>The report identifies few and/or oversimplified perspectives from sources.**</td>
<td>6 Pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The report identifies multiple perspectives from sources, making some general connections among those perspectives.**</td>
<td>6 Pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The report discusses a range of perspectives and draws explicit and relevant connections among those perspectives.**</td>
<td>6 Pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 APPLY CONVENTIONS</strong></td>
<td>The report includes many errors in attribution and citation OR the bibliography is inconsistent in style and format and/or incomplete.</td>
<td>3 Pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The report attributes or cites sources used but not always accurately. The bibliography references sources using a consistent style.</td>
<td>3 Pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The report attributes and accurately cites the sources used. The bibliography accurately references sources using a consistent style.</td>
<td>3 Pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Individual Research Report (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row/Proficiency</th>
<th>Points earned for…</th>
<th>MAX Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 APPLY CONVENTIONS</strong></td>
<td>The report contains many flaws in grammar that often interfere with communication to the reader. The written style is not appropriate for an academic audience.</td>
<td>1 Pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The report is generally clear but contains some flaws in grammar that occasionally interfere with communication to the reader. The written style is inconsistent and not always appropriate for an academic audience.</td>
<td>2 Pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The report communicates clearly to the reader (although may not be free of errors in grammar and style). The written style is consistently appropriate for an academic audience.</td>
<td>3 Pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For the purposes of AP Seminar, “validity” is defined in the glossary of the CED as “the extent to which an argument or claim is logical.”

**For the purposes of AP Seminar, “perspective” is defined in the glossary of the CED as “a point of view conveyed through an argument.”

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

**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. For rows 1 to 4, if there is no evidence of any research (i.e., it is all opinion and there is nothing in the bibliography, no citation or attributed phrases in the response) then a score of 0 should be assigned.
- 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.
How to Address the Heroin Epidemic of the United States: Foreign Considerations

According to Madison C. Ratycz, Thomas J. Papadimos, and Allison A. Vanderbilt of the College of Medicine and Life Sciences at the University of Toledo, drug overdose deaths in the United States more than tripled from 1999 to 2016 (Ratycz, Madison C., et al. 1). Ratycz and her colleagues assert that heroin especially contributed to this increase in overdose deaths (Ratycz, Madison C., et al. 1). Shane Darke of the National Drug Abuse and Research Center at the University of New South Wales clarifies that “overdose” is a catch-all term used to describe heroin-related deaths in general; most heroin-related deaths are caused by polydrug toxicity (Darke 2061). As such, the issue discussed hereinafter is heroin-related mortality in general, not heroin-related mortality caused by dosage. As stated, heroin-related mortality has reached epidemic proportions in the U.S. However, the U.S. is not alone in its war on heroin; European countries, Asian countries, and other North American countries are battling the opioid as well. What can the United States learn from the successes and failures of other countries in addressing their heroin epidemics and apply to its own heroin epidemic?

According to Kamil Alptekin of KTO Karatay University in Turkey and his colleagues, “research regarding the nationwide prevalence of substance use” and, by extension, heroin use “in Turkey has been limited” (Alptekin, et al. 578), but a study on the development of addiction syndrome in Turkey conducted by Turkish researchers Melike Nebioğlu, Hacer Yalnız, Fatma M. Güven, and Ömer Geçici revealed that an increase in heroin use has been seen among Turkish people in younger age groups (Nebioğlu 37). In a study that researched the transit flows of Afghan heroin through Turkey to southwest Asia and Europe, Behsat Ekici and Adem Coban of the Department of Anti-Smuggling and Organized Crime in Turkey recommended, among other
policy implications, that the Turkish government deploy a larger number of counter-narcotics liaison officers (Ekici 360).

Turkey’s heroin epidemic is similar to that of the U.S. in that most of the heroin seized was not produced domestically. Most of the heroin seized by Turkish officers from the 1990s on was produced in Afghanistan and transported through Turkey, which serves as a natural bridge to markets in southwest Asia and Europe (Ekici 342-344). Most of the heroin seized by U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) officers, U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) officers, and other law enforcement authorities in the past came from Colombia, but Mexico is now the principal supplier (Jakovljevic 357). Ekici and Coban argue for the Turkish government to deploy more counter-narcotics liaison officers. Mirroring this argument, the U.S. could send more liaison officers to Mexico to cooperate with Mexican law enforcement authorities. Furthermore, domestically, the U.S. could deploy more DEA officers at hotspots of heroin use and deploy more CBP officers at the border. This policy would require the allocation of additional funding to the DEA and CBP.

