teacher: scale subject to change.

AP History DBQ Rubric

lame:		
	Name:	Name:

Points Earned	Scoring Criteria	Decision Rules: (See circled/highlighted)
/1 □ Did not specifically address the prompt. □ Insufficiently analytical □ No attempted thesis	A. Thesis Claim/1 pt. Responds to the prompt with a historically defensible thesis/claim that establishes a line of reasoning.	To earn this point, the thesis must make a specific claim that responds to the prompt rather than restating or rephrasing the prompt. The thesis must consist of one or more contiguous sentences located either in the introduction or the conclusion, & must be clear & analytical .
/1 □ Insufficient information □ Irrelevant/not historically significant	B. Contextualization 1 pt. Describes a broader historical context relevant to the prompt.	To earn this point, the response must situate the topic of the prompt to broader historical events, developments, or processes that occur before, during, or continue after the time frame of the question. Context must be thoroughly detailed, & more than a phrase/sentence
/3	C. Evidence from the Documents	To earn one point, the response must accurately describe—rather than simply quote—the content from
□ Doc 1	1 pt. OR 2 pts.	at least three of the documents.
□ Doc 2 □ Doc 3 □ Doc 4 □ Doc 5 □ Doc 6 □ Doc 7	Uses the Supports an content of at argument in least three response to documents to address the using at topic of the prompt.	To earn two points, the response must accurately describe—ratherthansimplyquote—thecontent from at least six documents. In addition, the response must use the content of the documents to support an argument in response to the prompt.
☐ Outside Evidence explained, specific and relevant.	C. Evidence beyond the Documents	To earn this point, the response must describe the
☐ Outside evidence insufficient, not specific, not relevant to the prompt.	1 pt.: Uses at least two additional pieces of the specific historical evidence (beyond that found in the documents) relevant to an argument about the prompt	evidence and must use more than a phrase or reference. This additional piece of evidence must be different from the evidence used to earn the point for contextualization.
	D. Analysis & Reasoning: Analyzing Documents 1 pt. For at least three documents, explains how or why the document's point of view, purpose, historical situation, and/or audience is relevant to an argument.	To earn this point, the response must explain how or why (rather than simply identifying) the document's point of view, purpose, historical situation, or audience is relevant to an argument about the prompt for each of the three documents sourced. Always attempt at least 4!
□ Doc 4 H I P P	D. Analysis & Reasoning: Essay	A response may demonstrate a complex
□ Doc 5 H I P P □ Doc 6 H I P P □ Doc 7 H I P P □ Demonstrated a complex understanding of the question using supporting evidence. □ Essay explanation simplistic, does not show nuance or depth of historical	Complexity & Quality 1 pt. Demonstrates a complex understanding of the historical development that is the focus of the prompt, using evidence to corroborate, qualify, or modify an argument that addresses the question.	understanding in a variety of ways, such as: Explaining nuance by analyzing multiple variables Explaining both similarity & difference, or explaining both continuity & change, or explaining multiple causes, or explaining both cause & effect Explaining relevant and insightful connections within and across periods Confirming the validity of an argument by corroborating multiple perspectives across themes
understanding. Unbalanced, did not address both elements of the historical thinking skill {HTS}		Qualifying or modifying an argument by considering diverse or alternative views or evidence This understanding must be part of the argument, not merely a phrase or reference.
Score: Grade:	Comments:	
7=100 6=90 5=85 4=80 3=75 2		
1= 65 0= 60 (if attempted) Range s		

