

AP Seminar Performance Task 2: Individual Written Argument (IWA) Rubric and Scoring Notes

EFFECTIVE 2017-18 ACADEMIC YEAR

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.

On/Off-Topic Decision:

For the purpose of the IWA, if the response is not in any way related to a theme connecting at least two of the stimulus materials it will be counted as off-topic and will receive a score of 0.

Row/Proficiency	Score 0 if...	Points earned for...	MAX Points
1 UNDERSTAND AND ANALYZE CONTEXT	The response does not incorporate any of the stimulus material, or, at most, it is mentioned in only one sentence. OR The response includes a discussion of at least one of the stimulus materials however it does not contribute to the argument. 0 Pts	The response demonstrates the relevance of at least one of the stimulus materials to the argument by integrating it as part of the response. (For example, as providing relevant context for the research question, or as evidence to support relevant claims.) 5 Pts	5
	Decision Rules & Scoring Notes		
	Does the use of the stimulus material help progress the argument or contribute to the narrative of the response?		
	<p>NO,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> You could delete the reference with little to no effect on the response. It's no more than a jumping off point for the student's argument, no more than perfunctory mention. The use of the stimulus material is tangential. The response may misrepresent what the sources are discussing/arguing. 	<p>YES, The deletion of the reference to the stimulus material would change or weaken the argument. The stimulus material is used for more than a definition (which could be obtained anywhere). AND Its use reflects an accurate understanding of the source materials.</p>	
2 UNDERSTAND AND ANALYZE CONTEXT	The response either provides no context. OR The response makes simplistic references to or general statements about the context of the research question. 0 Pts	The response explains the significance or importance of the research question by situating it within a larger context. 5 Pts	5
	Decision Rules & Scoring Notes		
	Does it provide a detailed explanation of why the research question matters (e.g. academically, historically or practically) by putting it in context?		
	<p>Where to look: Usually first few paragraphs.</p> <p>NO,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unsubstantiated assertions without explanations (e.g. "this is important"). Overly broad, generalized statements about context. Contextual details are tangential to the research question and/or argument. 	<p>YES, Contains specific and relevant details (i.e., what, who, when, where) to convey why the research question matters/is important. AND There is alignment between research question and/or argument and context.</p>	

3 UNDERSTAND AND ANALYZE PERSPECTIVE	The response provides only a single perspective. OR The response identifies and offers opinions or unsubstantiated statements about different perspectives that may be overly simplified. 0 Pts	The response describes multiple perspectives and identifies some relevant similarities or differences between them. 6 Pts	The response evaluates multiple perspectives (and synthesizes them) by drawing relevant connections between them, considering objections, implications, and limitations. 9 Pts	9
	Decision Rules & Scoring Notes			
	Does the response have multiple perspectives (defined as a point of view as expressed through an argument)?			
<p><i>NO,</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Only one perspective.</i> • <i>May use a lens or lenses that all work to convey the same point of view.</i> <i>Note: A lens is a filter through which an issue or topic is considered or examined.</i> <p><i>OR</i></p> <p><i>YES, but</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Alternate perspectives are often conveyed as personal opinions, or assertions without evidence.</i> • <i>The perspectives are isolated from each other, without comparison.</i> • <i>Perspectives may be oversimplified by treating many voices/stakeholders/stances as one.</i> 	<p><i>YES, but</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Makes general comparisons between perspectives describing only basic agreement or disagreement.</i> • <i>While the response explains that disagreement/agreement exists, it does not explain how by clarifying the points on which they agree or disagree.</i> 	<p><i>YES,</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Elaborates on the connections among different perspectives.</i> • <i>Uses the details from different sources or perspectives to demonstrate specific agreement or disagreement among perspectives (i.e., evaluates comparative strengths and weaknesses of different perspectives by placing them in dialogue).</i> 		

4 ESTABLISH ARGUMENT	The response provides only unsubstantiated opinions or claims. OR The response summarizes information (no argument). The response employs inadequate reasoning due to minimal connections between claims and evidence. 0 Pts	The argument presents a claim with some flaws in reasoning. The response is logically organized, but the reasoning may be faulty or underdeveloped OR The response may be well-reasoned but illogical in its organization. The conclusion may be only partially related to the research question or thesis. 8 Pts	The response is a clear and convincing argument. The response is logically organized and well-reasoned by connecting claims and evidence, leading to a plausible, well-aligned conclusion. 12 Pts	12	
	Decision Rules & Scoring Notes				
	Is there an evidence-based argument present?				
NO, <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>May be just opinion.</i>• <i>May be expository writing (e.g., report, summary, chronicle, etc.); no case is made.</i>• <i>Contrived solution to a non-existent problem or complete lack of a conclusion.</i>	YES, but <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Response organizes the argument well OR links evidence and claims well in discrete sections, but does not do both. In other words, the response may fail to explain how evidence supports a claim—i.e., it lacks commentary-- OR the overall organization of the response is difficult to follow, even though it has done an adequate job of commenting on the evidence.</i>• <i>Often the evidence drives the argument, rather than contributing to the response's argument.</i>• <i>Conclusion/resolution lacks either enough detail to assess plausibility or is not fully aligned with the research question.</i>	YES, <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Organization is often signposted or explicit.</i>• <i>The commentary explains fully how evidence supports claims. (i.e., the commentary will engage with the content of the evidence to draw conclusions.)</i>• <i>Student voice (commentary) drives the argument.</i>• <i>Alternate views are explored, not just mentioned.</i>• <i>The solution/conclusion is fully aligned with the research question. Has enough detail to assess plausibility of conclusion/solution (perhaps with an assessment of limitations and implications).</i>			