According to Eric Janssen of the Department of General Population Surveys of the French Monitoring Center for Drugs and Drug Addictions in France, a better study on heroin use in France that is subject to less limitations is admittedly needed, but it does appear that heroin use in the country is on the rise (Janssen 686). However, according to Jean Vignau and Emmanuel Brunelle of the Hospital and University Center in Lille, France, the country has seen progress thanks to its effective health system. A French heroin addict seeking rehabilitation can go to a general practitioner, who is funded by France’s la Sécu social security system, or an addiction center, which is state-supported (Vignau 24). General practitioners and addiction
centers in France approach rehabilitating heroin addicts differently, but, medicinally, both of them primarily use buprenorphine (Vignau 24), and both of them are equally effective at rehabilitation (Vignau 25).

Understandably but unfortunately, general practitioners in the U.S. are required to obtain a waiver to prescribe buprenorphine, according to Alexander Walley of the Boston Medical Center and Boston University School of Medicine in Massachusetts and his colleagues (Walley 1393). This hinders heroin addicts’ accessibility to buprenorphine-prescribing general practitioners, as there is no guarantee that credentialed physicians are in their area. The U.S. could do away with the waiver. However, this policy change would not be perfect, as the waiver does decrease the likelihood of buprenorphine falling into incompetent hands. On a different but not completely unrelated note, France’s socialized health system ensures that its populace has unobstructed access to healthcare, making rehabilitation more accessible. Considering this, it can be argued that the U.S. is in need of broad, large-scale reforms to its health system. This is under debate, though, as the costs could outweigh the benefits.

Whether buprenorphine should be the medication of choice is under debate, as there is a myriad of drugs that can treat addiction to heroin. Buprenorphine has its pros and cons: Andrew J. Saxon of the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences at the University of Washington and his colleagues herald both buprenorphine and methadone but identify methadone’s superiority in regard to treatment retention and buprenorphine’s superiority in regard to reduced illicit opioid use early in treatment (Saxon 69). Neeraj Jain and his colleagues of the Department of Psychiatry of Government Medical College and Hospital in India advocate detoxification using a carefully dosed combination of buprenorphine and clonidine (Jain 293).
They reason that buprenorphine and clonidine are equal in efficacy and that clonidine can reduce cravings for opioids (Jain 293). The con of this combination is that clonidine can cause negative health effects, “such as sedation and hypotension, rebound hypertension, atrioventricular block, and bradycardia” (Jain 293). Buprenorphine and methadone are reliable staples in rehabilitation from heroin addiction, and some general practitioners in the U.S. already prescribe sublingual buprenorphine and oral methadone, but clonidine and other partial agonists are worth considering.

In addition to methadone and clonidine, the effectiveness of prescribing heroin itself has been debated. The United Kingdom is internationally unique in that it prescribes diamorphine (among other drugs), or heroin, to treat heroin addiction (Metrebian 115). According to a study published in Drug and Alcohol Review, which is a peer-reviewed medical journal, prescribing heroin instead of methadone decreases the risk of illicit heroin use by a patient after treatment (Metrebian 115). The obvious risk posed by this is that patients can become addicted to the provided heroin, albeit in controlled doses and of high purity. However, heroin use in the U.K. is not as “epidemic” as that of the U.S. (“United Kingdom Country Drug Report 2018”). It is uncertain whether heroin use in the U.K. is as low as it is due to the country’s prescription of heroin, but doing so is a policy that the U.S. could adopt.
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The Effects of a Vegetarian Diet on Modern Day Health Issues in the USA

