AP | CollegeBoard

AP® Seminar
End-of-Course Exam
Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

Inside:

Part A

☑ **Scoring Guideline**

☑ **Student Samples**

☑ **Scoring Commentary**

AP® SEMINAR — END-OF-COURSE EXAM
2019 SCORING GUIDELINES

Part A, Questions 1 to 3

Row/Proficiency	Points earned for...			MAX Points
1 **UNDERSTAND AND ANALYZE ARGUMENT**	The response misstates the author's argument, main idea, or thesis. 1 Pt	The response identifies, in part and with some accuracy, the author's argument, main idea, or thesis. 2 Pts	The response accurately identifies the author's argument, main idea, or thesis. 3 Pts	**3**
2 **UNDERSTAND AND ANALYZE ARGUMENT**	The response correctly identifies at least one of the author's claims. 2 Pts	The response provides a limited explanation of the author's line of reasoning by accurately identifying some of the claims AND identifying the connections or acknowledging a relationship among them. 4 Pts	The response provides a thorough explanation of the author's line of reasoning by identifying relevant claims and clearly explaining connections among them. 6 Pts	**6**
3 **EVALUATE SOURCES AND EVIDENCE**	The response identifies little evidence. It makes a superficial reference to relevance and/or credibility but lacks explanation. 2 Pts	The response explains various pieces of evidence in terms of credibility and relevance, but may do so inconsistently or unevenly. 4 Pts	The response evaluates the relevance and credibility of the evidence and thoroughly evaluates how well the evidence is used to support the author's argument. 6 Pts	**6**

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.
- 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.

Write your response to PART A, QUESTION 1 on this page only. Do not skip lines.

Peter Levine's argument is that the United States should lower its voting age from 18 to 17 in order to promote informed voting, expand the national electorate, and, in turn, strengthen the nation's democracy as a whole.

Levine builds his argument that the US should lower its voting age to 17 by presenting the notion that high schools could encourage informed voting, utilizing specific examples in which younger voting ages have benefitted democracies, and by examining the benefits ~~that could~~ of a ~~by~~ lower voting age that could potentially be enjoyed by the United States.

He first makes the claim that lowering the voting age would allow high schools to ~~inform~~ educate their students on how to be informed voters and create a cultural norm in American youth that encourages voting. Levine argues that because "voting is habitual," the US could see higher turn-out rates in areas where "a majority of students believed that they should vote." Not only will more people vote if the age limit is lowered to 17, Levine argues, but more informed people would also ~~strike through~~ participate in elections because schools would have the opportunity to improve their students' "knowledge of the Constitution, the political system and current issues" prior to an election.

These claims made by Levine are supported by his inclusion of specific examples in which lower voting ages have encouraged democratic participation. He notes that when Scotland lowered its voting age to 16, the "turnout in that age range was high." This greatly contrasts his example of California, which, in the 2014 elections, saw a turnout of only "5.2 percent of eligible 18-year-olds." He also notes the example that, when allowed to preregister at age 17, young voters were more likely to vote, a reform that encouraged students to branch out from simply voting blindly (if at all) and actually ~~strike through~~ "broadened the youth

electorate... to include more Republican voters."

Finally, Levine explains the impact that a lowered voting age could have on the US specifically. He claims that it would allow an opportunity to connect "civil learning in schools to an important act of citizenship," which would in turn "boost informed participation in our democracy" longterm, thus allowing the voices of the youth to make American "policies and institutions better."

Begin your response to PART A, QUESTION 3 on this page. Do not skip lines.

Levine effectively utilizes credible evidence ~~for wa~~ to support most of his claims, though there are some areas that lack credibility.

His use of ~~quote~~ research conducted by political scientists such as that of Eric Plutzer, Mark Franklin, and John Holbein and Sunshine Hillygus was appropriate because Levine's argument centered around politics. As these sources ~~proceeded~~ were all experts in their field of political science, they were perfectly in position to support Levine's argument with their research and claims that proved "voting is habitual," ~~and~~ having the voting age at 18 may have been the "sole reason voter turnout has declined," and that a lower age could potentially "broaden the youth electorate."

Levine's inclusion of examples from Scotland, Maryland, and Iowa were also effective as they supported his argument with historical evidence of successful attempts at lower voting ages.

Finally, Levine's use of claims by college professors David E. Campbell, Daniel Hart, and Robert Atkins was somewhat effective because, as college professors, they're around young adults (the young voting demographic) all the time. However, because they are not proven to be experts in the political field and because there is no cited proof of their claims, their credibility to speak on the matter was lacking. Overall, however, Levine's evidence was both effective and credible with relative consistency throughout the argument.

