

AP[®] SUMMER INSTITUTE SCORING NOTES

2013 AP English Language and Composition

Question 1

Sample Identifier: DD

Score: 9

- The student offers a sophisticated argument examining three essential factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument: preservation, lasting effect, and respect for what is being represented.
- The essay opens with an insightful counterargument to those who would claim the “actual image of the monument” is the primary consideration, arguing that a monument’s “mental effect” is a far more important factor.
- The sources selected illustrate a critical understanding of each source’s position, allowing the student to engage the sources in a meaningful dialogue to facilitate the student’s own argument. In particular, the second paragraph contrasts the permanence of Mount Rushmore and the carving of Crazy Horse in the South Dakota Badlands with the neglect of the burial site of San Gabriel Valley pioneers in Savannah Memorial Park, lamenting the loss of history that “allows the present to understand the roots of a nation and ancestors.”
- The sources are well cited in a variety of ways, some using the last name of the author of the source, some using the source letter in parentheses, and some using both methods. The student uses apt signal phrases and smoothly integrates the source material into the student’s own prose: e.g., “In Source A, Kirk Savage argues the Lincoln Memorial ‘contains no actual relic of Lincoln. It is pure representation – a colossal marble statue’ (Source A).”
- Within the two major body paragraphs, the student cites numerous sources, and their relation to one other as well as to the argument they serve is always clear. The effective synthesis and organization of at least three sources allows the student’s argument to move forward, unpacking further meaning as each body paragraph develops. When examining the possible relocation of the burial site of the San Gabriel Valley pioneers and the neglected state of the statue of H. Elroy Johnson, the student provides an insightful consideration: “If a group cannot effectively design and have plans to protect a monument, it would be much more respectful for its building to be postponed or even cancelled.”
- The essay receives a score of 9 based on the sophistication of its argument, thoroughness of its development, effectiveness in synthesizing sources, and impressiveness of its coherent and mature writing style.

Sample Identifier: HH

Score: 8

- The student develops an effective argument examining two key factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument: value of the subject being memorialized, the “potential durability of structure and effect,” and the promotion of reflection.
- In the second paragraph, the student thoughtfully qualifies that since “[e]verything is history,” people need to be careful in their selection of “what deserves to be remembered” because “the creation of a monument cannot be justified solely by the previous existence [*sic*] of a person or event.” The student proceeds to clarify this idea by contrasting the Mount Rushmore memorial with the statue of Crazy Horse as effective evidence that “heroic conquests of one side may be the tragedy [*sic*] of another” because it is not appropriate to memorialize a person or event that might be “disrespectful” to another person or event.

AP[®] SUMMER INSTITUTE SCORING NOTES

2013 AP English Language and Composition

- The student selects four key sources, and while each source is examined in a separate paragraph, the links between the paragraphs and the sources allow the student to effectively synthesize the ideas. The opening of the third paragraph continues the student's argument that careful selection of events is critical in deciding whether a person or event should be memorialized, noting that "monuments are, in some ways, art, and artists frequently choose to depict what falls in the category of 'everyday life.'" However, the student maintains that H. Elroy Johnson and lobster trapping are "not worth of remembrance," as evidenced by neglect.
- The sources are clearly cited, and the discussion of how each source supports the student's argument is fully developed and convincing.
- The essay earns an 8 for its effectiveness in argumentation, synthesis of sources, and consistent ability to control a wide range of the elements of effective writing, particularly evidenced in its coherence and transitions.

Sample Identifier: KK

Score: 7

- The student adequately argues that the most crucial factor a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument is "the effect of such a project on the community and the environment." The student's examination of how memorials help people cope with loss and rejoice in success unifies the essay.
- In the second paragraph, the student provides a full explanation of how memorials like the Vietnam Veterans Memorial serve as an "outlet to heal and a place to mourn those lost as well as to celebrate," emphasizing the duality of effects that a memorial can have on a community. The student follows this discussion with a personal example that advances the argument.
- The student provides a thorough explanation of how the controversy surrounding the Mount Rushmore monument and the statue of Crazy Horse provides a counter example to the positive effects a memorial can have on a community, noting that "although many feel a sense of national pride for Mount Rushmore, a commemoration of our incredible presidents, the Indians feel that the carvings are undesirable [*sic*] and intruding."
- The student adequately synthesizes at least three sources and sufficiently cites each source using parentheses.
- The essay rises to a 7 because it uses the community function of monuments as an organizing theme, providing a more complete explanation and thorough development of how the sources serve the writer's central argument.

Sample Identifier: EEE

Score: 6

- The student establishes ownership of the argument by opening the essay with a personal reflection of a visit to the Lincoln Memorial, which connects appropriately with the position that the "vital" factor a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument is its "impact on their nation above all else," because "a monument 'symbolizes the nation's dedication to honoring an individual, while preserving their ideals.'"
- While the student acknowledges in the third paragraph that in an "ideal world we would have a moment [*sic*] for everyone," the student proceeds to adequately examine how "one cannot overlook the importance of the size and cost of a monument."

