

2020

AP  **CollegeBoard**

AP[®] Seminar

Performance Task 1

Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

Inside:

Individual Research Report

- Scoring Guideline**
- Student Samples**
- Scoring Commentary**

© 2020 College Board. College Board, Advanced Placement, AP, AP Central, and the acorn logo are registered trademarks of the 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.

Performance Task 1: Individual Research Report Scoring Guidelines

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. 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 and no citations 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.

Word Count

The Individual Research Report task instructions stipulate a word count of no more than 1200 words. At times, responses might exceed this limit. Students are allowed a 10% cushion. You should score these papers by discounting the words that are over 10% (or 1320 words).

Individual Research Report

30 points

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 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.	4 points 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.	6 points 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.
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes				
Typical responses that earn 0 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide no evidence of research. 	Typical responses that earn 2 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Address a very general topic of investigation (e.g., “pollution”). Draw mainly from one or two sources or poor-quality sources. Provide unsubstantiated assertions about the significance of the investigation (e.g., “this is important”). 	Typical responses that earn 4 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify too many aspects of the topic to address complexity (e.g., “air, water, and land pollution”). May be overly reliant on journalistic sources or lack any academic/scholarly sources. May provide generalized statements about the significance of the investigation. 	Typical responses that earn 6 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly state an area of investigation that is narrow enough to address the complexity of the problem or issue (e.g., “water pollution in India”). Include research that draws on some academic/scholarly sources. Provide specific and relevant details to convey why the problem or issue matters/is important. 	
Additional Notes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research context is located often in the titles of the reports and first paragraphs. Review Bibliography or Works Cited (but also check that any scholarly works are actually used to create context). 				

AP Seminar 2020 Scoring Guidelines

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
<p>Row 2</p> <p>Understand and Analyze Argument</p> <p>(0, 2, 4, or 6 points)</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>Does not meet the criteria for two points.</p>	<p>2 points</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>4 points</p> <p>The report summarizes information and in places offers effective explanation of the reasoning within the sources' argument (but does so inconsistently).</p>	<p>6 points</p> <p>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.</p>
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	<p>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide no evidence of research. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 2 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make no distinction between paraphrased material and response's commentary. Do not anchor ideas to sources. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide limited explanation of authors' reasoning; are dominated by summary of source material rather than explanation of sources' arguments. Occasionally lack clarity about what is commentary and what is from the source material. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 6 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide commentary that engages with and demonstrates understanding of the authors' reasoning, successfully using the sources' reasoning to draw conclusions.
<p>Additional Notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to arguments from the sources used often appears at the end of paragraphs and / or immediately following an in-text citation as part of the commentary on a source. 				

AP Seminar 2020 Scoring Guidelines

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 3 Evaluate Sources and Evidence (0, 2, 4, or 6 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for two points.	2 points 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.	4 points 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).	6 points 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.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide no evidence. 	Typical responses that earn 2 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide evidence that is irrelevant or only obliquely relevant. 	Typical responses that earn 4 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include references to credibility of sources that are more descriptive than analytical. Pay attention to the evidence, but not the source (may treat all evidence as equal when it is not). Draw upon research that may be clearly outdated without a rationale for using that older evidence. 	Typical responses that earn 6 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Go beyond mere description in the attribution, making purposeful use of the sources.
Additional Notes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Row 1, the judgement is whether the bibliography allows for complex context; Row 3 judges whether the incremental examples of evidence presented are well-selected and well-used. Purposeful use, in this case, refers to the deployment of relevant evidence from a credible source. 				

AP Seminar 2020 Scoring Guidelines

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
<p>Row 4</p> <p>Understand and Analyze Perspective</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>Does not meet the criteria for two points.</p>	<p>2 points</p> <p>The report identifies few and/or oversimplified perspectives from sources.**</p>	<p>4 points</p> <p>The report identifies multiple perspectives from sources, making some general connections among those perspectives.**</p>	<p>6 points</p> <p>The report discusses a range of perspectives and draws explicit and relevant connections among those perspectives.**</p>
<p>(0, 2, 4, or 6 points)</p>	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	<p>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide no evidence of research (only opinion). 	<p>Typical responses that earn 2 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Might include a minimal range of perspectives but they are not connected (they are isolated from each other). 	<p>Typical responses that earn 4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include multiple perspectives, but only general connections (or the connections need to be inferred). Include multiple perspectives that are connected, but do not explain the relationships among them by clarifying or elaborating on the points on which they are connected. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 6 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Go beyond mere identification of multiple perspectives by using details from different sources' arguments to explain specific relationships or connections among perspectives (i.e., placing them in dialogue).
<p>Additional Notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> **A perspective is a "point of view conveyed through an argument." (This means the source's argument). Throughout the report, pay attention to organization of paragraphs (and possibly headings) as it's a common way to group perspectives. Readers should pay attention to transitions, as effective transitions may signal connections among perspectives. 				

AP Seminar 2020 Scoring Guidelines

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
<p>Row 5</p> <p>Apply Conventions</p> <p>(0–3 points)</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>Does not meet the criteria for one point.</p>	<p>1 point</p> <p>The report includes many errors in attribution and citation OR the bibliography is inconsistent in style and format and/or incomplete.</p>	<p>2 points</p> <p>The report attributes or cites sources used but not always accurately. The bibliography references sources using a consistent style.</p>	<p>3 points</p> <p>The report attributes and accurately cites the sources used. The bibliography accurately references sources using a consistent style.</p>
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes				
<p>Typical responses that earn 0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide no evidence of research. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 1 point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include internal citations, but no bibliography (or vice versa). 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 (e.g., “Studies show...”; “Research says...” with no additional in-text citation). 	<p>Typical responses that earn 2 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide some uniformity in citation style. 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 and/or in-text parenthetical citations. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 3 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contain few flaws. Provide consistent evidence of linking internal citations to bibliographic references. Include consistent and clear attributive phrasing and/or in-text parenthetical citations. <p>Note: The response cannot score 3 points if key components of citations (i.e., author/organization, title, publication, date) are consistently missing.</p>	
<p>Additional Notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In AP Seminar, there is no requirement for using a particular style sheet; however, responses must use a style that is consistent and complete. Check the bibliography for consistency in style (and if there are fundamental elements missing). Check for clarity/accuracy in internal citations. Check to make sure all internal citations match up to the bibliography (without extensive search). 				