In the article, the main idea or thesis is that the voting age should be lowered to the age of 17 and that it will boost participation in our democracy.

Begin your response to PART A, QUESTION 2 on this page. Do not skip lines.

In the first paragraph the author makes a claim that lowering the voting age to 17 will increase the participation in our democracy. A subclaim that he uses ~~he uses~~ for this claim If the government affected you then you should have a say in who runs the government.~~He t~~

He ~~to~~ throws in a Counter argument about being too younge to vote, then makes a subclaim that If they get to wear our uniform in battle then how are they too immature. The first subclaim he makes goes with the second subclaim because they are both talking about if they can go to war then they should be able to vote.

The next subclaim he makes is that once you vote once you would want to vote again. He backs this up by using a political scientist from Penn State who did a ~~few~~ research on this subclaim.

His next subclaim is that being 17 you are still at home, which means you have influence from your parents. He makes an argument about being influenced to vote when you see other people vote. The next subclaim he makes connects to the subclaim about out being influenced to vote. The subclaim is that having influences from your school can make you want to vote. He uses a Notro Dame professor to back up this subclaim.

The next subclaim he makes is that a 16 year-old political knowloge is about the same as a 21 year-old. To back this claim up he uses professors from Rutgers-Camden who have done research on it.

To back up him main claim he use Scotlands voting turn out. In Scotland they lowered their voting age to 16 and their turnout range was high.

All around I think the sources he used were effective. The first source he states is Eric Plutzer. Eric Plutzer is a political scientist from Penn State who has done research on the topic, so think he used & Plutzer as an effective scrce. Like Eric Plutzer I thought that he used his next source, Mark Franklin who is also a political scientist, in a way that was benefical to the artical. Franklin was a good choice to use because he had studied 22 democracies and had found a pattern. The next source he had used I didn't find as effective. He used a professor from Notro Dame, I didn't feel who knew much about I think a little more information about him would have made it more effective. The last one that is used is two political scientist, John Holbein and Sunshine Hillygus. I thought that they were effective because it should a result of their experement in a benefical way to the main claim and subclaim. I thought the sources were used in a benefical way to the claim made.

Write your response to PART A, QUESTION 1 on this page only. Do not skip lines.

The author's argument is that the government should lower the age of voting, because younger ages are most likely to vote more. The author's thesis is to let younger students to vote because may be they can make a change in the government.

Begin your response to PART A, QUESTION 2 on this page. Do not skip lines.

There are several claims that the author makes to support his argument. One of the claims that Peter Levine states is that "It is time to try lowering the voting age to 17 nation wide" (Levine). He backs it up with that many states have done such as Maryland and Iowa, also he mention how Scotland went lower age 16. Levine says that it will boost the voting participation more. Another argument Levine makes is that "To get into voting booth, we also need to hear arguments, debates and emotional appeals about the importance of current issues" (Levine). He supports it by saying that it should be a civic responsibility for people to vote. In this claim he is saying that people need motivation to vote. Another claim that Levine makes is that "But 17 maybe a better age. At 17, most people are still living at home, where they can see parents voting and probably hear about local issues and candidates" (Levine). Levine supports the fact that when one is 17 one is still in school which will help encourage to vote more. Also, one is still with parents and if they see that their parents vote, then one is going to get motivated to vote.

The effectiveness of the evidence given was not bad but some claims are not supported. For example where Levine states "It is time to try lowering the voting age to 17 nationwide." He supports it with the fact that Maryland and Iowa has done, and because Scotland lowered it to the 16. But where Levine states "To get into the voting booth, we also need to hear arguments, debated and emotional appeals about the importance of current issues." He never supported this claim he just moved on. But after all he did give valid evidence. Some of the claims that he gave were too vague, which weren't considered supported.

AP® SEMINAR
2019 SCORING COMMENTARY

End-of-Course Exam
Short Answer

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

Overview

This task assessed a student's ability to read a general interest article and:

- Identify the article's argument or thesis in its entirety (Q1);

- Identify the claims and/or line of reasoning contained in the argument as well as the connections among those claims (Q2); and

- Identify the evidence utilized by the author in support of the claims, assessing the relevance and credibility to that claim (Q3).