With the amount of diversity in our country, the United States of America, there are many different ways people eat. According to the Vegetarian Times, a 40 year old magazine recently put online in 2017, based on a 2008 study “7.3 million people follow a vegetarian-based diet” (Editors, pg. 1). A vegetarian diet is any diet or eating trend that excludes eating meat at all yet all the while continuing to consume animal products such as egg or milk. A diet where one does not consume meat or animal products is known as a vegan diet. It is well known that diets affect your nutrition and in her paper “Impact of Dietary Pattern on Human Life Quality and Life Expectancy: A Mini-Review” Ceren Gerzer states that during one's lifetime nutrition has an effect on their health status. (Gerzer, pg 1). Some modern day health issues are things such as an individual’s life expectancy, heart disease, and obesity. Each of these health issues can be and are influenced by your diet, which could range from lifestyle diets such as veganism and vegetarianism to food plan diets such as the Mediterranean and DASH diets. More specifically, a vegetarian diet directly influences each modern day health issue: life expectancy, heart disease, and obesity.

Life expectancy is the average amount of time that people from a specific area live from birth till death. Vegetarian diets have a direct impact on life expectancy. Ceren Gerzer, who is part of the Department of Nutrition and Dietetics at Eastern Mediterranean University, even puts in her paper that a “vegetarian diet can produce 3.6 years increase in life expectancy” (Gerzer, pg. 2). This increase in life expectancy is a direct result of a long term vegetarian diet, which only happens when one has been following a vegetarian diet plan since at least early adulthood. The Center for Disease Control (CDC) showed an increase in life expectancy for all
of America. According to the CDC, a government funded agency, the life expectancy in America from 1970-2014 has risen for everyone regardless of race, sex, or diet (Arias et al, pg. 4). So this means that the increase of 3.6 years for someone following a vegetarian diet is on top of the life expectancy increase already in place. One thing that can determine whether a vegetarian diet will have an affect on life expectancy is diet quality, which is measured by a diversified, balanced, and healthy diet. According to Ceren Berzer, “diet quality is one of the main part[s] of life quality, thus related with longevity” (Berzer, pg 1). This means that if a vegetarian diet has a higher diet quality, then it would help to increase life expectancy.

According to Mayo Clinic, a non profit academic medical center focused on integrated clinical practice, education, and research, a vegetarian, when planning their diet, should “choose a variety of healthy plant-based foods” (Mayo Clinic, pg 1). A vegetarian who follows this suggestion of “a variety of… plant-based food” by the Mayo Clinic will have a result of a vegetarian diet with an enhanced diet quality. As a result of this ‘enhanced diet quality’ a vegetarian will experience an increase in life expectancy.

According to the CDC about “610,000 people die of heart disease in the United States every year”, and they go on to say that this accounts for “1 in every 4 deaths” (CDC, pg 1). This is one of the greater health issues in the United States of America. In a paper by Winston J Craig and Ann Reed Mangals, in association with the American Dietetic Association, titled “Position of the American Dietetic Association: vegetarian diets”, says that “vegetarians [are] at lower risk of death from ischemic heart disease than non vegetarians” (Craig et al, pg. 7). It can be inferred from this paper that a vegetarian diet has a positive effect on heart disease, which is lessening the disease. In an analysis of studies titled “Mortality in Vegetarians and
Non-Vegetarians: A Collaborative Analysis of 8300 Deaths Among 76,000 Men and Women in Five Prospective Studies”, one of the studies looked at the effects of being a vegetarian on heart disease and it was found that “there was evidence of heterogeneity… for mortality” for people with heart disease (Thorogood, pg. 4). This evidence of heterogeneity is that vegetarians die less from heart disease than non vegetarians regardless of sex or how differently divided up the participants were.

Obesity is a growing problem in America. The Centre for Science in the Public Interest even states that “obesity rates have doubled in adults” and have even “tripled in children” (pg. 1). With this being stated in the paper “The relation between dietary change and rising US obesity” by JK Binkley, who is part of the Department of Agricultural Economics at Purdue University, it states that since “vegetarians tend to be lighter” the effect on obesity “should be negative”(Binkley et al, pg 8). Binkley is saying that a vegetarian diet can lessen the extent someone is obese. In the paper, “The relation between dietary change and rising US obesity”, a chart shows that people who say they are vegetarian have a significantly lower BMI than any other diet, lifestyle, or demographic in that chart (Binkley et al, pg 3). BMI or body mass index is the relation between one’s weight and height which can be affected by things such as food intake and exercise. Since a higher BMI is caused by a higher intake of food, a vegetarian diet must cause followers to feel fuller while still consuming less food. Thus inferring that a vegetarian diet is beneficial towards people looking to be less obese. In the study titled “Prevalence of obesity is low in people who do not eat meat” done by T. Key and G. Davey, the chart on page 1 shows that no matter age or gender when compared with meat eaters, vegetarians always had a lower BMI and were less obese than meat eaters (Key, pg 1). This
shows that a vegetarian diet will cause people to become less obese with a lowered BMI. Based on the study by T. Key and the paper by JK Binkley both show evidence that a vegetarian diet can cause a follower of these diets to become less obese.