AP Seminar 2020 Scoring Guidelines

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
<p>Row 6</p> <p>Apply Conventions</p> <p>(0–3 points)</p>	<p>0 points</p> <p>Does not meet the criteria for one point.</p>	<p>1 point</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>2 points</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>3 points</p> <p>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.</p>
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
		<p>Typical responses that earn 1 point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employ an overall style that is not appropriate for an academic report: throughout the report, there are sustained errors, incoherent language, or colloquial tone. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 2 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contain some instances of errors. Demonstrate imprecise or vague word choice insufficient to communicate complexity of ideas. Sometimes lapse into colloquial language. Use overly dense prose that lacks clarity and precision. 	<p>Typical responses that earn 3 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contain few flaws. Demonstrate word choice sufficient to communicate complex ideas. Use clear prose.
<p>Additional Notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Readers should focus on the sentences written by the student, not those quoted or derived from sources. 				

Cambodian Women in the Workforce: Generations of Change

AP Seminar

March 2020

Word Count: 1302

The Cambodian saying, “We don’t forget the old rice pot when we get the new one,” well describes the situation women are facing in Cambodia (Hughes and Ojendal, 2006). Women in Cambodia face unequal opportunities in the workforce due to gender disparity. Their present situation is a tug-of-war between historical and cultural expectations of the past and increasing social changes aimed at improving the future. The progress of women’s roles in the workforce is hindered by the influence of older generations and cultural texts, such as the *Chba’p Srei*, which moralize adherence to Cambodian tradition. However, recent social change in Cambodia may counter this static culture significantly, creating opportunities for women to receive higher education and take more control over their lives.

The *Chba’p Srei*, a Buddhist text defining the ideal woman as silent and subservient, is often referenced as a code for the expectations of Cambodian women. Caroline Hughes, from the University of Notre Dame, and Joakim Ojendal, a Ph.D. in Peace and Development Research, wrote about a historical connection to the importance of the *Chba’p Srei*. During the Khmer Rouge, “social rupture” caused a ban on many cultural texts, including the *Chba’p Srei*. In years following, the *Chba’p Srei* was restored as a symbol of Cambodian culture, even “paraded [...] as a form of resistance to French colonial influence” (Hughes and Ojendal, 2006). Thus, the traditional expectations for Cambodian women are deeply rooted in national identity; to diverge from their teachings is to become as the foreigners. As University of London human geography professor Katherine Brickell commented: “Not only is Cambodian culture widely portrayed as stifling efforts at political reform, it is also regarded as unchanging itself” (Brickell, 2011). The reinforcement of the code and the static nature of the culture make the gender expectations difficult to escape. In an article from the *Phnom Penh Post*, Leabphea Chin (a Young Research Fellow at Future Forum) explains how in 2007, the Ministry of Women’s Affairs asked that the

Chba'p Srei no longer be taught in Cambodian schools. However, only parts of the text were removed, and a shorter version of the *Chba'p Srei* remains in the curriculum for grades seven to nine (Chin, 2019). The continued teaching of the *Chba'p Srei* perpetuates gender norms in a cycle that inhibits women's roles. If girls grow up believing they must behave as told in the *Chba'p Srei*, they may believe it unacceptable to pursue specific careers. Brickell (2011) claimed the progress of women's roles in the workforce is also limited because they feel pressure to maintain a consistent role in both family and society, due to the varied expectations. The cultural background of Cambodian society provides insight to the significant roadblocks to the advancement of women's roles in the workforce.

The gap between generations further demonstrates the pull between tradition and changing social norms. Traditionally, Cambodian families do not support careers for women that are seen as 'a man's job' or that may portray their daughters as lacking virtue. Cambodian actress Lida Duch described her mother's beliefs to the *Southeast Asia Globe* art and journalism magazine. She said: "My mum didn't support me. She never wanted me to pursue a career in film [...] She just wanted me to get a normal job" (Black and Len, 2018). Duch's experience demonstrates how the older generation advises youth to conform to tradition rather than defy it. According to Dr. Judy Ledgerwood, an anthropologist from Northern Illinois University, many homes in rural Cambodia are multigenerational—especially after the Khmer Rouge, which broke apart families and forced together extended relatives (Ledgerwood, n.d.). Surrounded by elder relatives with rigid views on culture and tradition, young women living in these multigenerational homes face difficulties in choosing their own career paths in life.

Interestingly, however, Ledgerwood observed a shift in decision-making factors in the newer generations when interviewing Khmer women in the 1980s. The women agreed that

adhering to cultural norms was “of critical importance,” but when asked how their lives differed from their mothers, “hard economic realities” were a greater concern than “concern with social status or gender ideals,” (Ledgerwood, n.d.). Ledgerwood observed that “...although the ideals are maintained as ideals, circumstances require that women act in bold ways, like coming to Phnom Penh to work as construction laborers or factory workers on their own” (Ledgerwood, 2002). Lida Duch has noted a similar shift: “It feels like a movement is developing. Parents are more open-minded about their children pursuing careers in the film industry, and people are getting more exposure” (Black and Len, 2018). While Duch’s perspective may not apply to all industries, it seems clear that the gap is gradually closing with each generation. While progress may be slower for women in rural areas due to isolation and less access to education, the urban area is beginning to see increasing acceptance of new careers for women.

Improvement of the accessibility of education for Cambodian girls has a significant impact on advancement in the workforce. Ledgerwood references the Cambodian Secretariat of State for Women’s Affairs 1995 data, saying that only 15% of Cambodian students in higher education were women, due to traditional values favoring the education of boys (Ledgerwood, n.d.). However, the World Bank reports that in 2017, 12% of Cambodian women were enrolled in tertiary education, compared to the 14% of men (World Bank, n.d.), showing a clear change to increasing balance between men and women in higher education since 1995. As girls receive increasingly equitable education, the rising generations of Cambodian women are better equipped and motivated to speak up about what still needs to be done for them to experience equality in the workforce. Lida Duch is one of few actresses to “defy the country’s prevailing definition of femininity” despite the drawbacks it has on her career (Black and Len, 2018). Although speaking up may be deemed unacceptable, women with a voice are pushing for

change. Thus, Cambodian women have experienced increasing mobility and authority in their lives, particularly in urban locations. Women make up 90% of the garment industry in Cambodia (Chin, 2019). These women migrate from the countryside to the city, where they live together with other working women. They make their own money, live independently from multigenerational families and male relatives, and are free to choose their own future “in a way impossible in the past” (Ledgerwood, n.d.). These Cambodian women may not hold decision-making careers, but their jobs provide increasing power to make decisions in their own lives.