Sample: A
Question 1 Score: 3
Question 2 Score: 6
Question 3 Score: 6

HIGH SAMPLE RESPONSE

Row 1: Question 1 — This response earned **3** points for this row because it accurately captures the entirety of the author's argument that the United States should "lower its voting age from 18 to 17 in order to promote informed voting, expand the national electorate, and, in turn, strengthen the nation's democracy as a whole."

Row 2: Question 2 — This response earned **6** points because it accurately identifies several claims and draws a clear connection between those claims to demonstrate the line of reasoning. The response begins by establishing Levine's claims that voting is habitual and lowering the voting age "would lead to more informed voters" and "encourage democratic participation." The response also thoroughly explains the links between claims in the author's line of reasoning and provides examples: "Levine builds his argument that the US should lower its voting age to 17 by presenting the notion that high schools could encourage informed voting … and by examining the benefits of a lower voting age," and, "These claims made by Levine are supported by his inclusion of specific examples in which." This thorough explanation of the relationship between claims to illustrate the line of reasoning is sufficient to earn a high score for this row.

End-of-Course Exam
Short Answer

Row 3: Question 3 — This response earned **6** points for row 3 because it provides an evaluation of the relevance and credibility of several pieces of evidence and explains how that evidence supports the author's overall argument. As the response moves through the claims, it refers to specific pieces of evidence that support the author's claim: "Levine's inclusion of examples from Scotland, Maryland, and Iowa … supported his argument … of successful attempts at lower voting age." The response acknowledges that "use of research conducted by political scientists such as that of Eric Plutzer, Mark Franklin, and John Holbein and Sunshine Hillygus was appropriate because Levine's argument centered around politics." The response adds that the sources were experts in their fields, perfectly positioned to support the author's argument. The response suggests that the citations of college professors were "somewhat effective because, as college professors, they're around young adults … all the time" demonstrating an ability to question credibility of the researchers; there is no reason to suppose that being around young adults in itself would prove any of the author's claims. The response, concludes, nonetheless, with the statement that the "evidence was both effective and credible with relative consistency throughout the argument." The analysis would have been stronger had the response noted where evidence was lacking, for example, when the author claims that seeing others vote will help young people develop the habit of voting.

Sample: B
Question 1 Score: 2
Question 2 Score: 4
Question 3 Score: 4

MEDIUM SAMPLE RESPONSE

Row 1: Question 1 — The response earned a score of **2** on row 1. The response partially captures the author's argument by identifying the effect lowering the voting age to 17 would have on democracy; however, the response does not clarify that improved voter turnout is the mechanism behind this effect.

Row 2: Question 2 — The response earned a score of **4** on row 2. The response correctly identifies a number of the author's claims (for example, "if the government affected you then you should have a say in who runs the government" and "once you vote once you would want to vote again"). The response also acknowledges connections between claims ("a subclaim that he uses for this claim") and refers back to the author's thesis ("to back up him main claim"). Yet these connections are asserted rather than explained, and the response overall does not demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of how the author develops his argument.

Row 3: Question 3 — The response earned a score of **4** on row 3. The response discusses numerous pieces of evidence and their effectiveness in supporting the author's argument. Overall, however, the response lacks specificity. The response does connect some pieces of evidence to the author's claims in Question 2 ("he backs this up by using a political scientist" and "he uses a Notre Dame professor to back up this subclaim") but is generally vague regarding how the evidence is relevant. The response also engages in some assessment of credibility, noting, for example, "he used a professor from Notre Dame … I think a little more information about him would have made it more effective." Still, the response does not clarify why the source lacks credibility.

End-of-Course Exam
Short Answer

Sample: C
Question 1 Score: 1
Question 2 Score: 2
Question 3 Score: 2

LOW SAMPLE RESPONSE

Row 1: Question 1 — The response earned **1** point for this row because it misstates the argument by stating that "younger ages are most likely to vote more," but is not linked to the primary point: that 17-year-olds are more likely to vote than 18-year-olds.

Row 2: Question 2 — The response earned **2** points for this row because it only vaguely identifies one claim with "[a]t 17, most people are still living at home, where they can see parents voting and hear about local issues and candidates," but fails to place even that claim into context by noting that 17 may be better than 18 for that reason. The rest of the response deviates from the topic and discusses the need to hear debates and emotional appeals. The response also does not attempt to explain the line of reasoning necessary to ascend to a 4.

Row 3: Question 3 — This response earned **2** points for this row because it does not evaluate the pieces of evidence beyond stating "the evidence given was not bad." The response also repeats how the claims were not supported, failing to give sufficient reason.