All in all, vegetarian diets have beneficial effects on modern day health issues. These health issues being life expectancy, heart disease, and obesity. This can be seen in that a vegetarian diet, in association with the growing life expectancy rates already taking place, has an increase on life expectancy. It can also be seen since a vegetarian has a lower risk for being diagnosed with heart disease and even a lower risk of death from heart disease. Lastly this can be seen since a vegetarian diet causes one to be less obese with a lower BMI. Based on evidence and research it is shown that a vegetarian diet has a beneficial effect on modern day health issues in the United States of America.
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Killing animals isn't art

Have you thought about animals poaching? Or on animals being used for art. I bet it hasn't gone through your mind until right now that I brought it up. Well in the world specifically in Africa Rhinoceros poaching is still at crisis levels according to the south African government. Last year there were 1,028 rhinos illegally killed. " rhino population is still in critical danger” stated by an author at the national geographic. Africa is home to 80 percent of the worlds 29,000 rhinos. This is the third year that the poaching of rhinos has dropped compared to other years, but there are still being hunted and killed for their horns.

Rhino horns are in demand in, especially in Vietnam. Possibly because of their medical value. They're capable of anything from curing cancer to being used as alcohol. What is a rhino horn made out of? the horn is made out of keratin, same as hair and fingernails. But most of all Rhino horn is increasingly being used for work of art. “There have been 21 government officials that had been arrested for poaching-related crimes in 2017” Edna Mole a South Africa environment minister stated in a press release.

What are government officials doing to solve this? Not much but they have started somewhere. they have banned crossing borders with rhino horns, buying and selling within South Africa has been prohibited. BUT there was a court ruling in April that there was a lawsuit happening by a rhino farmer named John home who owns about 1,500. Made the domestic moratorium be lifted. In August, there was an auction held by home to sell his stockpiled of rhino horns. He gets these horns by cutting them off with a chainsaw. It can be painless if done right. Auctions like this can lead on to illegal trade of horns internationally in black markets.
Kruger national park, that was a poaching hot spot has now decreased its poaching by 24 percent, this is an attributed to an anti-poaching park they train their rangers and have improved radio communication, and also use train dog to track suspected poachers over a long distance. In other words, rhino poaching has increased.

But in other hands rhino poaching in KwaZulu-natal country the numbers of poaching has increased by 50 percent over the past year.

In Africa, 502 alleged rhino poachers and 16 traffickers have been arrested in 2017 (government press release states). But the other countries have not yet released anything on capturing/arresting any poachers.

Rhinos are not the only animals being poached in Africa. There are giraffe, lions, one of the most recent poaching done that was made public was about “killing of the African giraffe”. There was a photograph that included a picture of a woman pointing to the sky while she was next to the animal corpse during a trip took in June 2017. Some even go as far as blaming the animal's age for there killing. Or there killing of other animals. Or they go on a hunting trip to play a game of hunting animals and taking there some body part of the animal as a trophy as if they won something huge.

Ok maybe the rhino's horn can save someone life from cancer but why not wait for the animal to die in natural causes or try to recreate the rhino horn we know what it made of. why not make it yourself we could probably make it better but butting a animals population at risk just to make it's into alcohol that a no to save someone ones like ok we will understand but to use it to make cocktails. Is that really what we humans turned into? turning animals into alcohol just so you can get drunk you're putting an animal life at risk their species at risk just
for a drink? Us human really doesn't care about animals. Let's do this put yourself in a rhinos place or a giraffe or a lion or an elephant does are the animals being poached for art. Yes for art.

