



AP Government & Politics: U.S. 2000 Scoring Guidelines

The materials included in these files are intended for non-commercial use by AP teachers for course and exam preparation; permission for any other use must be sought from the Advanced Placement Program. Teachers may reproduce them, in whole or in part, in limited quantities, for face-to-face teaching purposes but may not mass distribute the materials, electronically or otherwise. These materials and any copies made of them may not be resold, and the copyright notices must be retained as they appear here. This permission does not apply to any third-party copyrights contained herein.

These materials were produced by Educational Testing Service (ETS), which develops and administers the examinations of the Advanced Placement Program for the College Board. The College Board and Educational Testing Service (ETS) are dedicated to the principle of equal opportunity, and their programs, services, and employment policies are guided by that principle.

The College Board is a national nonprofit membership association dedicated to preparing, inspiring, and connecting students to college and opportunity. Founded in 1900, the association is composed of more than 3,900 schools, colleges, universities, and other educational organizations. Each year, the College Board serves over three million students and their parents, 22,000 high schools, and 3,500 colleges, through major programs and services in college admission, guidance, assessment, financial aid, enrollment, and teaching and learning. Among its best-known programs are the SAT[®], the PSAT/NMSQT[™], the Advanced Placement Program[®] (AP[®]), and Pacesetter[®]. The College Board is committed to the principles of equity and excellence, and that commitment is embodied in all of its programs, services, activities, and concerns.

Copyright © 2001 by College Entrance Examination Board. All rights reserved. College Board, Advanced Placement Program, AP, and the acorn logo are registered trademarks of the College Entrance Examination Board.

2000 AP US Government & Politics
Question 1 Scoring Guidelines

5 POINTS TOTAL

Part A : 3 points total

1 point for each problem clearly linked to a solution

If only problem OR solution is given, no credit

No credit if problem is only implicit, not clearly listed

Possible examples of A:

- Amendment process
- Creation of a dominant national legislature
- Creation of an executive
- Interstate commerce
- National court system
- Power to coin money
- Power to raise a military force
- Power to tax/raise revenue
- Settle disputes between states
- Supermajority
- “Supremacy Clause”
- Treaties
- Reference to other enumerated powers of Article 1, Section 8

{PRIVATE }{tc \l 1 ""}

{PRIVATE }Part B: 2 points total{tc \l 1 "Part B: 2 points total"}

1 point for general description of specific continuing tensions between centralization and decentralization (federal/state; federal/local governments) with **at least** implicit linkage to one of the three policy areas.

2 points for a specific explanation of the continuing tensions between centralization and decentralization (federal/state; federal/local governments) with **explicit** linkage to one of the three policy areas. Explanation has to say how, why, etc.

*Readers should look throughout essay for identification of problems and solutions, even if not

Attempts to answer question but earns no points: scored as zero (0)

Blank or off-task: scored as a dash (-)

clearly written up front.

Attempts to answer question but earns no points: scored as zero (0)
Blank or off-task: scored as a dash (-)

2000 AP Comparative Government & Politics
Question 2 Scoring Guidelines

7 POINTS TOTAL

***Note: “appointment process” includes nomination and confirmation

Part A : 4 points total: Nominees’ CHARACTERISTICS

1 point for identifying ALL THREE characteristics (**1 point total**)

1 point for EACH discussion (**3 points total**)

Accepted characteristics may include:

- Acceptability (NOT to House OR Congress)
- Age
- Competence/qualifications (e.g. ABA rating)
- Gender
- Ideology
- Issue orientation (litmus test)
- Judicial experience
- Partisan identification
- Patronage
- Race/Ethnicity
- Region
- Religion
- Reputation (e.g. prestigious education, ethics, character)
- Role (activist vs. restraint)

Not necessary to use specific examples of nominees. If example is incorrect, but discussion is correct, student still gets credit.

