

Historical Writing Analysis Rubric for Expository Writing

| Score | Content | Statement of Purpose/Focus and Organization | | Development: Language and Elaboration of Evidence | |
|-------|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | Statement of Purpose/Facts | Organization | Elaboration of Evidence | Language and Vocabulary |
| 4 | <p>The historical content selected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the historical content • Clearly relates to the thesis and provides a clear context based in historical content • Presents a logical interpretation of historical events, grounded in evidence • Incorporates both primary and corroborating secondary sources into analysis, establishing strong support for the thesis | <p>The response is fully sustained, consistently, and purposefully focused:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thesis is grounded in historical content, clearly stated, focused, and strongly maintained • Thesis is introduced and communicated clearly within context of historical content | <p>The response has a clear and effective organizational structure creating unity and completeness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective, consistent use of a variety of transitions • Logical progression of ideas from beginning to end • Effective introduction and conclusion for audience and purpose • Strong connections among ideas with some syntactic variety | <p>The response provides thorough and convincing support/evidence for the writer's thesis that includes the effective use of facts, and details from primary/secondary sources. The response achieves substantial depth that is specific and relevant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of evidence from primary & secondary sources is smoothly integrated, comprehensive, relevant, and concrete • Effective use of a variety of elaborative techniques | <p>The response clearly and effectively expresses ideas, using precise language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of academic and domain-specific vocabulary is clearly appropriate for audience and purpose |

| Score | Content | Statement of Purpose/Focus and Organization | | Development: Language and Elaboration of Evidence | |
|-------|---|--|---|--|---|
| | | Statement of Purpose/Facts | Organization | Elaboration of Evidence | Language and Vocabulary |
| 3 | <p>The historical content selected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a strong understanding of the historical content • Relates to the thesis and provides a clear context in historical content • Presents a logical interpretation of historical events, mostly grounded in evidence • Incorporates both primary and corroborating secondary sources into analysis, establishing reasonable support for the thesis | <p>The response is adequately sustained and generally focused:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thesis is grounded in historical content, clear and for the most part maintained, though some loosely related material may be presented • Historical context supporting the thesis is adequate | <p>The response has a clear and effective organizational structure and a sense of completeness, though there may be minor flaws and some ideas may be loosely connected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate use of transitional strategies with some variety • Adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end • Adequate introduction and conclusion • Adequate, if slightly inconsistent, connection among ideas | <p>The response provides adequate support/evidence for the writer's thesis that includes the effective use of facts and details from primary/secondary sources. The response achieves some depth and specificity but is predominately general:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some evidence from primary/secondary sources is integrated, though citations may be general or imprecise • Adequate use of some elaborative techniques | <p>The response adequately expresses ideas, using more general language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of academic and domain-specific vocabulary is generally appropriate for audience and purpose |

| Score | Content | Statement of Purpose/Focus and Organization | | Development: Language and Elaboration of Evidence | |
|-------|--|---|---|--|---|
| | | Statement of Purpose/Facts | Organization | Elaboration of Evidence | Language and Vocabulary |
| 2 | <p>The historical content selected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding of the content • Somewhat relates to the thesis and provides a general historical context • Presents an inconsistent interpretation of historical events, weakly grounded in evidence • Incorporates either primary or corroborating secondary sources into analysis, establishing weak support for the thesis. | <p>The response is somewhat sustained and may have a minor drift in focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be clearly focused on the thesis and grounded in historical content but is insufficiently sustained • Thesis may be somewhat unclear and unfocused within the context of historical content | <p>The response has an inconsistent organization and flaws are evident:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent use of basic transitional strategies with little variety • Uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end • Conclusion and introduction, if present, are weak • Weak connections between ideas | <p>The response expresses ideas unevenly, using simplistic language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of evidence from primary/secondary sources is weakly integrated, and citations, if present, are uneven • Weak or uneven elaborative techniques | <p>The response unclearly expresses ideas, using imprecise language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of academic and domain-specific may at times be inappropriate for the audience and purpose |

| Score | Content | Statement of Purpose/Focus and Organization | | Development: Language and Elaboration of Evidence | |
|-------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Statement of Purpose/Facts | Organization | Elaboration of Evidence | Language and Vocabulary |
| 1 | <p>The historical content selected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates little understanding of the historical content • Does not relate to the thesis (if present) or provide a clear context based in historical content • Presents an inconsistent interpretation of historical events, not grounded in evidence • Does not incorporate either primary and corroborating secondary sources | <p>The response may be related to the purpose but may offer little relevant historical detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be very brief • May have a major drift • If present thesis may be confusing or ambiguous | <p>The response has a no discernible organizational structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few or no transitional strategies are evident • Frequent extraneous ideas may intrude | <p>The response provides minimal support/evidence for the writer's thesis that includes little or no use of primary/secondary sources, facts, and details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of evidence from primary/secondary sources is minimal, absent, in error, or irrelevant | <p>The expression of ideas is vague, lacks clarity, or is confusing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses limited language of domain-specific vocabulary • May have little sense of audience and purpose |