Reflection on this. Animal poaching needs to stop no matter what the needs are because these animals are suffering what they shouldn't be suffering. Just for a horn piece hanging in a person's wall, or for a drink. No animal deserves to suffer like this. Or kill animals just for your amuse to take it home as a trophy as if you deserve something to reward you-you killed an animal you should be rewarded by going to jail even though that won't bring the animal back but it will show that the poaching of animals will not be tolerated.

Word count 825
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AP® SEMINAR
2019 SCORING COMMENTARY

Performance Task 1
Individual Research Report

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

Overview

This task assessed the student’s ability:

• To investigate a particular approach or range of perspectives on a research topic selected by a student team;

• To conduct scholarly research relevant to the topic;

• To produce an evaluative, analytic report on the research conducted, analyzing the reasoning within the texts reviewed and the relevance and credibility of the evidence utilized in those texts.

Sample: A
1 Understand and Analyze Context Score: 6
2 Understand and Analyze Arg Score: 6
3 Evaluate Sources and Evidence Score: 6
4 Understand and Analyze Persp Score: 6
5 Apply Conventions Score: 3
6 Apply Conventions Score: 3

HIGH SAMPLE RESPONSE

Row 1: Understand and Analyze Context — The report earned a score of 6 for this row because, from the first sentence, it situates the topic in the research literature, which includes a deep list of academic journals, reviews, and reports. At first glance, the scope of the Works Cited list might appear to be scattered (sources about the U.S., Turkey, Europe, and India). However, the report continually brings the reader back to the focus on “foreign considerations,” on what the U.S. might learn from studying research literature from other countries. The introduction to the report draws on the research literature to underscore the significance of the problem: “drug overdose deaths in the United States more than tripled from 1999 to 2016,” reaching “epidemic” status.

Row 2: Understand and Analyze Argument — The report earned a score of 6 for this row because it leads the reader through the arguments in the research literature collected. Throughout, there are abundant markers that trace causation, problems and solutions or proposed solutions, or strengths and limitations of policies. The report also traces logic within individual sources. (E.g., see the treatment of the Jain source on the bottom of page 3, top of page 4: “They reason that buprenorphine and clonidine are equal in efficacy and that clonidine can reduce cravings for opioids.”)

Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence — The report earned a score of 6 for this row because the sources for the report have been carefully selected and purposefully used. (There is no need for the report writer to tell us that these are “peer-reviewed” journals because the Works Cited does this work.) Attributive tags, on the whole, clarify either relevance or credibility or both. (E.g., on page 1: “Shane Darke of the National Drug Abuse and Research Center” tethers back to the journal Addiction and is clearly relevant in the context of heroin addiction.)
Row 4: Understand and Analyze Perspective — The report earned a score of 6 for this row because paragraphs consistently signal precise topics, present arguments from multiple sources, and explicitly link those sources. (E.g., on page 1 the writer draws from three separate academic sources to explicitly discuss the extent of heroin use in Turkey and the problem of how the drug enters the country. The next paragraph connects back to the U.S. context and looks to Turkey’s liaison officer as a possible model for the U.S.)

Row 5: Apply Conventions (Attribution) — The report earned a score of 3 for this row because the Works Cited page is consistent and complete. In-text citations clearly connect to each source on the Works Cited: The in-text and bibliography match with no extraneous sources. Within the body of the report, attribution of source material is clear.

Row 6: Apply Conventions (Grammar and Style) — The report earned a score of 3 for this row because the writing conveys complex information with clarity and precision. The tone is appropriate for an academic report. It contains few flaws.

Sample: B
1 Understand and Analyze Context Score: 4
2 Understand and Analyze Arg Score: 4
3 Evaluate Sources and Evidence Score: 4
4 Understand and Analyze Persp Score: 4
5 Apply Conventions Score: 2
6 Apply Conventions Score: 2

MEDIUM SAMPLE RESPONSE

Row 1: Understand and Analyze Context — The report earned a score of 4 for this row because the research is adequately focused on the health benefits of a vegetarian or vegan diet on three “modern day health issues” — life expectancy, heart disease, and obesity. Any of these areas might form the basis for a more focused, complex report, but here, all are ambitiously grouped together. There is evidence of some variety in source selection, although it is frequently unclear what kinds of sources are being used to establish context. The report makes clear that diet choices significantly impact health.

