

2020

AP®

 CollegeBoard

AP® Seminar Performance Task 1

Scoring Guidelines

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			
Row 2 Understand and Analyze Argument (0, 2, 4, or 6 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for two points.	2 points The report restates or misstates information from sources. It doesn't address reasoning in the sources or it does so in a very simplistic way.	4 points The report summarizes information and in places offers effective explanation of the reasoning within the sources' argument (but does so inconsistently).	6 points 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.
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"> Make no distinction between paraphrased material and response's commentary. Do not anchor ideas to sources. 	Typical responses that earn 4 points: <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. 	Typical responses that earn 6 points: <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.
Additional Notes <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. 				

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).
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. 				

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 4 Understand and Analyze Perspective	0 points Does not meet the criteria for two points.	2 points The report identifies few and/or oversimplified perspectives from sources.**	4 points The report identifies multiple perspectives from sources, making some general connections among those perspectives.**	6 points The report discusses a range of perspectives and draws explicit and relevant connections among those perspectives.**
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes				
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Provide no evidence of research (only opinion).	Typical responses that earn 2 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Might include a minimal range of perspectives but they are not connected (they are isolated from each other).	Typical responses that earn 4 points: <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.	Typical responses that earn 6 points: <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).
Additional Notes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> **A perspective is a “point of view conveyed through an argument.” (This means the source’s argument). 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. 				

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
	0 points	1 point	2 points	3 points
Row 5 Apply Conventions (0–3 points)	Does not meet the criteria for one point.	The report includes many errors in attribution and citation OR the bibliography is inconsistent in style and format and/or incomplete.	The report attributes or cites sources used but not always accurately. The bibliography references sources using a consistent style.	The report attributes and accurately cites the sources used. The bibliography accurately references sources using a consistent style.
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 1 point: <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). 	Typical responses that earn 2 points: <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. 	Typical responses that earn 3 points: <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>
	Additional Notes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In AP Seminar, there is no requirement for using a particular style sheet; however, responses must use a style that is consistent and complete. Check the bibliography for consistency in style (and 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). 			

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 6 Apply Conventions (0–3 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	1 point 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.	2 points 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.	3 points 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.
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes				
	Typical responses that earn 1 point: <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. 	Typical responses that earn 2 points: <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. 	Typical responses that earn 3 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contain few flaws. Demonstrate word choice sufficient to communicate complex ideas. Use clear prose. 	
Additional Notes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Readers should focus on the sentences written by the student, not those quoted or derived from sources. 				