AP History LEQ Rubric (6 points) Name: _____

reasoning and shows mastery of the HTS (comparison, causation, CCOT) to frame or structure an argument. Demonstrates a complex understanding of the historical question. (see circled points) Essay explanation simplistic, does not show nuance or depth of historical understanding. Unbalanced, did not address both elements of the historical thinking skill {HTS} Attempts to make historical	Score Earned	Scoring Criteria	Decision Rules (See Circled/Highlighted)
□ Insufficient information □ Irrelevant/not historically significant □ Irrelevant specific historical examples/evidence that addresses the prompt. □ Uses specific historical examples/evidence to support an argument in response to the prompt—supports the thesis. □ Insufficient or irrelevant specific examples of evidence relevant specific historical evidence to support an argument/thesis. □ Irrelevant/not historical evant specific historical examples/of evidence to support an argument in response to the prompt. □ Demonstrates historical examples of evidence to support an argument in the prompt using specific historical evant evangles of evidence. □ Irrelevant to the prompt. □ Demonstrates relevant to the prompt. □ Demonstrates historical evant specific historical evant specific historical evant to the topic of the prompt. □ Demonstrates historical evant specific examples of evidence response to the prompt. □ Demonstrates historical evant specific historical evant specific historical evant specific examples of evidence response to the prompt. □ Demonstrates historical evant specific historical evant specific examples of evidence response to the prompt. □ Demonstrates historical evant specific examples of evidence response to the prompt. □ Demonstrates historical evant specific examples of evidence or support an argument the prompt. □ Demonstrates a complex understanding of the historical evant specific examples of evidence. □ Irrelevant relevant specific examples of evidenc	□ Did not specifically address the prompt. □ Insufficiently analytical	Responds to the prompt with a historically defensible thesis/claim that	that responds to the prompt rather than restating or rephrasing the prompt. The thesis must consist of one of more contiguous sentences located either in the introduction or the conclusion, & must be clear &
I pt. OR 2 pts.	☐ Insufficient information☐ Irrelevant/not historically	Describes a broader historical	the prompt to broader historical events, developments, processes that occur before, during, or continue after the time frame of the question. This point is not awarded for
□ Demonstrates historical reasoning and shows mastery of the HTS (comparison, causation, CCOT) to frame or structure an argument. □ Demonstrates a complex understanding of the historical question. (see circled points) □ Essay explanation simplistic, does not show nuance or depth of historical understanding. □ Unbalanced, did not address both elements of the historical thinking skill {HTS} □ Attempts to make historical connections were insufficient. □ Demonstrates a complex Uses historical teasoning to frame or structure an argument, although the reasoning might be uneven or imbalanced. □ Demonstrates a complex understanding of the historical development or structure an argument that is the surgiment that is the prompt, using evidence to corroborate, qualify, or modify an argument that the the question □ Unbalanced, did not address both elements of the historical connections were insufficient. □ Attempts to make historical reasoning to frame or structure an argument, although the reasoning might be uneven or imbalanced. Point 2: the response must demonstrate a complex understanding: For example: □ Explains nuance by analyzing multiple variables that is the using evidence to corroborate, qualify, or modify an argument that the theorical understanding. □ Unbalanced, did not address both elements of the historical thinking skill {HTS} □ Attempts to make historical connections were insufficient.	□ Identifies relevant specific historical examples/evidence that addresses the prompt. □ Uses specific historical evidence to support an argument in response to the prompt—supports the thesis. □ Insufficient or irrelevant specific historical evidence □ Evidence fails to support the	1 pt. OR 2 pts. Provides specific examples of evidence relevant to the topic of the prompt. OR 2 pts. Supports an argument in response to the prompt using specific and relevant examples of	specific historical examples of evidence relevant to the topic of the prompt. To earn two points the response must use specific historical evidence to support an
	Demonstrates historical reasoning and shows mastery of the HTS (comparison, causation, CCOT) to frame or structure an argument. Demonstrates a complex understanding of the historical question. (see circled points) Essay explanation simplistic, does not show nuance or depth of historical understanding. Unbalanced, did not address both elements of the historical thinking skill {HTS}	Uses historical causation, CCOT) to frame or structure an argument that addresses the prompt. Demonstrates ancental anc	historical reasoning to frame or structure an argument, although the reasoning might be uneven or imbalanced. Point 2: the response must demonstrate a complex understanding: For example: Explains nuance by analyzing multiple variables Explains both similarity & difference, or explaining both continuity & change, or explaining multiple causes, or explaining both causes & effects Explains relevant and insightful connections within and across periods Confirms the validity of an argument by corroborating multiple perspectives across themes Qualifies OR modifies an argument by considering diverse or alternative views or evidence This understanding must be part of the argument,

6=100, 5=90, 4=85 3=80 2=75 1=70 0= 60 (if attempted) Range determined by teacher: Scale subject to change