Despite these promising changes, there is still more progress to be made. A 26-year-old Cambodian woman, Vannary, said: “If we live far from the past, we will be criticized” (Hughes and Ojendal, 2006). But, with each generation of progress, women in Cambodia come closer to equality than before. It is a step (or rather, many steps) in the right direction. Jenny Pearson, the founding director of the VBNK NGO in Cambodia, wrote a peer-reviewed article about a “women’s empowerment process” she led with a group of Cambodian women (Pearson, 2011). She discusses Cambodian culture, the psychological effect of the Khmer Rouge, and other factors that influence the way Cambodian women play a role in the workforce. From her perspective, the “empowerment process” made “no visible difference” (Pearson, 2011). Yet, she concluded with this: “The difference may yet become visible—but in Cambodian daughters, rather than their mothers” (Pearson, 2011). Progress is happening one generation at a time, and while it might not seem visible yet, it soon will be. Gender equality in every aspect will advance with each generation of change, as men and women strive to promote equal treatment and opportunities for women. The role of women in Cambodia’s workforce has come far since the Khmer Rouge ended in 1975, and it still has a way to go—but things are looking up.

Works Cited

- Black, Euan, and Leng Len. *Meet the Cambodian Actress Shaking up Social Norms*. Southeast Asia Globe, 12 June 2019, southeastasiaglobe.com/cambodian-actress-shaking-up-social-norms/.
- Brickell, Katherine. “‘We Don’t Forget the Old Rice Pot When We Get the New One’: Discourses on Ideals and Practices of Women in Contemporary Cambodia.” *Signs*, vol. 36, no. 2, 2011, pp. 437–462. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/655915. Accessed 9 Feb. 2020.
- Chin, Leabphea. “Addressing Stereotypes: Harmful Gender Norms in Cambodia.” *Addressing Stereotypes: Harmful Gender Norms in Cambodia | Phnom Penh Post*, Phnom Penh Post, 18 Aug. 2019, www.phnompenhpost.com/opinion/addressing-stereotypes-harmful-gender-norms-cambodia.
- Hughes, Caroline, and Joakim Öjendal. “Reassessing Tradition in Times of Political Change: Post-War Cambodia Reconsidered.” *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, vol. 37, no. 3, 2006, pp. 415–420. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/20071784. Accessed 9 Feb. 2020.
- Ledgerwood, Judy. “Women in Cambodian Society.” *Women in Cambodian Society*, Northern Illinois University, n.d., www.seasite.niu.edu/khmer/ledgerwood/women.htm.
- Pearson, Jenny. “No Visible Difference: A Women's Empowerment Process in a Cambodian NGO.” *Development in Practice*, vol. 21, no. 3, 2011, pp. 392–404., www.jstor.org/stable/23048603. Accessed 9 Feb. 2020.
- World Bank. “Country at a Glance - Cambodia.” *Education Statistics*, United Nations, n.d., datatopics.worldbank.org/education/country/cambodia.

The Hospital's View on a Reexamination of the Renal Transplant System

According to data collected by the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network as of January 16, 2020, 84% of the 112,684 patients on the organ waiting list need kidneys (“National Data”). Physicians performing transplant surgery prioritize patient care and ethics, with recipients favoring their own health. Hospital officials, however, take a holistic approach and view the issue of transplant allocation within context. With transplant demands and rates reaching an all-time high due to advances in medicine, a review of the current kidney allocation system is justified. When inspecting the hospital's view on renal transplant reallocation, some distinct views emerge: renal transplant recipients (RTRs) and physicians favoring a reevaluation of the system, with hospital administrators (HAs) opposing.

RTRs would favor a reexamination of the current renal transplant system due to its patient-related problems. Chiefly amongst these concerns is the lengthy waiting time; according to a Milliman research report on organs written by T. Scott Bentley and Stephen J. Phillips, Fellows of the Society of Actuaries, the average wait time for renal transplants in 2014 was approximately 679 days (12). While the authors find that this wait time has decreased significantly (from an average of 877 days in 2011) and argue its positivity (12), it still leaves a wait time of almost two years, and it would likely be one of the main goals of a new system to further decrease this. Additionally, according to Sharon R. Kaufman of the University of California, San Francisco, due to advances in medicine, a greater percentage of RTRs are elderly; this creates social friction as younger donated organs have their potential years of life unused on a person who may not live through the next decade (S57). An improved system would be more accurate at matching ages of organs, and would thus reduce this social unrest caused by shifting demographics. However, obesity complicates matters for RTRs. As per a report by the

National Center for Health Statistics, approximately 39.8% of United States (US) adults classify as obese (Hales et al. 1). J. S. Gill and his colleagues from the University of British Columbia examined the effects of obesity on renal transplant success rates. The authors find that, rather counterintuitively, certain obese patients can actually benefit more from dialysis (a process generally considered inferior to transplantation), as opposed to a renal transplant (2088); as such, obese RTRs would find the benefit of a reorganization limited at best. A new renal transplant system would thus have to consider the effects of obesity before deciding placement on the waiting list. The RTR's point of view regarding renal transplant allocation is similar to that of the physician's, albeit for different reasons.

