

AP[®] SEMINAR 2015 SCORING GUIDELINES

AP SEMINAR END OF COURSE EXAM RUBRIC: SECTION I, PART A

CONTENT AREA	PERFORMANCE LEVELS		
Question 1			
1 Understanding and Analyzing Argument	The response misstates the author’s argument, main idea, or thesis. 1	The response identifies, in part and with some accuracy, the author’s argument, main idea, or thesis. 2	The response accurately identifies the author’s argument, main idea, or thesis. 3
Question 2			
2 Understanding and Analyzing Argument	The response omits or misidentifies the author’s claims and provides little or no explanation of how the author establishes a line of reasoning. 2	The response identifies some of the author’s claims and the connections between them that produce a limited explanation of the author’s line of reasoning. 4	The response identifies the author’s relevant claims and the connections between them, producing a thorough explanation of the author’s line of reasoning. 6
Question 3			
3 Analyzing and Evaluating Evidence	The response omits or misidentifies some of the evidence. The response disregards how well the evidence supports the argument. 2	The response partially identifies and evaluates the evidence. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the evidence in supporting the argument’s claims is limited or general. 4	The response provides a thorough and detailed evaluation of how well the evidence supports the argument. The response evaluates the relevance and credibility of the evidence. 6

NOTE: IF A RESPONSE TO ONE QUESTION PROVIDES INFORMATION THAT SUPPORTS A RESPONSE TO ANOTHER QUESTION, SCORES TO BOTH QUESTIONS SHOULD BE CREDITED, AS APPLICABLE.

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.

PART A, QUESTION 1

1AQ1

The author's main argument is that settling into a routine that promotes sleep inertia can greatly hinder ~~with~~ one's cognitive function and overall health. Those who sleep according to their natural circadian rhythm experience ~~←~~ ~~←~~ ~~←~~ a generally higher quality of life.

NA

1A02

PART A, QUESTION 2

The author begins her argument with a relatable, hypothetical situation involving the hitting of an alarm clock snooze button. She then denounces this practice by claiming that it draws out the wake-up process - plunging one's brain back into the beginnings of a sleep cycle and making one extra groggy. She uses this to segue into the phenomenon of sleep inertia - which refers to the period between waking up and being fully awake.

From this point on, her argument is ~~not~~ scientifically based. With her statement that sleep inertia prevents the full engagement of the prefrontal cortex, or the decision-making and self-control portion of the brain, she ~~again~~ uses a quote from neuroscientist Kenneth Wright to claim that cognition is worst when one is waking up. The author then goes into an explanation of circadian rhythm (our ~~body's~~ body's natural sleep cycle). She then compares ~~the~~ the effects of sleep inertia to those of following one's circadian rhythm and claims that those most prone to sleep inertia - such as night-shift workers, are at a higher risk for cancer, heart conditions, and other chronic diseases.

The author then proceeds ~~to~~ to claim that while sleep inertia can be dangerous - it is in fact reversible. She describes a case study where this was proven, with this claim she moves into her solution of reverting to hyperlocal time zones in order to make sure external factors in certain regions could be greatly beneficial to the overall sleep cycles and well-being of the general public.

1A03

PART A, QUESTION 3

The effectiveness the author uses to support the claims made in her argument is high. First of all, this article was published in ~~the~~ The New Yorker, a well-known and respected magazine. Because the magazine in itself is known to be a reputable source, the article appears ~~to~~ reliable as well.

Along with this, the author consistently uses reliable research in order to properly back up her findings. She utilizes the work of Kenneth Wright, a neuroscientist, to give background on optimal cognition and the possibility of reversing sleep inertia. She gives greater information on the bodily effects of sleep inertia based on the findings of Charles Czeisler and Megan Jewett at Harvard Medical School. She dismisses social jetlag with the research of Till Roenneberg, a professor of chronobiology. She then combines Roenneberg's work with psychologist Marc Wittmann to back up her claim of the long term harm of sleep inertia, when speaking of her idea of hyperlocal time zones. She uses historical experience to back up her claim with past utilization. Her claims ~~are~~ are not furnished with doubt or ~~a~~ mere speculation. She instead grounds them all in solid evidence.

PART A, QUESTION 1

1AQ1

The author's main idea, or argument is that when people ~~are~~ unnaturally awake, they tend to be the least effective. Maria Konnikova writes in her article that people who use the aids of alarm ~~clocks~~ clocks, many neurological functions begin to suffer.

1AQ2

PART A, QUESTION 2

The author's line of reasoning for stating that ~~unatural~~ ~~unatural~~ unnatural sleep habits is harmful. She used quotations from many scientists who majored in neurological sciences. She uses the research of many neuroscientists and chronobiology experts, then applies that to strengthen her argument. Konnikova's claim that brain function suffers is shown through use of normal everyday interactions. She begins with saying, "The ring of the alarm clock probably jerks you ~~out~~ out of sleep." Shows how we ~~o~~ unaturally wake up. The author then connects her claim to many experiments ~~do~~ done ~~o~~ on the subject and explaining how it ties into her ~~o~~ thesis.