Row 2: Understand and Analyze Argument — The report earned a score of 4 for this row because there is a mixture of effective explanation of source arguments combined with instances of misunderstood or simplistic interpretation. (E.g., Arias example, page 2: It is unclear from the evidence that the 3.6 years “is on top of the life expectancy increase already in place.” See also the Thorogood example, page 3: It is unclear how the student inferred that vegetarians die less often from heart disease than non-vegetarians.) In other places the analysis is brief but apt.

Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence — The report earned a score of 4 for this row because the report writer’s references to credibility are frequently merely descriptive. While CDC information is used well, elsewhere there is insufficient attention paid to the type of source used: Attributive tags frequently refer generally to “papers,” with all papers treated equally. The exact source of the evidence is in many places unclear. The evidence used is generally relevant to the topic.

Row 4: Understand and Analyze Perspective — The report earned a score of 4 for this row because some perspectives are identified and appropriately signaled by paragraph organization (on heart disease, life expectancy, and obesity). The writer has appropriately grouped multiple sources in each paragraph, but connections among sources are general and must be inferred.
Row 5: Apply Conventions (Attribution) — The report earned a score of 2 for this row because there are some instances of unsuccessful linking between in-text citations and the bibliography (e.g., “Editors”), some in-text citations with missing bibliographic entries (e.g., Thorogood), and some additional bibliographic entries not used in the text (e.g., Dwyer).

Row 6: Apply Conventions (Grammar and Style) — The report earned a score of 2 for this row because the writing is generally clear, but there are some instances of imprecise language (e.g., “One thing that can determine”). In other places, the writer exhibits a lack of control over the flow of information. For instance, on page 2: “In a paper by Winston J Craig and Ann Reed Mangals, in association with the American Dietetic Association, titled ‘Position of the American Dietetic Association: vegetarian diets’, says that ‘vegetarians [are] at lower risk of death from ischemic heart disease than non vegetarians’ (Craig et al, pg. 7).” Or, on page 3, consider the fragment “Thus inferring that a vegetarian diet is beneficial towards people looking to be less obese.”

Sample: C
1 Understand and Analyze Context Score: 2
2 Understand and Analyze Arg Score: 2
3 Evaluate Sources and Evidence Score: 2
4 Understand and Analyze Persp Score: 2
5 Apply Conventions Score: 1
6 Apply Conventions Score: 1

LOW SAMPLE RESPONSE

Row 1: Understand and Analyze Context — The report earned a score of 2 for this row because the area of investigation (“Killing animals isn’t art”) is overly broad. Additionally, the report becomes focused on animals — often at the expense of any mention of art (e.g., there is a lot of information about the rhino horn with only the briefest mention of its use in art). The writer’s opinions, rather than the research, establish the context.

Row 2: Understand and Analyze Argument — The report earned a score of 2 for this row because it mainly restates (possibly misstates) information from the sources. Where commentary is present, it is brief and illogical. (E.g., on the top of page 2, the paraphrased information points to a decrease in poaching, but the commentary reads, “In other words, rhino poaching has increased.”) Overall, information is presented; arguments are not articulated or analyzed.

Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence — The report earned a score of 2 for this row because the statements concerning credibility and relevance are simple or absent. (E.g., in the first paragraph, the report states that “Africa is home to 80 percent of the worlds 29,000 rhinos” but does not reference a source and does not provide a discussion of the relevance of this information.) The only reference to credibility is found in the second paragraph where the response references “Edna Mole a South Africa environment minister.” Mole is not found in the Works Cited, so credibility cannot be established through source selection.

Row 4: Understand and Analyze Perspective — The report earned a score of 2 for this row because it does not clearly identify arguments from the sources presented, nor does it connect arguments from sources.

Row 5: Apply Conventions (Attribution) — The report earned a score of 1 for this row because, while it contains a well-organized Works Cited page with three sources, it provides no evidence of in-text citations that link to it. The National Geographic source used in the introduction is not included on the Works Cited page.
Row 6: Apply Conventions (Grammar and Style) — The report earned a score of 1 for this row because of its colloquial tone and many distracting errors throughout. Issues in grammar and tone begin with the very first sentences (“Have you thought about animals poaching? Or on animals being used for art.”). These issues persist throughout the response.