Due to both professional and ethical obligations, physicians would favor a different kidney allocation system. One of physicians' main concerns would be potential malpractice lawsuits caused by lower success rates in renal transplants due to a greater age disparity between donors and recipients. According to M. Stacia Dearmin, a practicing physician at Akron Children's Hospital, malpractice suits greatly damage physicians' personal lives; Dearmin argues that these lawsuits can greatly damage a physician's mental well-being, and states that sometimes malpractice suits are misdirected anger at a procedure gone awry (365). Physicians would thus favor a new system that would be more efficient at matching organs and thus prevent transplant-related malpractice suits. Barring malpractice issues, however, there are still both medical and ethical issues associated with long wait times for RTRs. Jeffrey H. Wang and his colleagues of the University of Minnesota and the Minneapolis Medical Research Center determined that, for end-stage renal disease, RTRs in the US had an average five-year success rate of around 70%; in other words, the majority of RTRs survived beyond five years (283). This is in sharp contrast with the average of 2.9 years time on dialysis for patients over 70 who died,

as found by Barbara A. Elliot and her colleagues at the University of Minnesota (1497). Elliot and her colleagues also found that, for many patients, dialysis restricted their lifestyle and made some feel as if their suffering was just prolonged (1502). One of physicians' main goals is to prevent patient suffering, which an improved transplant system that could provide more transplants would accomplish. Additionally, physicians could argue for a twofold benefit of this; patients would no longer have to undergo regular treatment through dialysis, which would mean a one-time charge for hospitals and transplant centers rather than an ongoing process. This statement could potentially sway HAs, the third kind of parties involved in the hospital; however, they would still likely be against a restructuring of the renal transplant system.

As HAs' outlook is broader than that of physicians and patients, HAs would likely be against reorganization. Due to their focus on the hospital overall, HAs have more pressing concerns, such as the opioid crisis. According to Joshua M. Sharfstein, the associate dean at Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, opioid abuse led to almost 30,000 deaths in 2017 in the US alone (24); additionally, opioid treatment can greatly help improve the lives of those who are helped (25). HAs would thus prioritize opioid treatment, a more urgent issue, over the comparatively less pressing question of renal transplant reallocation. Moreover, managing primary care for RTRs presents a unique challenge. Gaurav Gupta and his colleagues at Johns Hopkins and the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center found that primary care for the RTR can be quite difficult due to a host of medical complications following the transplant (736). The authors assert that these chronic issues are accentuated by the rapidly-increasing amount of transplants occurring due to advances in medicine, which many hospitals are simply not equipped to handle (731). A parallel can be drawn to the aforementioned Kaufman's highlighting of the socioethical aspects of renal transplants, as they are also accentuated by increasing

amounts of RTRs. An additional issue still remains, however: hospital performance evaluations. As per Jesse D. Schold and his colleagues at the Cleveland Clinic, the quality of transplanted kidneys does not affect performance evaluations, which influence reimbursement and physician credentialing, among other benefits (907). However, the authors imply that this could be overlooked by hospital officials; they found that transplant centers sometimes reject viable kidneys that have some issues but still function well, citing past studies on the matter (912). A reevaluated transplant allocation system could deemphasize the use of these performance evaluations; this would be beneficial to patients as they would receive more kidneys. For HAs, however, this would mean a change from the current system, which could negatively impact their method of management due to its relative novelty. As a result of their non-individual point of view, HAs would look negatively upon reexamining the renal transplant system.

When considering a reexamination of the renal transplant system, transplant trends, finances, and ethics must also be reviewed; however, where hospitals are concerned, a more individual perspective yields support, whereas a broader one yields opposition. Physicians and RTRs would support a new allocation system due to their more individual point of view; RTRs would favor faster, more efficient kidney matching, whereas physicians would have medical and ethical issues with the current allocation system. However, HAs would likely not be amenable toward a new system. A new transplant system would have to be more efficient and closer at matching ages in order to justify the overhaul of the current system and thus be worth the effort from HAs. Additionally, many new rules and regulations would have to be implemented that could cover potential issues that may arise with shifting medical care. It remains to be seen if the potential positive effects of a reexamined transplant system, as experienced by physicians and RTRs, would outweigh the potential negatives experienced by HAs.

Word Count: 1270

Works Cited

- Bentley, T. Scott, and Steven J. Phillips. *2017 U.S. Organ and Tissue Transplant Cost Estimates and Discussion*. Aug. 2017. Milliman, us.milliman.com/insight/2017/2017-U_S_-organ-and-tissue-transplant-cost-estimates-and-discussion/. Accessed 8 Jan. 2020.
- Current U.S. Waiting List: Overall by Organ (Candidates). Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network, Health Resources and Services Administration / U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 16 Jan. 2020, optn.transplant.hrsa.gov/data/view-data-reports/national-data/#. Accessed 19 Jan. 2020. Table.
- Dearmin, M. Stacia. "Experience Is Treacherous: An Intimate View of the Physician's Experience of Adverse Patient Outcomes and Malpractice Litigation." *Health Matrix: Journal of Law-Medicine*, vol. 29, Jan. 2019, p. 357-70. EBSCOhost, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=f5h&AN=136372416. Accessed 9 Jan. 2020.
- Elliott, Barbara A., et al. "Shifting Responses in Quality of Life: People Living with Dialysis." *Quality of Life Research*, vol. 23, no. 5, 2014, pp. 1497–1504. JSTOR, doi:10.1007/s11136-013-0600-9. Accessed 12 Jan. 2020.
- Gill, J. S., et al. "The Survival Benefit of Kidney Transplantation in Obese Patients." *American Journal of Transplantation*, vol. 13, no. 8, Aug. 2013, pp. 2083-90. Wiley Online Library, doi:10.1111/ajt.12331. Accessed 9 Jan. 2020.
- Gupta, Gaurav, et al. "Primary Care of the Renal Transplant Patient." *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, vol. 25, 27 Apr. 2010, pp. 731-40. National Center for

Biotechnology Information, doi:10.1007/s11606-010-1354-5. Accessed 5 Jan. 2020.

Hales, Craig M., et al. *Prevalence of Obesity among Adults and Youth: United States, 2015-2016*. 2016. *Center for Disease Control*, www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/databriefs/db288.pdf. Accessed 12 Jan. 2020.

Kaufman, Sharon R. "Fairness and the Tyranny of Potential in Kidney Transplantation." *Current Anthropology*, vol. 54, no. Number S7, Oct. 2013, pp. S56-66. *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.1086/670193. Accessed 7 Jan. 2020.

Schold, Jesse D., et al. "Hidden Selection Bias Deriving From Donor Organ Characteristics Does Not Affect Performance Evaluations of Kidney Transplant Centers." *Medical Care*, vol. 48, no. 10, 2010, pp. 907–914. *JSTOR*, doi:10.1097/MLR.0b013e3181e57a4d. Accessed 6 Jan. 2020.

Sharfstein, Joshua M. "The Opioid Crisis From Research to Practice." *The Milbank Quarterly*, vol. 95, no. 1, 2017, pp. 24–27. *JSTOR*, doi:10.1111/1468-0009.12241. Accessed 8 Jan 2020.

