



AP[®] Spanish Literature 2006 Scoring Guidelines

The College Board: Connecting Students to College Success

The College Board is a not-for-profit membership association whose mission is to connect students to college success and opportunity. Founded in 1900, the association is composed of more than 5,000 schools, colleges, universities, and other educational organizations. Each year, the College Board serves seven million students and their parents, 23,000 high schools, and 3,500 colleges through major programs and services in college admissions, guidance, assessment, financial aid, enrollment, and teaching and learning. Among its best-known programs are the SAT[®], the PSAT/NMSQT[®], and the Advanced Placement Program[®] (AP[®]). The College Board is committed to the principles of excellence and equity, and that commitment is embodied in all of its programs, services, activities, and concerns.

© 2006 The College Board. All rights reserved. College Board, AP Central, APCD, Advanced Placement Program, AP, AP Vertical Teams, Pre-AP, SAT, and the acorn logo are registered trademarks of the College Board. Admitted Class Evaluation Service, CollegeEd, connect to college success, MyRoad, SAT Professional Development, SAT Readiness Program, and Setting the Cornerstones are trademarks owned by the College Board. PSAT/NMSQT is a registered trademark of the College Board and National Merit Scholarship Corporation. All other products and services may be trademarks of their respective owners. Permission to use copyrighted College Board materials may be requested online at: www.collegeboard.com/inquiry/cbpermit.html.

Visit the College Board on the Web: www.collegeboard.com.

AP Central is the official online home for the AP Program: apcentral.collegeboard.com.

AP[®] SPANISH LITERATURE 2006 SCORING GUIDELINES

Question 1: Poetry Analysis

9 Demonstrates Superiority

- A very well-developed essay that **analyzes** clearly and thoroughly how suffering is presented in the poem.
- Accurately discusses how poetic language and devices are used in the poem to communicate this theme.
- Commentary is supported with specific textual references.
- Demonstrates insight; may show originality.
- Virtually no irrelevant or erroneous information.
- Reader has no doubt that the student possesses a superior understanding of the poem and the question.

7–8 Demonstrates Competence

- A well-developed essay that **analyzes** how suffering is presented in the poem. Textual analysis outweighs description and paraphrasing.
- Discusses how poetic language and devices are used in the poem to communicate this theme.
- Commentary is supported with specific textual references.
- May reveal some insight or originality.
- The reader may have to make some inferences because the essay is not always sufficiently explicit.
- May contain some errors, but these do not undermine the overall quality of the essay.
- The essay must include some treatment of the poetic language and devices used in the poem to merit a 7.

5–6 Suggests Competence

- Description and paraphrasing outweigh textual analysis.
- Student basically understands the question and the poem, but the essay is not well focused or developed.
- Erroneous and/or repetitive statements may intrude and weaken the overall quality of the essay.
- May require significant inferences because the response is not always explicit.
- An essay that does not address poetic language and devices must be good to merit a 5.

3–4 Suggests Lack of Competence

- Essay is so general as to suggest that the student has not adequately understood the question and/or the poem.
- Poorly organized; focus wanders; comments are sketchy.
- Irrelevant statements may predominate.
- May contain major errors of interpretation that detract from the overall quality of the essay.

1–2 Demonstrates Lack of Competence

- Essay is chaotic, confused, or incorrect.
- It is clear the student has not understood the question or the poem.

**AP[®] SPANISH LITERATURE
2006 SCORING GUIDELINES**

Question 1: Poetry Analysis (continued)

0 No Credit

- Blank page; OR response is on task but is so brief or so poorly written as to be meaningless; OR response is written in English; OR response is completely off task (obscenity, nonsense poetry, drawings, letter to the reader, etc.).

**AP[®] SPANISH LITERATURE
2006 SCORING GUIDELINES**

Question 2: Thematic Analysis

9 Demonstrates Superiority

- A very well-developed essay that **convincingly and explicitly** compares how the two works selected treat the theme of social criticism.
- Analyzes appropriate examples from the chosen texts to support the response.
- Demonstrates insight; may show originality.
- Virtually no irrelevant or erroneous information.

7–8 Demonstrates Competence

- A well-developed essay that **explicitly** compares how the two works selected treat the theme of social criticism.
- Provides appropriate examples from the chosen texts to support the response.
- May reveal some insight or originality.
- Any plot summary or description serves to support the comparison.
- The reader may need to make some inferences because the response is not always sufficiently explicit.
- May contain some erroneous information, but errors do not significantly affect the overall quality of the essay.

5–6 Suggests Competence

- Attempts to compare how the two works selected treat the theme of social criticism, but commentary is relatively superficial.
- Plot summary predominates but is connected to the attempted comparison.
- Student basically understands the question and the texts, but the essay is not always well focused or sufficiently developed.
- May contain errors of fact or interpretation that detract from the overall quality of the essay.
- May require significant inferences because the response is not always explicit.
- If the essay deals with two works but does not provide a direct comparison, discussion must be good to merit a 5.

3–4 Suggests Lack of Competence

- Student has not adequately understood the question and/or the text.
- May deal with only one work.
- Essay is poorly organized; focus wanders; sketchy.
- May consist almost entirely of plot summary.
- Erroneous or no comparison.
- Irrelevant comments may predominate.
- Possible prepared overview of the texts with limited connection to the question.
- May contain major errors or be so general as to suggest that the student is unable to deal competently with the question.