1A03

PART A, QUESTION 3

The author has a great deal of affectiveness when supporting the claims made in her argument. She first introduces the topic with a scenario that many human beings do every morning; press the snooze button on the alarm clock. Konni Kova then explains all the possible effects of doing this. To make her argument credible, she adds the work of many neuroscientists; some include Kenneth Wright, a neuroscientist and chronobiology expert, and Till Roenneberg, a ~~professor~~ professor of chronobiology at Ludwig-Maximilians University of Munich. She explains their contributions and gives their work application to make her argument stronger.

1A02

PART A, QUESTION 2

analyze the rhythms of your and biological
 may be the best defense against the magnitude
 of a sleep-deprived brain, always to
 make that we are making the most of what
 our minds have to offer.

The author develops the theme of reasoning
 through an inductive writing style. The author
 uses personal experiences, syntax, and scientific
 findings to develop the theme of reasoning through
 these claims that work to legitimize the argument.

1A03

PART A, QUESTION 3

The evidence that the author uses to develop the line of reasoning and validate the argument by making connections with the reader through the reference to personal experiences, emphasizing specific information through the use of different lengths of sentence structure (syntax), and through validating her argument by using scientific findings/information. The author uses the line of reasoning to justify her claim that taking our waking slurs and with the rhythms of light and biology may be the best defense against the thoughtlessness of a sleep-deprived brain, ~~use~~ a way to insure that, when we do wake fully, we are making the most of what our minds have to offer.

AP[®] SEMINAR
2015 SCORING COMMENTARY

End-of-Course Exam — Section I, Part A

Overview

Question 1 in Section IA assessed the students' ability to:

- Read and analyze a single given text in its entirety;
- Identify the entire main idea of this text, whether or not the thesis is stated explicitly; and
- Identify the argument in this text.

Question 2 in Section IA assessed the students' ability to:

- Explain the author's line of reasoning in a single text by identifying claims and connections.

Question 3 in Section IA assessed the students' ability to:

- Identify evidence in the given text;
- Evaluate the author's use of evidence in support of the argument;
- Evaluate the credibility of the evidence; and
- Evaluate the relevance of the evidence.

Sample: A

Question 1 Score: 3

Question 2 Score: 6

Question 3 Score: 6

HIGH SAMPLE RESPONSE

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument — Question 1, Row 1

The response earned 3 points for this row because it accurately identifies the author's argument that those whose sleep cycle is aligned with their natural biological time clock will be able to function at a higher level, thereby being more productive.

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument — Question 2, Row 2

The response earned 6 points for this row because it identifies the author's relevant claims pertaining to sleep inertia and cognitive function. It also connects the claims that both sleep inertia and social jet lag are reversible, thus producing a thorough explanation of the author's line of reasoning.

Content Area: Analyzing and Evaluating Evidence — Question 3, Row 3

The response earned 6 points for this row because it provides a thorough and detailed evaluation of how well the evidence supports the argument. The response evaluates the relevance and credibility of the evidence, using professionals with strong credentials as support, including a neuroscientist who sheds light on cognition and sleep inertia reversal, as well as a professor of chronobiology who has researched social jetlag.

AP[®] SEMINAR
2015 SCORING COMMENTARY

End-of-Course Exam — Section I, Part A

Sample: B

Question 1 Score: 2

Question 2 Score: 4

Question 3 Score: 4

MEDIUM SAMPLE RESPONSE

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument — Question 1, Row 1

The response earned 2 points for this row because it identifies, in part and with some accuracy, the author’s argument. The response identifies the part of the author’s argument pertaining to functionality and productivity but misstates the part of the argument that pertains to sleep patterns affected by unnatural waking times.

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument — Question 2, Row 2

The response earned 4 points for this row because it only identifies one of the author’s claims about the negative impact of sleep inertia on brain function and provides a limited explanation of the author’s line of reasoning.

Content Area: Analyzing and Evaluating Evidence — Question 3, Row 3

The response earned 4 points for this row because it partially identifies and evaluates the evidence provided by experts in the field. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the evidence in supporting the argument’s claims is general rather than clear-cut and specific.

Sample: C

Question 1 Score: 2

Question 2 Score: 2

Question 3 Score: 2

LOW SAMPLE RESPONSE

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument — Question 1, Row 1

The response earned 2 points for this row because it notes that cognitive abilities are less than optimal when people’s sleep is affected. However, the response mistakenly identifies waking as the main idea rather than sleep patterns or sleep cycles.

Content Area: Understanding and Analyzing Argument — Question 2, Row 2

The response earned 2 points for this row because it omits specific claims. The response also provides a limited explanation of how the author establishes a line of reasoning, referring to “personal experiences, syntax, and scientific findings.”

Content Area: Analyzing and Evaluating Evidence — Question 3, Row 3

The response earned 2 points for this row because it omits most of the evidence provided in the article and disregards how well the evidence supports the argument. The evidence provided is a misstatement that refers to irrelevant supporting material.