Wang, Jeffrey H., et al. "Current Status of Kidney Transplant Outcomes: Dying to Survive." *Advances in Chronic Kidney Disease*, vol. 23, no. 5, Sept. 2015, pp. 281-86. *ACKD*, doi:10.1053/j.ackd.2016.07.001. Accessed 9 Jan. 2020.

Biodiversity Loss and Its Effects On Sustainability

According to Megan Nichols, “biodiversity is defined as the totality of genes, species and ecosystems in a defined area” (Nichols). In other words, biodiversity is the variety of life on earth at all levels, from genes to ecosystems, and can encompass the evolutionary, ecological, and cultural processes that sustain life. However, biodiversity loss is being caused mainly from deforestation. Biodiversity loss is the decrease of the totality of genes, species, and ecosystems in a defined area. According to Edward Wilson, he describes biodiversity loss as “the scientific problem of greatest immediate importance for humanity.” (Chen). An example of extreme deforestation would be the Amazon Rainforest. In the article, *Patterns of Forest Loss Per Territorial Category In The Amazon Rainforest: Peru (2001-2006)*, Nelson Carlos Rosot states in the past fifty years, 17% of the Amazon has been lost. The tipping point is 20%. Nelson Carlos Rosot also states illegal logging is responsible for 50-90% of deforestation. With the increasing amount of deforestation begins the decreasing of animal species. This is because deforestation takes away the habitats of several species. A loss of species can lead to the decline in the evolution of new species and recovery of ecosystems. Along with the decline in evolution of new species, a loss of species can also lead anthropic land use. With all of these effects from biodiversity, it leaves the question: How can we seek and act on solutions in order to decrease the amount of biodiversity loss occurring?

According to Dillys Roe, declines in species evolution causes extinction which results in long lasting effects. Roe also states the loss of species can threaten stability on which humans depend. Lastly, anthropic land use can be an issue due to invasive species. Invasive species is

“an animal or plant that is introduced to a new environment that can grow quickly and adapt to a variety of living conditions' ' (Lakicevic). Some examples include cheatgrass or garlic mustard. Plants like those are responsible for 33.4% of animal extinctions. They are also responsible for 25.5% of plant extinctions. With invasive species being the cause of the high percentages of extinctions, it is a big impact on biodiversity loss and causes the decrease of many species.

According to Cai, biodiversity loss can lead to inability to sustain medicines, ocean wildlife, and adequate food and water. Cai states that half the plants that are used to make certain medicines could be lost by 2050. Along with medicine, ocean wildlife provides up to three billion people with food and has been depleted through human intervention. Lastly, adequate food and water is crucial for maintaining a nutritious diet and many ecosystems are decreasing in abundance. In order to prevent these issues from completely taking over, conservation laws were put into state and help protect species. To go along with ocean wildlife, there is an act called the *Marine Mammal Protection Act* in which protects and rehabilitates endangered mammals. Another act is the *Defender's Act* which helps prevent extinctions and promotes species' recovery. With these acts, it gives protection to species and helps prevent human intervention from affecting biodiversity.

Along with the inability to sustain medicines, ocean wildlife, and adequate food and water, there is another rumbling issue. This comes with the rapid development of cities. The rapid development of cities mainly affects birds due to the mass amount of air pollution. Currently, 33% of all houses in the United States live next to a forest. Due to the placement of houses near birds habitats, it has caused 17% of all 800 American birds to decline. According to Croce, “20% of all species on Audubon Society's list of “common birds in decline” have lost at

least 50% of their populations since 1950.” (Croce). This shows just how big of an impact building roads or cities is to the species that are inhabiting the area. In order to prevent this, people need to be aware of their surroundings.

With this broad variety of causes of biodiversity loss, there are many approaches that can be taken. One approach that stood out was the increase of oak trees. Oak trees are able to be habitats for millions of species compared to some trees who are only able to inhabit a couple hundred species. With this jurassic difference, it is important we make oak trees more available so that animals that are endangered are able to be kept safe in their natural habitat. In order to initiate the start of this solution, there are different aspects you have to consider. The most significant being cost. Cost will affect cities' openness to implant the solution. The cheaper it is, the more appealing it seems. First to obtain the seedlings, it would cost between \$450-1,400. Those prices might seem intimidating but after possessing the seedlings, it would only cost \$250 per 1,000 seedlings to plant. However, if cities chose to implant the trees farther in development, it changes the prices. For a fifteen inch oak tree, it would cost between \$100-400. For a twelve foot tree, it would be \$1200-1900. Buying the trees farther in development can guarantee a decent lifespan. As for a seedling, some could die and not grow past ten feet.

Implanting all these oaks also makes up for a major effect of biodiversity loss which is deforestation. Deforestation takes away homes of many species. Deforestation costs \$4-5 trillion each year. Despite the negative impacts, organizations such as *The United Nations' Reducing Emissions* have raised \$117 million dollars for deforestation reduction. According to worldwildlife, the two main causes of deforestation are agriculture and illegal logging.

In conclusion, biodiversity is a majority overlooked issue in society. Many people don't realize how negatively it can affect our future. However, many organizations are working on spreading awareness and implanting solutions. Unfortunately, if this continues and 20% of forest is cut down, the rainforests water cycle will not be able to support the ecosystems that are there. This will significantly impact the species that rely on the water cycle for living. It could make some species potentially go extinct. Another issue in the future is the lack of evolution in plant and animal species. This is because when taking away species habitats, it calls for endangered or even extinction for species. This doesn't allow for species to develop. Not only for species, this also affects plants. Deforestation gets rid of the many plants and along with invasive species, the plants are not able to grow or evolve in the environment. In the future, there are many concerns about what can happen if awareness is not spread. More cities will be built over animal and plant habitats and more invasive species are brought into developing areas. This goes back to another major issue being human intervention. If humans were made more aware of tiny improvements in lifestyle, it could majorly make a difference in biodiversity loss. It could prevent the need to build more cities. It could make people more aware of invasive species in their area. Making people more aware of the invasive species in their area will help decrease the spread of the invasive species. Overall, it is important to act upon solutions and to promote awareness of biodiversity loss.

