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## AP Seminar Rubric 2017: End-of-Course Exam
### Part B, Question 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Content Area/ Proficiency</th>
<th>Performance Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish Argument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The response misstates or overlooks a theme or issue that connects the sources. The response’s perspective is unclear or unrelated to the sources.</td>
<td>The response identifies a theme or issue that connects the sources. The response derives its perspective from only one of the sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Establish Argument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The response’s line of reasoning is disorganized and/or illogical. The response lacks commentary or the commentary incorrectly or tangentially explains the links between evidence and claims.</td>
<td>The argument is mostly clear and organized, but the logic may be faulty OR the reasoning may be logical but not well organized. The commentary explains the links between evidence and claims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Select and Use Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The response repeats or misinterprets information from at least two of the provided sources, or the information lacks relevance thereby providing little support for an argument.</td>
<td>The response accurately uses relevant information from at least two of the provided sources to support an argument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AP Seminar Rubric 2017: End-of-Course Exam
#### Part B, Question 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Content Area/Proficiency</th>
<th>Performance Levels</th>
<th>Points (Max)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Apply Conventions</td>
<td>The response contains many flaws in grammar and style that often interfere with communication to the reader OR the response incorrectly or ineffectively attributes knowledge and ideas from sources.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The response is generally clear but contains some flaws in grammar and style that occasionally interfere with communication to the reader. The response accurately attributes knowledge and ideas from sources.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The response communicates clearly to the reader (although may not be free of errors in grammar and style) AND the response effectively integrates material from sources into the argument (e.g. it is clearly introduced, integrated, or embedded into the text) and accurately attributes knowledge and ideas.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.
Begin your response to PART B on this page.

Imagine walking down the street in a crowded city, trying to find somewhere to eat. Within two or three blocks you've probably seen a Taco Bell, Jack in the Box, Wendy's, Subway, and at least 2 McDonalds - and maybe - if you're lucky - one independent healthy restaurant. It makes sense; it's affordable, convenient, fast, and it's there. American restaurant consumption has become dominated by fast-food markets in the recent decades to the point where a 2013 Gallup Consumption Poll shows that 33% of respondents report to visiting a fast-food restaurant once or twice a month. This consumption has ignited debate over what courses of action could be taken to draw American consumers back to healthier food options and away from the monopolized fast-food chains. One potential option has recently sparked the question, "Should farmers be subsidized to increase production and availability of healthier foods?" In comparing the current pros and cons of fast-food versus independent restaurants, and in considering the economic and societal implications of outside intervention, it is clear that farmer subsidization could significantly increase the availability of healthier food options in America.

To understand the complexities of this discussion it is necessary to determine why American consumers turn to fast-food and junk food. In Gallup's 2013 annual consumption poll respondents were questioned on the frequency of their consumption of fast-food and their perceptions of fast-food generally.
Continue your response to PART B on this page.

The results of the poll revealed that "All Americans" perceive 48% of "All Americans" perceive fast food to be "Not too good" for you. Furthermore, this number increases with consumption: 54% of weekly consumers believe fast food to present negative health concerns. However, despite this awareness of the negative repercussions of consuming fast food, the poll exemplifies that Americans are hardly changing their consumption from these monopolistic chains. Much of this is attributed to the abundance and proximity of these food options; fast food is in fact fast, and consequently, it is most highly consumed by young people who rely on the ease and affordability of fast food options.

In comparison, healthier food options are rarely available at similar pricing and abundance as many chain restaurants. To explain this trend economically, the major fast-food chains (including McDonald’s, Wendy’s, Taco Bell, etc.) exhibit the control of an oligopoly within the market. This means that these companies offer extremely similar products at an extremely low cost. As a result, it is difficult for a new, independent restaurant to enter the market and remain competitive with higher prices. As healthier food options typically cost more, it is impossible for them to expand to the same availability and affordability as the chains currently running the market. Thus, the only ways in which this problem...
can begin to be addressed by changing the environment within healthier food options.

While this is a two pronged issue and both proximity and affordability must be addressed in order for healthy independent firms to compete with fast-food, these two facets require of the issue problem require different actions be taken. However, according to a study in an article written by Joe Cortright within the Atlantic, price levels play a more influential role in food access than grocery store location. In the article, Cortright addresses the question of whether lack of access to healthy eating was to blame for “America’s Poor Eating Habits.” In an analysis of a variety of perspectives on the issue Cortright finds that food availability explains very little food choice and instead this decision is largely determined by income. Cortright’s analysis arrives at the conclusion that “governments should focus on raising incomes” if they wish to increase access to healthy food in low income families. However, a better comparable solution to this issue may not be to raise incomes, but to decrease the price of healthy eating.