5 SELECT AND USE EVIDENCE	Any evidence presented in the response is predominantly irrelevant and/or lacks credibility. 0 Pts	The response includes mostly relevant and credible evidence. 6 Pts	The response includes relevant, credible and sufficient evidence to support its argument. 9 Pts	9	
	Decision Rules & Scoring Notes				
	Does the response select relevant evidence from credible sources? (Ask is it an appropriate authoritative source for that particular claim?). Is the evidence selected sufficient to support the argument?				
Where to look: Bibliography and works cited Individual instances of selected evidence throughout (commentary of the evidence).	NO, <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Many sources are not credible for the context in which they are used.</i>• <i>Includes no well-vetted sources (i.e., scholarly, peer-reviewed, credentialed authors, independently verified), beyond the stimulus materials.</i>	YES, but <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Most but not all sources are relevant to the topic and credible for the context.</i>• <i>Includes at least one piece of scholarly work (although dominated by less scholarly sources). General reference guides such as encyclopedias and dictionaries do not fulfill this requirement.</i>• <i>Many sources are only referenced rather than drawn on with any depth.</i>• <i>The selected evidence doesn't fully support claims (e.g. there are gaps, trivial selection).</i>• <i>May cite several scholarly works, but selects excerpts that only convey general or simplistic ideas OR the evidence is dropped in without explanation of how it supports a claim.</i>	YES, <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Makes purposeful use of relevant evidence from a variety of scholarly work (e.g., peer-reviewed, credentialed authors, independently verified, primary sources, etc.).</i>• <i>The response effectively connects evidence to the argument, even if the relevance of the evidence is not initially apparent.</i>• <i>There is purposeful analysis and evaluation of evidence used (i.e., goes beyond mere citation or reference).</i>• <i>The selected evidence fully supports claims.</i>		

6 APPLY CONVENTIONS (CITATION)	The response is missing a bibliography/works cited OR the response is largely missing in-text citations/footnotes. 0 Pts	The response attributes or cites sources used through the use of in-text citations or footnotes, but not always accurately. The bibliography or works cited references sources using a generally consistent style with some errors. 3 Pts	The response attributes, accurately cites and integrates the sources used through the use of in-text citations or footnotes. The bibliography or works cited accurately references sources using a consistent style. 5 Pts	5
	Decision Rules & Scoring Notes			
	Is the citation/attribution accurate? 1. Check the bibliography for consistency in style (and if there are fundamental elements missing). 2. Check for clarity/accuracy in internal citations. 3. Check to make sure all internal citations match up to the bibliography. Where to look: Bibliography/works cited and internal citations.			
NO, There are internal citations, but no bibliography (or vice versa); unsuccessful linking of internal citations and bibliography.	YES, but Uneven, inconsistent citations; poor or no attributive phrasing, unclear references, including citations with missing elements or essential elements that must be guessed from a url.	YES, Few flaws. The response cannot score 5 points if key components of citations (i.e., author/organization, title, publication, date) are consistently missing.		

7 APPLY CONVENTIONS (GRAMMAR AND STYLE)	The response has many grammatical flaws, is difficult to understand, or is written in a style inappropriate for an academic audience. 0 Pts	The response is mostly clear but may contain some flaws in grammar or a few instances of a style inappropriate for an academic audience. 2 Pts	The response creates variety, emphasis, and interest to the reader through the use of effective sentences and precision of word choice. The written style is consistently appropriate for an academic audience, although the response may have a few errors in grammar and style. 3 Pts	3
	Decision Rules & Scoring Notes			
	Is the grammar and style appropriate for an academic audience?			
NO, Multiple grammatical errors that make reading difficult. Overall style is colloquial or in other ways not appropriate for an academic paper.	YES, but Some instances of errors which occasionally make reading difficult. Some lapses into colloquial language.	YES, Few flaws.		