Word Count: 1205

Works Cited

Chen, James M. “The Fragile Menagerie: Biodiversity Loss, Climate Change, and the Law.” *Indiana Law Journal*, vol 93, no. 2, Spring 2018, pp. 303-367. EBSCOhost, search. [ebSCOhost.com/login.aspx?direct=true & db= a9h&AN= 132598794 & site=ehost-live](http://ebSCOhost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=132598794&site=ehost-live).

Croce, A., et al. “Evidence of Dramatic Biodiversity Loss in a Wet Biotope Calls for Urgent Conservation Strategies.” *Plant Biosystems*, vol 126, no. 4, Dec 2012, pp. 827- 834. EBSCOhost, doi:10. 1080//11263504.2012.692338.

Grove-Fanning, William. *Biodiversity Loss, The Motivation Problem, and the Future of Conservation Education in the United States*. 2011. EBSCOhost.

Hooper, David U., et al. “A Global Synthesis Reveals Biodiversity Loss as a Major Driver of Ecosystem Change.” *Nature*, vol.486, no. 7401, June 2012, pp. 105-108. EBSCOhost, doi:10.1038/nature11118

Lakicevic, Milena D. and Emina M. Mladenovic. “Non-Native and Invasive Tree Species- Their Impact on Biodiversity Loss” *Matica Srpska Journal for Natural Sciences*, no. 134, Jan. 2018, pp. 19-26. EBSCOhost.

Rendekova, Alena, et al, “Effects of Invasive Plant Species on Species Diversity: Implications on Ruderal Vegetation in Bratislava City, Slovakia, Central Europe.” pp. 1-19, vol. 88, no. 2, Summer 2019, EBSCOhost.com

Roe, Dillys, etc al. “Biodiversity Loss Is A Developmental Issue.” pubs.iied.org, IIED. Apr. 2019, pubs.iied.org/pdf/17636IIED.pdf.

Van Ryswysk, Brenda. “Invasive Species and Biodiversity.” *Invasive Species and Biodiversity-Conservation Halton*, 2020, www.conservationhalton.ca

Data Mining

Big Corporate Giants like Google are datamining our personal information and using it for advertisements. It's all underpinned by the same thing: the massive trove of data that Google is collecting on billions of people every day. – Ben Popken (NBC News). This issue is controversial because it is an important part of Google livelihood, yet it is an invasion of privacy on the people. This issue is relevant today because compared to other world problems, this one is still relatively new and with the Tech Industry booming, has more light being shed on it by the day. Businesses, People of all ages, and even the government. This can be mentally, politically, and socially harmful with your data being data mined and seen by these corporate giants, they can use it to help in elections, it's existence makes you uneasy and maybe scared to use the internet and it harms just about everyone making it social. I hope to find a solution that'll help reduce the amount of data mining going on.

Independent search engines will help protect you from “cookies” and data mining. Ashish Mundhra, the staff writer for guiding tech is a supporter of duckduckgo and is speaking about its benefits. This first and the foremost advantage of using DuckDuckGo is their privacy policy. It does not collect or share personal information. No search record is ever created on DuckDuckGo and thus no one can trace it back to you. – Ashish Mundhra (Guiding Tech). This evidence is proving that there are independent search engines that can be perfectly safe and still work just as good. My idea is that independent search engines are safe alternatives to google, etc. and this evidence supports that perfectly. Google gleans over all your search history and records the searches you have made across all its services. “This first and the foremost advantage of using DuckDuckGo is their privacy policy. It

does not collect or share personal information. No search record is ever created on DuckDuckGo and thus no one can trace it back to you.” (Guiding Tech). Google is using our private information to send out ads and monitor what we search, whereas duckduckgo does not. Even if you are not signed in and are searching as an anonymous user, Google still records your computer’s IP data. “Google still records your computer’s IP data.” (Guiding Tech). Google not only uses cookies and data mining, but they can also track you with your IP making it virtually impossible to escape. Search Engines like DuckDuckGo will go be bought out of business if they become too popular. DuckDuckGo is funded by the people and has a supportive fan base that won’t be so easily bought out. Google and other big corporate giants like Facebook, etc. are taking over and stealing our info and using it in marketing for ads. But with independent search engines made by the people, for the people, we can walk a new path without the constant stare.

“ In today’s fiercely competitive business environment, companies need to rapidly turn these terabytes of raw data into significant insights into their customers and markets to guide their marketing, investment.” (Abey Francis). Corporate companies are infringing on the rights of the people by interfering with their personal data. “The use of data mining in this way is not only considered unethical, but also illegal. Individuals need to be protected from any unethical use of their personal information” (Francis) Datamining can destroy people’s lives. Big companies can start losing customers or users because of privacy issues. “In data mining, the privacy and legal issues that may result are the main keys to the growing conflicts. The ways in which data mining can be used is raising questions regarding privacy.”(Francis) When customers feel violated by the websites they use, they most likely will switch to an alternative where they won’t feel so violated. Big corporate companies

need to data-mine to send out the right ads to the right people. Datamining might give you ads that can relate to you but they do it off of just a search which might not be accurate and also gives them access to other data than just the search. Being Misinformed can cause extreme damage to someone's life and yours, not only just people but also will damage companies.

Facebook using our private data for more than just ads. Facebook is one of the biggest data hoarders and something that no one would've expected. "Facebook would accept such a compensation package lightly. Multiplying £5000 by 87 million soon adds up, even for Facebook." (Timothy Revell) Most of Facebook's wealth comes from the accumulation of our data. When Facebook was first introduced, no one would've thought that they would sell so much of our data. "It is still very difficult to get Facebook to truly delete information it holds about you, and opting in to and out of certain aspects of the platform is still very limited." (Timothy Revell) We need to be more cautious and active in new upcoming social media to make sure we have a safe alternative. Facebook owns so much of our data they can sway election polls. "Facebook estimates that data from 87 million people ended up in the hands of Cambridge Analytica this way" (Timothy Revell) With the majority of the population using social media like Facebook and putting their views out through the platform, Facebook can use this and sell that data to advertisers that work with politicians to sway elections. Facebook is a monopoly in social media and it has become an important part of peoples lives. If we can get this problem into the light of everyday people, then there will start to begin change and slowly more and more people will begin moving to other social platforms and alternative search engines. Platforms

similar to Facebook or bought by Facebook are huge in collecting their users' data and abusing it to even maybe sway an election by selling our personal information.

