

LEARNING OUTCOME	Excellent mastery 5	Good mastery 4	Some mastery 3	Minimal mastery 2	No mastery 1-0
HISTORICAL KNOWLEDGE					
<p>Historical soundness of the argument (student demonstrates an understanding of the key historical events related to the question)</p> <p>15%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -statements are correct, verifiable, and precise -clear chronological understanding of events -complex grasp of causation -analyzes a range of factors shaping the sequence and outcome of events -reflects on larger themes informing specific events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -sound chronological framework -good grasp of causation -omits some key informing factors shaping events -proposes a sufficient range of major themes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -some factual or chronological errors -weak causal analysis -narrow range of informing factors in the discussion -little discussion of broader themes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -many chronological errors -simplistic causal analysis -few informing factors tied to the discussion -thin discussion of wider themes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -multiple factual or chronological errors -essay explores its subject in a historical vacuum with little commentary on causation and larger themes
<p>Pertinence of the argument</p> <p>15%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> all of the material in the essay directly relates to — and <i>fully</i> covers — the central issues posed in the question 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -some parts of the essay digress from the central focus of the question -good coverage of the historical material relevant to the question 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -several parts of the essay digress from the central focus of the question -fair coverage of the historical material relevant to the question (gaps in evidence) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -many parts of the essay digress from the central focus of the question -major omissions of historical material relevant to the question 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -material offered in the essay has no discernible bearing on the question asked -no coverage of the historical material relevant to the question
HISTORICAL THINKING					
<p>Explanation of the argument (student responds to historical questions in a thoughtful, critical manner)</p> <p>40%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -full explanation of the problem under review -essay defines and explores key terms / concepts / issues / ideas related to the question -situates issues within their distinctive historical context -essay clarifies the significance of the issue under review by answering the “why” and “because” questions -essay reflects the complexity and depth of the material under review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -some key parts of the historical issue omitted -most key terms defined -some effort at contextualizing the question -some gaps as the essay explores the meaning and significance of major issues -at some points, critiques either inappropriate or unsubstantiated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -several key terms left undefined -vagueness in response -essay <i>mentions</i> (but does not <i>explain</i>) key issues -weak contextualization -<i>significance</i> of the material presented remains unclear -critiques often unfair, irrelevant, or misinformed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -key terms often undefined -broad, sweeping, imprecise statements -confusing or contradictory arguments -little to no discussion of wider context of events -essay <i>raises</i> more questions than it answers -critiques commonly unfair, irrelevant, or misinformed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -omission of key information -omission of key <i>explanations</i> -fails to analyze issues within their distinctive historical context -critiques misplaced, inappropriate, or ahistorical

LEARNING OUTCOME	Excellent mastery 5	Good mastery 4	Some mastery 3	Minimal mastery 2	No mastery 1-0
HISTORICAL SKILLS					
Organization of the argument 15%	-argument unfolds through a logical sequence of points -statements made in a straightforward, understandable, and persuasive manner -structure of the argument is sound, understandable, and appropriate to the project.	-good organizational skills, though some parts of the essay move in unexpected directions -line of argument generally clear	-difficult to detect a logical sequence of the points in the essay -material presented in a scattershot fashion, making it hard to follow the line of argument	-confusing and puzzling sequence of points raised in the argument -difficult to determine the meaning, appropriateness, or significance of the material offered	-organization of argument remains incomprehensible, moving in perplexing or random directions
Mechanics of the argument 15%	Essay written using -complete sentences -well-formed paragraphs -proper grammar, spelling, and punctuation.	-occasional errors in spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence, and paragraph construction; not severe enough to hinder an understanding of the essay's main points	-numerous errors in spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence, and paragraph construction make some sections of the essay unintelligible	-repeated errors in spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence, and paragraph construction make <i>several</i> sections of the essay unintelligible	-problems in spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence, and paragraph construction so severe as to make the essay unintelligible -(or material presented in <i>outline</i> -- rather than essay – form)
TOTAL:	500-450 points: “A” range 449-350 points: “B” range 349-250 points: “C” range 249-150 points: “D” range 149- 0 points: “F” range exs.: 500 pts. equivalent to 100 / A+ 400 pts. equivalent to 85 / B 300 pts. equivalent to 75 / C 200 pts. equivalent to 65 / D 100 pts. equivalent to 55 / F				
FINAL GRADE:					