To determine what courses of action can be taken to reduce food prices we must analyze the issue from an economic standpoint. In a typical competitive market, prices and production are dictated by rules of supply and demand. The two ways in which prices can
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be lowered are by decreasing demand or by increasing supply. As decreasing demand is counterintuitive to the goal of increasing healthy eating, the feasibility of the other option must be determined. Should farmers of natural and healthy food products be subsidized in their production, workers have much more incentive to enter the field. As a result, government subsidy would directly correlate in an increase in supply of better farmers—leading to a decrease in prices and an increase in production. This change would make healthy food options a more practical option for low-income consumers and would benefit competition for independent companies versus fast food chains.

However, government involvement in the fast-food market does face many opposition in terms of practicality and ethicality. The major opponents of such involvement would be fast-food lobbyists as well as fiscal conservatives opposed to government involvement in the economy. However, public health is a major governmental concern, and thus, the US government has an ethical responsibility to take actions in improving public access to healthy food options. Furthermore, as 48% of Americans feel fast food is either "not too good" or "not good at all" there is significant public support for the availability of more affordable healthy eating options in the fast-food landscape. Therefore, the counterarguments to such a solution as farmer subsidization do not propose a significant risk.
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nor do they accurately convey any ethical or social

Therefore, it is evident that the current world
of American fast-food dining is deeply flawed. America's
poor eating habits have run rampant in previous decades
due to the ease and price of unhealthy chains
compared to the expense and difficulty of healthier
eating options. However, should action be taken to
subsidize farmers in production of natural, healthy food
options, the landscape of this market can be
changed so that healthier options can be more affordable
for all Americans, allowing them to put down the
fries and pick up their lives.
Fast food has been a major part in the United States of America's food system. In the year 2000, Americans spent more than $10 billion on fast food (Source C). These fast food restaurants allow people to have easy access to food almost everyone. Additionally, its cheap prices allow for even impoverished people to purchase their food. However, the fast food industry over all does not benefit American citizens. The easy access to fast food and poverty in America causes poor diet decisions in citizens.

The main problem with fast food is how unhealthy it is compared to other types of food. According to Source C, "The typical American now consumes approximately three hamburgers and four orders of french fries every week." Additionally, there are little to no mentions where these foods come from nowadays, or what ingredients they contain (Source C). These types of food are very unhealthy for people, yet many people still consume it. According to a study done by Source D, 28% of people acknowledge that fast food is "not good at all" for your health. However, people keep eating fast food because of its availability.
Another problem with fast food is how accessible it is. According to the study done by Source D, 50% of Americans eat fast food at least once a week. The amount of restaurants there are combined with the cheap prices draw in many people. People with over 400% of people with an income between $20,000 to $29,000 consume fast food at least weekly (Source D). The availability of fast food to almost all citizens causes many people to eat at these restaurants weekly, even when they know it isn't healthy for them. However, the amount of poverty in America contributes to this problem as well.

Poverty requires families to live off of cheaper sources of food in order to support themselves. Amartya Sen argues that the "cause of starvation and death in famines is seldom a physical lack of sufficient food, but is instead the collapse of the incomes of the poor". In order to ensure that impoverished families are receiving healthy meals, the government should focus on raising incomes (Doc A). This would allow more families to purchase grocery store items instead of relying on cheaper and unhealthy foods.
In conclusion, to solve the issue of poor diet choices, the government needs to raise incomes to assist the impoverished. This would allow fast food to be purchased less frequently due to higher wages, overall increasing the health of citizens. This in turn would reduce the risks of poor eating habits while also assisting many citizens financially.
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America today is not America like 5 or 10 years ago. America today is higher on fast food places than in fresh and healthy vegetable. People with little or no money can only afford fast food. Therefore because of this "poor people in the united states suffer from measurably worse nutrition because of limited access to good food" (The Atlantic, November 9, 2015). And if the people do get vegetables it only a few who offer fresh fruit and vegetables. "fast food and processed food in convenience stores" with few offering fresh fruits and vegetables (The Atlantic November 9, 2015).

With the need of increase in cereal production, rice, maize, wheat for people on welfare. Being that "fifty percent of the present world population is undernourished and that an even larger percentage, perhaps sixty-five percent is malnourished, no room is left for comliancy" (Nobelprize.org, December 11, 1976), it will be not enough to fix the situation of unhealthy choices and hunger. Even if we did countries such as the U.S., Canada, Australia, Argentina, and Russia won't allow the expansion to happen because of their weak economies.
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therefore can't even expand their cereal production by at least thirty percent.

"Even if present production could expand rapidly by thirty percent in the developing countries, the hunger problem as it now exists still would not be solved." (Noble Prize.org, December 11, 1970).

