

LEARNING OUTCOME	Excellent mastery 5.0-4.5	Good mastery 4.4-4.0	Some mastery 3.9-3.5	Minimal mastery 3.4-3.0	No mastery 2.9-0
HISTORICAL KNOWLEDGE					
Student demonstrates an understanding of the key historical events related to the narratives 10%	The paper displays: clear chronological understanding of events; complex grasp of causation; analyzes a range of factors shaping the sequence and outcome of events; situates issues within larger contexts; reflects on larger themes informing specific events.	Sound chronological framework; good grasp of causation; omits some key informing factors shaping events; some effort at contextualizing the question; proposes a sufficient range of larger themes.	Some chronological confusion; weak causal analysis; narrow range of informing factors in the discussion; weak contextualization; little discussion of broader themes.	Many chronological errors; simplistic causal analysis; few informing factors tied to the discussion; little to no discussion of wider context of events; thin discussion of wider themes.	Paper explores its subject in a historical vacuum with little commentary on causation, context, and larger themes
HISTORICAL THINKING					
Student addresses historical questions in a thoughtful, critical manner 25%	The paper addresses the questions posed in an especially insightful manner. Focuses on critical analysis rather than mere description. Key terms defined. Student clarifies the significance of the question. The response is conceptually strong, logically formulated, and precisely stated.	The paper addresses the questions posed in a very informed manner. Focus rests largely on critical analysis. Key terms usually defined. Responses posed with minimal logical flaws in framing of the question; offers evidence for claims.	The paper addresses the questions posed in a reasonable manner. Focus shifts between critical analysis and mere description. Some key terms left undefined. Does not clarify significance of questions. Lapses in logical framing of the question. Vague, unsupported assertions.	Significance of questions not demonstrated; commentary is largely descriptive rather than analytical; key terms often undefined; the central points in the paper are of inappropriate scope or illogically presented; frequently relies on sweeping generalizations	Fails to address key questions; paper offers broad, unsupported generalizations; paper merely descriptive.
Student evaluates and analyzes primary sources effectively 35%	Demonstrates thorough awareness of origins, authors, <i>contexts</i> of primary sources; consciously employs verification strategies as needed; complex analysis of sources. Thorough, fair-minded, and informed assessment of sources, summarizing main ideas clearly and accurately; raises historically legitimate critiques concerning the beliefs/main arguments of historical subjects.	Demonstrates some awareness of contexts of primary sources; employs some verification strategies; sound analysis of sources. At some points, critical analysis remains either inappropriate or misinformed.	Offers partial evaluation of primary sources; spotty verification; at times departs from subject's historical context; not all claims supported by the evidence. Critical analysis often unfair, irrelevant, misinformed, or unsubstantiated	Little evaluation of primary sources; no verification; imposes contemporary judgments on historical material; sources usually do not support interpretive weight placed upon them. Critical analysis commonly unfair, irrelevant, misinformed, or unsubstantiated.	Demonstrates little to no awareness of need to evaluate, verify, or contextualize sources; "evidence" offered does not support interpretive weight placed upon it.