AP[®] SUMMER INSTITUTE SCORING NOTES

2013 AP English Language and Composition

- In the fourth paragraph, the student is not entirely successful in connecting the controversy over claiming a monument to the essay's overarching argument; however, the explanation of the debate over the location of the Holocaust Memorial Museum remains sufficient.
- Even though each source is examined in a separate paragraph, the links between the paragraphs and the sources allow the student to adequately synthesize the ideas from the sources. The student cites sources appropriately and smoothly integrates a piece of each source into an argument that responds adequately to the prompt.
- The essay earns a 6 for its adequate argumentation of the topic, use of sources as support for the argument, and generally clear prose style.

Sample Identifier: UU

Score: 5

- The student opens the argument with some rhetorical questions connected to the topic prior to identifying three key factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument: location, effect, and reason.
- Although essays scoring in the upper range do sometimes use each factor as an organizing element, the links between the factors and paragraphs in this essay are strained, and the formulaic structure keeps the essay from adequately developing the student's argument.
- The student provides limited explanation for how each factor contributes to decisions about memorializing people or events, using a single source for each factor as support for the explanation. However, the discussion of the "reason behind every monument created" (paragraph 4) provides more sufficient examination of the contrast between the desire "to recognize Lincoln's achievements and the country's achievements with Lincoln being our president" and the lack of planning that accompanied an inappropriate reason for constructing the state of H. Elroy Johnson.
- Although the student uses at least three sources and cites those sources appropriately, the relationship between the points discussed from the sources is strained and incompletely developed in some places. In paragraph three, for example, the student attempts to explain that the "effect of a monument can be positive and negative" but only notes the negative effect created by Mount Rushmore because those who built the memorial "destroyed and stole the Sioux's lands." In this part of the essay, the student confuses the historical background of the monument with the effects of the monument.
- The essay earns a 5 for its limited and uneven explanation of how the sources contribute to the student's examination of the factors to be considered in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument.

Sample Identifier: A

Score: 4

- The student identifies three factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument: time, size, and location.
- In the second paragraph, the student discusses both factors of time and location; however, the three sources selected as support dominate the student's attempt at development. The student oversimplifies the sources – for instance, by claiming that the statue of Christopher Columbus "stands tall and proud" and the sculpture of H. Elroy Johnson "wouldn't be an attraction to the tourists of Maine" because of the problems with its construction.

AP[®] SUMMER INSTITUTE SCORING NOTES

2013 AP English Language and Composition

- In the third paragraph, the student attempts to discuss the importance of location at the Savannah Memorial Park and the Holocaust Memorial Museum; however, the student inadequately explains the controversy surrounding each of those locations, noting only that “protestors say that America isn’t the place for the museum because during the Holocaust America refused to ‘lift a finger.’”
- While the student selects and cites at least three sources for inclusion in the argument, the links between the sources and the student’s position are weak. The student makes repeated use of sentences that begin “In Source D” and “In Source E” without linking the sources to one another in a synthesis.
- The essay earns a 4 for its insufficient and unconvincing explanations of how the sources contribute to the student’s examination of the factors to be considered in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument.

Sample Identifier: III

Score: 3

- The student opens the essay questioning whether it is “appropriate” to create a memorial but does not clearly identify the factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument. The final sentence of the essay does vaguely summarize the student’s argument, noting that a monument’s “design, place, and cost could almost outweigh the advantages of creating one.”
- The student selects three sources but struggles to connect any of the sources with the points being made in each paragraph, often dropping in quotations that are not smoothly integrated into the discussion. In discussing the cost factor, the student provides a less perceptive explanation of the problems associated with the Savannah Memorial Park, asking “once you have a monument then how can you move it or pay for it?”
- The student attempts to provide additional sources, but the explanations are weak and simplistic, arguing that “[p]laques about a fallen police officer or firefighter are two-sided cause [sic] that person could’ve been a bad husband or wife but good at his/her job.”
- The essay earns a 3 instead of a 4 for its less perceptive and particularly limited explanation of the factors to be considered in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument, and for its less mature control of elements of writing, particularly diction and syntax.

Sample Identifier: NN

Score: 2

- The student demonstrates little success in developing a position, identifying simply that “[t]o memorialize an event or a person takes time and it takes money.”
- The sources dominate the essay, which does little more than string together fragmented pieces of five sources and provide a summary rather than an argument.
- Although each source is cited appropriately, the student repeats simplistic constructions such as “According to Source F” or “in Source E.”
- The essay earns a 2 for its lack of development and little success in examining the factors to be considered in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument.

AP[®] SUMMER INSTITUTE SCORING NOTES

2013 AP English Language and Composition

Sample Identifier: II

Score: 1

- The student chooses a much simpler task of making personal assertions rather than examining the factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person *and* in creating a monument.
- The use of “I believe” statements permeates the essay, ensuring an especially undeveloped argument and distorted use of sources. In addition, the student misreads Downes by noting that since Crazy Horse had never been photographed, there is “no significance of this man in history, in which I believe this landmark is not worth being remembered.”
- The student ends the essay by dropping in two sources with some hurried evaluation about the circumstances surrounding Mount Rushmore and the Savannah Memorial Park.
- The essay earns a 1 for its undeveloped approach to the task and for its weak control of writing.