Fast food is now everywhere over the last three decades. It went from a handful to fast food being in every corner. Fast food is now in schools, hospitals, restaurants, bargain stores like K-Mart, Wal-Mart, etc. In 1970 Americans spent about 6 billion on fast food and in 2000 more than 110 billion was spent on fast food. Fast food makes enemies with farmers which makes fruits and vegetables limited. The Farm activist Jim Hightower warned of "The McDonaldization of America" viewed that the fast growing economies of Fast food industry as a threat to independent businesses. And in "eat your heart out" stating that bigger is not better. As well as restaurants and fast food places going from a size small only to a large size that can be shared with 2 or more people.
In conclusion, fast-food and healthy food have been a problem. Being that there is more fast food than fresh healthy food. And if "healthy" the food is processed. With healthy food being limited, consumers tend to go to fast food.
Overview

The response to this question was expected to demonstrate the students’ ability to:

- Identify a theme or issue connecting two or more of the provided sources
- Read the sources critically, understanding the perspective or voice contained in each source
- Use the theme as an impetus for writing a logically organized, well-reasoned, and well-crafted argument presenting their perspective
- Incorporate two or more of the sources to support the newly-developed argument
- Cite the sources, identifying them either by author or by assigned letters
- Identify or paraphrase quotations
- Complete the task within the 90-minute time period

Sample: A
1 Establish Argument Score: 6
2 Establish Argument Score: 6
3 Select and Use Evidence Score: 6
4 Apply Conventions Score: 6

HIGH SAMPLE RESPONSE

Row 1
The response earned a score of 6 points because it reflects a clear understanding of the sources and uses those sources to articulate its own thesis about the need for government intervention to regulate the nutritional values of foods offered. The response does not begin by simply stating something along the lines of “Sources A, B, C and D all talk about food;” rather, it sets out its own perspective and then enters a conversation with those sources.

Row 2
The response earned a score of 6 points because its argument is easily discernible and well-developed. The argument drives the response; its claims are ordered logically and the line of reasoning is easy to follow. It is attentive to counterclaims, addressing them as necessary without losing its own focus.

Row 3
The response earned a score of 6 points because information from the sources is seamlessly woven into the argument. The evidence is not cherry-picked: the claims are matched to the material from the sources.
Row 4
The response earned a score of 6 points because it is well-written and easy to follow. It uses transitions well (however, in comparison, therefore) to guide the reader through the analysis. There are few errors in grammar or syntax, and the writing generally enhances the argument. All sources are clearly attributed.

Sample: B
1 Establish Argument Score: 4
2 Establish Argument Score: 4
3 Select and Use Evidence Score: 4
4 Apply Conventions Score: 4

MEDIUM SAMPLE RESPONSE

Row 1
The response earned a score of 4 points because it utilizes the sources to derive a theme (poverty and access to fast food leads to poor dietary decisions). The sources are somewhat run together, but the response does reflect an understanding of the common themes and makes an effort to bring the sources into conversation with each other.

Row 2
The response earned a score of 4 points because it articulates a clear, if simple, argument: fast food and poverty lead to poor dietary choices. The thesis is sustained throughout the response, and an effort is made to link claims relating to the overall argument with evidence. Problematically, the response misconstrues some evidence, e.g., Source D makes it clear that fast food is not eaten primarily by the poor, but the argument and commentary suggest that only the poor eat fast food. The solution feels a bit forced and is underdeveloped.

Row 3
The response earned a score of 4 points because it makes a good effort to match evidence to claims. That effort is not wholly successful, as it overlooks some of the nuance in the sources, leading to some overstatement of the evidence contained therein.

Row 4
The response earned a score of 4 points. It is clearly written, but the writing does not enhance the argument. Citations are adequate, and errors in grammar and syntax are relatively infrequent.
Sample: C
1 Establish Argument Score: 2
2 Establish Argument Score: 2
3 Select and Use Evidence Score: 2
4 Apply Conventions Score: 2

LOW SAMPLE RESPONSE

Row 1
The response earned a score of 2 points because it is unclear whether a theme has been identified from the sources. There is no effort to bring the sources together, and the introductory paragraph reflects a misreading of the source it uses. There is no apparent independent perspective nor any attempt to weave the sources together.

Row 2
The response earned a score of 2 points because there is no clear argument, and as a result, there is no line of reasoning to follow. The commentary is confusing and sometimes fails to make sense: "...countries such as the U.S., Canada, Australia, Argentina and Russia won't allow the expansion to happen because of their weak economies and therefore can't even expand their cereal production by at least thirty percent." The sources are summarized with little apparent understanding of how they might be linked to—or be distinct from—one another.

Row 3
The response earned a score of 2 points because the evidence is used randomly and is not utilized to support a claim. Source B, for example, has little to do with poor diets in the United States, nor does Source B connect at all with the later argument about fast food consumption in the United States.

Row 4
The response earned a score of 2 points because the writing is clumsy, which makes it difficult to decipher the meaning. Though some sources are cited, many are unattributed. Material is often paraphrased or quoted exactly without citations. There are many sentence fragments and other errors of grammar and syntax: "With the need of increase in cereal production, rice, maize, wheat for people on welfare."