1–2 Demonstrates Lack of Competence

- Essay is chaotic, confused, or incorrect.
- The response demonstrates a lack of understanding of the question or unfamiliarity with the works chosen.

**AP[®] SPANISH LITERATURE
2006 SCORING GUIDELINES**

Question 2: Thematic Analysis (continued)

0 No Credit

- Blank page; OR response is on task but is so brief or so poorly written as to be meaningless; OR response is written in English; OR response is completely off task (obscenity, nonsense poetry, drawings, letter to the reader, etc.).

**AP[®] SPANISH LITERATURE
2006 SCORING GUIDELINES**

Question 3(a): Text Analysis

5 Demonstrates Superiority

- Accurate and thorough analysis of the effect of the use of mythological and historical references in the cited passage.
- Organization contributes to the quality of the response.
- Virtually no erroneous or irrelevant commentary.
- May show insight or originality.
- Clearly demonstrates superiority.

4 Demonstrates Competence

- Some analysis of the effect of the use of mythological and historical references in the cited passage.
- May contain some errors of fact or interpretation, but these do not significantly affect the overall quality of the response.
- Clearly demonstrates competence.

3 Suggests Competence

- Attempts to analyze the effect of the use of mythological and historical references.
- Basically understands and addresses the question and the cited passage.
- Errors, ambiguity, and/or incompleteness detract from the quality of the response.
- Paraphrasing may predominate.
- Reader may have to make some inferences.

2 Suggests Lack of Competence

- Student has not adequately understood the question and/or the cited passage.
- May contain irrelevant comments, serious omissions, or major errors.
- May contain prepared overview of Rubén Darío or “A Roosevelt.”
- The reader is forced to make significant inferences.
- The response, at best, is weak.

1 Demonstrates Lack of Competence

- Fails to address the question in any meaningful way.
- May consist entirely of paraphrasing or summary of the poem.
- Incorrect interpretation not supported by the cited passage.

0 No Credit

- Blank page; OR response is on task but is so brief or so poorly written as to be meaningless; OR response is written in English; OR response is completely off task (obscenity, nonsense poetry, drawings, letter to the reader, etc.).

Note: Content scores for question 3 (3a and/or 3b) may each be lowered by one category when the student has not written two separate responses.

**AP[®] SPANISH LITERATURE
2006 SCORING GUIDELINES**

Question 3(b): Text Analysis

5 Demonstrates Superiority

- Accurate and thorough explanation of the title’s meaning as it relates to the cited verses.
- Organization contributes to the quality of the response.
- Virtually no erroneous or irrelevant commentary.
- May show insight or originality.
- Clearly demonstrates superiority.

4 Demonstrates Competence

- Convincing explanation of the title’s meaning as it relates to the cited verses.
- May contain minor errors of fact or interpretation, but they do not significantly affect the overall quality of the response.
- Clearly demonstrates competence.

3 Suggests Competence

- Attempts to explain the title’s meaning as related to the cited verses.
- Basically understands and addresses the question and the cited verses.
- Errors, ambiguity, and/or incompleteness detract from the quality of the response.
- Reader may have to make inferences.

2 Suggests Lack of Competence

- Attempts to answer the question but does not do so adequately.
- Paraphrasing or summary of the poem outweighs commentary.
- May contain irrelevant comments, serious omissions, or major errors.
- May contain prepared overview of Rubén Darío or “A Roosevelt.”
- The reader is forced to make significant inferences.
- The response, at best, is weak.

1 Demonstrates Lack of Competence

- Fails to address the question in any meaningful way.
- May consist entirely of paraphrasing or summary of the poem.
- Incorrect interpretation not supported by verses 13–22.

0 No Credit

- Blank page; OR response is on task but is so brief or so poorly written as to be meaningless; OR response is written in English; OR response is completely off task (obscenity, nonsense poetry, drawings, letter to the reader, etc.).

Note: Content scores for question 3 (3a and/or 3b) may each be lowered by one category when the student has not written two separate responses.

AP[®] SPANISH LITERATURE 2006 SCORING GUIDELINES

Language Usage

The AP Spanish Literature Exam tests the ability of students to write well-organized essays in correct and idiomatic Spanish. These scoring guidelines assess **the degree to which language usage effectively supports an on-task response to the question**. All the criteria listed below should be taken into account in categorizing the student's command of the written language as related to each literature question.

5 Very Good Command

- Infrequent, random errors in grammatical structures.
- Varied and accurate use of vocabulary.
- Control of the conventions of the written language (spelling, accents, punctuation, paragraphing, etc.).

4 Good Command

- Some errors in grammatical structures; however, these do not detract from the overall readability of the essay/response.
- Appropriate use of vocabulary.
- Conventions of the written language are generally correct (spelling, accents, punctuation, paragraphing, etc.).

3 Adequate Command

- Frequent grammatical errors, but essay/response is comprehensible.
- Limited vocabulary.
- May have numerous errors in spelling and other conventions of the written language.

2 Weak Command

- Serious grammatical errors that force a sympathetic reader to supply inferences.
- Very limited and/or repetitive vocabulary.
- Pervasive errors in the conventions of the written language.

1 Inadequate Command

- Constant grammatical errors that render comprehension difficult.
- Insufficient vocabulary and control of the conventions of the written language.

0 No Credit

- Unintelligible, written in English, or off task.

Note: Both responses to question 3 receive one single language score.