The discussion for each must show that they are three distinct characteristics – (e.g., acceptability must be discussed differently than ideology – no double-dipping)

Part B: 3 points total: METHODS Used by Interest Groups to Influence Process

1 point for identifying BOTH methods (**1 point total**)

1 point for EACH explanation that provides linkage (**2 points total**)

--two explanations must be distinct (no double-dipping)

--explanation must answer question of how the method has been used to influence the process

METHODS must be relevant to the appointment process and may include:

- Advertisement (any media)
- Campaign contributions to White House or Senate
- Mailings/e-mail
- Op/ed pieces
- Press conferences
- Lobbying EITHER White House staff/President OR lobbying the judicial committee (NOT lobbying Congress in general; can say “lobbying Senate;” can say “lobbying White House to influence the President’s selection”)
- “Use of media” (does not count with another form of media as second point)
- Protests/demonstrations
- Ratings
- Talk shows (TV and radio)
- Testifying after nomination
- Writing to interest group members

Attempts to answer question but earns no points: scored as zero (0)

Blank or off-task: scored as a dash (-)

2000 AP Comparative Government & Politics
Question 3 Scoring Guidelines

9 POINTS TOTAL

Note that this map deals with the PRESIDENTIAL election – and A and B ask for explain of support for presidential candidate, not Congress, governor, etc.

1 point for correctly identifying BOTH a Democratic region and a Republican region.

For strong Democratic support: regions 1, 4, 6 only

For strong Republican support: region 3 only

Part A: 4 points total Support for Democratic candidate:

Identify first factor that contributes to Democratic support (**1 point**)

Explain first factor -- student must answer the question “why?” or “how?” (**1 point**)

Identify second factor that contributes to Democratic support (**1 point**)

Explain second factor -- student must answer the question “why?” or “how?” (**1 point**)

Possible Democratic factors include:

- Unions/labor
- Race/ethnicity
- Urban areas
- Tradition of Democratic support (does not apply to Region 1)
- Liberal
- Environmental concerns

Part B: 4 points total Support for Republican candidate:

Identify first factor that contributes to Republican support (**1 point**)

Explain first factor -- student must answer the question “why?” or “how?” (**1 point**)

Identify second factor that contributes to Republican support (**1 point**)

Explain second factor -- student must answer the question “why?” or “how?” (**1 point**)

Possible Republican factors include:

- Non-union
- Rural/less urban
- Tradition of Republican support
- Conservative
- Strong Christian/Protestant/Fundamentalist

Region 3: just saying that Dole is from Kansas or Bush is from Texas is not enough for ID unless explained in terms of the region

Attempts to answer question but earns no points: scored as zero (0)

Blank or off-task: scored as a dash (-)

2000 AP Comparative Government & Politics
Question 4 Scoring Guidelines

6 POINTS TOTAL

Obstacle 1 **One point** for description
 One point for elaborating the obstacle
 One point for explicit linkage to how/why obstacle restricts enactment of finance reform
TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS FOR OBSTACLE 1: **Three (3)**

Obstacle 2 **One point** for description
 One point for elaborating the obstacle
 One point for explicit linkage to how/why obstacle restricts enactment of finance reform
TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS FOR OBSTACLE 2: **Three (3)**

Attempts to answer question but earns no points: scored as zero (0)

Blank or off-task: scored as a dash (–)

OBSTACLES PERMITTED:

- ***Buckley v. Valeo (1976)***

Description: Supreme Court struck down certain campaign donation limits and spending limits as violation of free expression provisions of 1st Amendment

Explanation:

- Contributing to one's own campaign, contributing to parties for party building, and spending money independently of a campaign are forms of protected free expression.
- A constitutional amendment is required to limit free expression, not a more easily enacted statute.

- **Soft Money**

Description: unregulated donations to political parties for party activities/party building; usually spent in the states to aid candidates *indirectly* in various ways

Explanation:

- Both parties benefit from soft money, so partisan members of Congress and presidents have little incentive to regulate this resource; there is no critical policy-making mass for reform
- Interest groups are often the contributors of these funds, perceive benefits from their use, and have no incentive to urge office seekers or incumbents with whom they have a relationship to regulate these monies.

- **Incumbency**

Description: an office holder who is pursuing reelection

Explanation:

- Incumbents benefit most from existing campaign finance laws
- Incumbents have a high probability of re-election and thus attract more donations than challengers, which gives them a desirable advantage in re-election contests.
- Incumbents know the consequences of current policy, find them favorable, and realize that changes may created unanticipated negative consequences for themselves.

NOTES: (1) This discussion is necessarily set in the context of federal elections (presidency and Congress).
(2) One or both points may be earned for the explanation without earning the description point, although earning one such point will likely be unusual, and two points rare.
(3) Independent expenditures are NOT considered soft money