Datamining is a problem because it's invading our privacy. Big corporate companies like Google and Facebook are using our private information for their benefit. Search Engines like DuckDuckGo and using other social media are great ways of dodging the companies and becoming less of a target. We need to get this information out to the people so that more people will use these alternatives. If we continue to not do anything about this, there will be more and more data used to either sway elections, go against us in job interviews, etc. Although billions of people already use Google and Facebook, we can make a change with their platforms and direct people in the direction of privacy and safety. The community would be much more private, employers at job interviews won't pester you with your past and elections will become more of a legitimate choice by the people. This is the power of data mining for why we need to help prevent this.

Word Count: 1,182

Works Cited:

- <https://www.nbcnews.com/tech/tech-news/google-sells-future-powered-your-personal-data-n870501>
- <https://www.newscientist.com/article/2166435-how-facebook-let-a-friend-pass-my-data-to-cambridge-analytica/>
- <https://www.guidingtech.com/11797/5-reasons-to-search-web-with-duckduckgo/>
- <https://www.mbaknol.com/information-systems-management/ethical-security-legal-and-privacy-concerns-of-data-mining/>

**AP Seminar
Performance Task 1
Individual Research Report (IRR)
2020 Scoring Commentaries**

Index of Scores for Samples

Sample Reference	Row 1	Row 2	Row 3	Row 4	Row 5	Row 6
A: Cambodian Women	6	6	6	6	3	3
B: Renal Transplant	6	6	6	6	3	3
C: Biodiversity Loss	4	4	4	4	2	2
D: Data Mining	2	2	2	2	1	1

**AP Seminar
Performance Task 1
Individual Research Report (IRR)
2020 Scoring Commentaries**

Sample A

Cambodian Women in the Workforce: Generations of Change

Sample Scores: 6, 6, 6, 6, 3, 3

Row 1: Understand and Analyze Context

The report earned 6 points in Row 1 because it isolates a precise area of study: how cultural norms shape Cambodian women’s work lives over generations. The report makes clear the importance of the topic by stressing that this particular historical moment offers the prospect of access to higher education and change. The bibliography consists of two news sources, three academic journals, one statistical source, and one undated .edu website (not itself peer-reviewed). The bibliography is (minimally) sufficient to contextualize the report.

Row 2: Understand and Analyze Argument

The report earned 6 points in Row 2 because it consistently provides insightful analysis of arguments derived from the sources. For example, on p. 1, the report notes the cultural power of the Chbab Srey and links this to national identity within the context of a French Colonial past. The rest of the paragraph teases out the conflict between a text that is important to national identity but that dismisses women’s contributions. Another example, in the second paragraph on p. 4, questions the statistical argument provided in a journal article.

Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence

The report earned 6 points for Row 3 because it uses academic peer-reviewed material well and, overall, provides abundant rationale for the inclusion of other types of sources. While a more precise case could have been made for Chin, elsewhere, the treatment of sources is apt. For example, on pp. 3–4, the report uses details from a news source (about actress Lida Duch’s personal experience) to suggest the pervasiveness of generational advice given to women. The report then follows with research conclusions from a university anthropologist, albeit from an undated source on a faculty webpage. Ideally, that research conclusion would have been from a dated, current peer-reviewed source. The case is implicitly made for Duch as a credible source for “influence” and Judy Ledgerwood’s credibility for anthropological study.

Row 4: Understand and Analyze Perspective

The report earned a score of 6 points for Row 4 because it consistently draws complex connections among the sources, sometimes using one source to corroborate another, sometimes teasing out differences, sometimes building a coherent research narrative from the literature. Examples abound in each paragraph of the report.

Row 5: Apply Conventions (Citation and Attribution)

The report earned a score of 3 points for Row 5 because the Works Cited page lists each source used and provides enough information to determine the type of source. While a descriptor would have made the Ledgerwood citation clearer (e.g., “Faculty Webpage”), journals are clearly distinguished from news sources. Internal citations clearly link to the Works Cited page and attribution within the text makes clear to the reader whence the information is derived.

**AP Seminar
Performance Task 1
Individual Research Report (IRR)
2020 Scoring Commentaries**

Row 6: Apply Conventions (Grammar and Style)

The report earned a score of 3 points for Row 6 because the tone is appropriate for an academic report, and the prose clearly articulates complex ideas.

**AP Seminar
Performance Task 1
Individual Research Report (IRR)
2020 Scoring Commentaries**

Sample B

The Hospital’s View on a Reexamination of the Renal Transplant System

Sample Scores: 6, 6, 6, 6, 3, 3

Row 1: Understand and Analyze Context

The report earned a score of 6 points in Row 1 because, while the title could be a more precise reflection of the content, it does identify a precise topic (the renal transplant system), and the introduction signals a particular focus (conflicting perspectives of different stakeholders—patients, doctors, hospitals). While the report does focus on three different stakeholders and is organized by these perspectives—a move that might suggest breadth rather than depth—the report consistently drills down to the details and complexities of the renal transplant system. Thus, overall, the report is characterized by depth rather than breadth. The bibliography is sufficient for the report, consisting of specialized peer-reviewed journals, government documents, and a report by a research and consulting firm. The context for the question is clear: The demand for transplants is rising; patients and doctors favor a reevaluation of the current system, while hospitals oppose.

Row 2: Understand and Analyze Argument

The report earned a score of 6 points in Row 2 because it consistently and precisely analyzes the arguments in the sources and uses that information from sources to draw conclusions. For example, on p. 1, the report cites the consulting firm’s conclusion (derived from actuarial data) and then offers this detailed commentary: “While the authors find that this wait time has decreased significantly (from an average of 877 days in 2011) and argue its positivity (12), it still leaves a wait time of almost two years, and it would likely be one of the main goals of a new system to further decrease this.” Examples of such analysis of sources’ arguments are present throughout the report.

Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence

The report earned a score of 6 points in Row 3 because it draws from well-chosen relevant and credible sources, frequently augmenting the Works Cited with apt attributive phrasing, e.g., on p. 1, “according to a Milliman research report on organs written by T. Scott Bentley and Stephen J. Phillips, Fellows of the Society of Actuaries,” and on p. 2, “As per a report by the National Center for Health Statistics.”

Row 4: Understand and Analyze Perspective

The report earned a score of 6 points in Row 4 because it consistently articulates the relationships among sources, often drawing nuanced and complex connections. In each paragraph, arguments from a particular stakeholder are collected and then woven together into a coherent narrative of the research literature.

Row 5: Apply Conventions (Citation and Attribution)

The report earned a score of 3 points in Row 5 because it consistently and accurately cites sources. The Works Cited page makes clear the type of source being used (it contains all essential elements), and attribution within the text is clear. While there is one misfired linking (the “National Data” internal citation should read something like “Current U.S. Waiting List”), all other citations clearly link to the Works Cited.

**AP Seminar
Performance Task 1
Individual Research Report (IRR)
2020 Scoring Commentaries**

Row 6: Apply Conventions (Grammar and Style)

The report earned a score of 3 points in Row 6 because the prose is clear and capable of expressing complex ideas. There are few to no errors to impede communication. The tone is appropriate for an academic research report.

**AP Seminar
Performance Task 1
Individual Research Report (IRR)
2020 Scoring Commentaries**

Sample C

Biodiversity Loss and Its Effects on Sustainability

Sample Scores: 4, 4, 4, 4, 2, 2

Row 1: Understand and Analyze Context

The response earned 4 points in Row 1 because it identifies a topic in the title and, in the introduction, appears to narrow the focus to the Amazon Rainforest. The bibliography is well-populated with academic sources. The report makes clear the significance of the issue. However, the body of the report does not limit the report to the Amazon and does not sustain a focus: It moves to loss of species, invasive species, medicine, ocean life, adequate food and water, expansion of cities, and more (the list continues as the report unfolds, with each new sentence or two bringing a new idea about biodiversity loss or sustainability in the world). Finally, the report develops by touching lightly on many facets of the topic, with the result that no single facet is explored in depth.

Row 2: Understand and Analyze Argument

The response earned 4 points in Row 2 because analysis, where present, only generally traces the logic (e.g., on p. 2, “This shows just how big of an impact building roads or cities is to the species that are inhabiting the area. In order to prevent this, people need to be aware of their surroundings”). On occasion, analysis repeats rather than develops. In some places, the report does not clearly mark what is paraphrase of source material and what is the candidate’s own analysis of reasoning.

Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence

The response earned 4 points in Row 3 because it does partially rely on well-chosen sources from peer-reviewed journals. However, there is some evidence that all sources are treated equally (e.g., On the bottom of p. 1, top of p. 2, information from a policy and research institute “promoting sustainable development” is treated the same as information from an academic source). In some places, it is not clear whence the information is derived.

Row 4: Understand and Analyze Perspective

The response earned 4 points in Row 4 because perspectives are only generally linked (e.g., “Implanting all these oaks also makes up for a major effect of biodiversity loss which is deforestation. Deforestation takes away homes of many species”). In the second and third paragraphs, different sources are used predominantly to list issues or solutions and are simply juxtaposed, rather than placed in conversation (e.g., Roe and Lakicevic in paragraph 2, or the two Acts in paragraph 3). At times perspectives are not tethered to particular sources.

Row 5: Apply Conventions (Citation and Attribution)

The response earned 2 points in Row 5 because, while citation format is mostly consistent, there are missing sources (Cai, Nicols, & Rosot) and missing elements (e.g., the publisher for Grove-Fanning book is EBSCOhost; there is no title for the journal in which the Rendekova source appears).

**AP Seminar
Performance Task 1
Individual Research Report (IRR)
2020 Scoring Commentaries**

Row 6: Apply Conventions (Grammar and Style)

The response earned 2 points in Row 6 because the prose lacks precision and is not sufficient to communicate complex ideas (e.g., “This is because when taking away species habitats, it calls for endangered or even extinction for species. This doesn’t allow for species to develop. Not only for species, this also affects plants”).

**AP Seminar
Performance Task 1
Individual Research Report (IRR)
2020 Scoring Commentaries**

Sample D

Data Mining

Sample Scores: 2, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1

Row 1: Understand and Analyze Context

The report earned a score of 2 points in Row 1 because, while it identifies a topic (data mining, big corporations, and harmful impacts), it shows little evidence of research. The significance of the overall problem is simplistic (i.e., “compared to other world problems, this one is still relatively new and with the Tech Industry booming, has more light being shed on it by the day”). “Invasion of privacy” is also identified, but there is no elaboration. The rationale is a jumble of many elements of the problem.

Row 2: Understand and Analyze Argument

The report earned a score of 2 points in Row 2 because it restates or misstates information from the sources or provides simplistic commentary (e.g., p. 2, “Even if you are not signed in and are searching as an anonymous user, Google still records your computer’s IP data. ‘Google still records your computer’s IP data.’ (Guiding Tech)”). Frequently, rather than commenting on the sources’ arguments, the report delves into the student’s ideas (e.g., on p. 1, “My idea is that...”).

Row 3: Evaluate Sources and Evidence

The report earned a score of 2 points in Row 3 because there is little attention to credibility. While there is an attributive tag for Ashish Mundhra, it states only the fact that Mundhra is a staff writer for Guiding Tech. Nothing more is said about Mundhra’s credentials as an expert on data mining and privacy. There is nothing else to indicate the credibility of sources used.

Row 4: Understand and Analyze Perspective

The report earned a score of 2 points in Row 4 because it identifies perspectives from three sources (Mundhra, Francs, and Revell), but it treats each independently. Overall, the report loses sight of reporting out on the research, focusing instead on articulating the report writer’s own opinions.

Row 5: Apply Conventions (Citation and Attribution)

The report earned a score of 1 point in Row 5 because the bibliography consists entirely of URLs. Internal citations do not link to anything, but they are evidence that the report writer did conduct research.

Row 6: Apply Conventions (Grammar and Style)

The report earned a score of 1 point in Row 6 because of significant flaws in grammar and incoherent syntax, e.g., on p. 1, “Businesses, People of all ages, and even the government. This can be mentally, politically, and socially harmful with your data being data mined and seen by these corporate giants, they can use it to help in elections, it’s existence makes you uneasy and maybe scared to use the internet and it harms just about everyone making it social.” Or on p. 3, “Datamining might give you ads that can relate to you but they d it off of just a search which might not be accurate and also gives them access to other data than just the search. Being Misinformed can cause extreme damage to someone’s life and yours, not only just people but also will damage companies.”