

<b>LEARNING OUTCOME</b>	<b>Excellent mastery 5.0-4.5</b>	<b>Good mastery 4.4-4.0</b>	<b>Some mastery 3.9-3.5</b>	<b>Minimal mastery 3.4-3.0</b>	<b>No mastery 2.9-0</b>
<b>HISTORICAL KNOWLEDGE</b>					
Student demonstrates an understanding of the key historical events related to the thesis  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
<b>HISTORICAL THINKING</b>					
Student frames historical questions in a thoughtful, critical manner  10%	The paper addresses a clearly-stated and significant historical question. Focuses on critical analysis rather than mere description. Key terms defined. Student clarifies the significance of the question. The question is of manageable scope, logically formulated, and precisely stated.	The paper addresses a significant historical question that is clearly stated. Focus rests largely on critical analysis. Key terms usually defined. Question is of manageable scope, posed with minimal logical flaws in framing of the question; offers evidence for claims.	The paper addresses a historical question that can be identified with some difficulty. Focus shifts between critical analysis and mere description. Some key terms left undefined. Significance of question unclear. Lapses in logical framing of the question. Vague, unsupported assertions.	Significance of question not demonstrated; commentary is largely descriptive rather than analytical; key terms often undefined; the central question in the paper is of inappropriate scope or illogically presented; frequently relies on sweeping generalizations	No identifiable historical question; paper offers broad, unsupported generalizations
Student evaluates and analyzes primary sources  15%	Demonstrates thorough awareness of origins, authors, contexts of all primary sources; consciously employs verification strategies as needed; complex analysis of sources	Demonstrates some awareness of contexts of primary sources; employs some verification strategies; sound analysis of sources	Offers partial evaluation of primary sources; spotty verification; at times departs from subject's historical context; not all claims supported by the evidence	Little evaluation of primary sources; no verification; imposes contemporary judgments on historical material; sources usually do not support interpretive weight placed upon them	Demonstrates little to no awareness of need to evaluate, verify, or contextualize sources; "evidence" offered does not support interpretive weight placed upon it.
Student evaluates and analyzes secondary sources, demonstrating an awareness of interpretive differences  10%	Demonstrates careful reading from all relevant historiographical traditions; thorough, fair-minded, and informed assessment of historiography, summarizing main ideas clearly and accurately; places his/her own work within the historiography; raises historically legitimate critiques concerning the strengths/weaknesses of the studies.	Has read widely in several historiographical traditions; assesses and summarizes those read; places his/her own work within the historiography; at some points, critiques either inappropriate or unsubstantiated	Cites at least two different interpretations; makes an effort to place his/her own work in reference to these two interpretations; critiques often unfair, irrelevant, or misinformed	Minimal discussion of interpretation in secondary works. No effort to place his/her own work within historiography; critiques commonly unfair, irrelevant, or misinformed.	No awareness of interpretive differences.

<b>LEARNING OUTCOME</b>	<b>Excellent mastery 5.0-4.5</b>	<b>Good mastery 4.4-4.0</b>	<b>Some mastery 3.9-3.5</b>	<b>Minimal mastery 3.4-3.0</b>	<b>No mastery 2.9-0</b>
<b>HISTORICAL SKILLS</b>					
Student employs a range of primary sources appropriate to the informing thesis of the paper  15%	Makes thorough use of all relevant online and print databases to identify primary source literature; all available primary sources identified. All sources in bibliography used thoroughly in text.	Makes good use of relevant online and print databases; some gaps in primary source base. A few sources in bibliography not fully used.	Makes some use of online or print databases; significant gaps in source base; paper based on only a few of cited sources.	No evidence of using databases to establish source base; source base very limited. Major sources unknown or not employed. Little evidence that author has used works listed in bibliography.	No evidence of using databases; sources entirely insufficient and inappropriate to paper topic.
Student employs a range of secondary sources appropriate to the informing thesis of the paper  10%	Makes thorough use of all relevant online and print databases to identify secondary literature; uses classic and most recent secondary literature; no major secondary sources omitted. All sources in bibliography used thoroughly in text.	Makes good use of relevant online and print databases; some gaps in secondary source base. A few sources in bibliography not fully used.	Makes some use of online or print databases; significant gaps in source base; paper based on only a few of cited sources.	No evidence of using databases to establish source base; source base very limited. Major sources unknown or not employed. Little evidence that author has used works listed in bibliography.	No evidence of using databases; sources entirely insufficient and inappropriate to paper topic.
Organization of argument  10%	Thesis announced --and argument previewed for the reader -- at the start of the paper in a succinct and comprehensible manner; clear framework for analyzing the thesis; argument unfolds through a logical sequence of points; excellent transitions.	Statement of thesis --and preview of argument -- are clear, but do not appear in the opening of the paper. Structure of the argument is sound, understandable, and appropriate to the project. Good transitions.	Thesis stated, but not at the start of the paper. Argument previewed; but the paper moves in a different direction. Difficult to detect a logical sequence to the points raised in the paper. Weak transitions between parts of argument.	Difficult to determine the meaning, appropriateness, or significance of the thesis. No clear preview of the argument's direction. Sequence of points raised in the argument remains episodic, confused, puzzling.	Thesis either severely flawed or simply not offered; organization of argument remains incomprehensible
Well-substantiated argument; proper citation of evidence  10%	The writer correctly and thoroughly cites sources using Chicago Manual of Style format in footnotes or endnotes; the paper includes a separate bibliography listing all sources consulted for the paper.	Cites sources using the Chicago Manual of Style format in footnotes or endnotes and provides separate bibliography; however, some gaps in citation, errors in their construction, and inaccuracies in the bibliography.	Offers partial evaluation of primary sources; spotty verification	Offers little to no evaluation of primary sources; no verification.	Is not aware of need to evaluate or verify sources.
Mechanics  10%	Spelling, punctuation, grammar all correct; proper sentence and paragraph construction	Occasional errors in spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence & paragraph construction; not severe enough to hinder an understanding of the paper's main points.	Weaknesses in spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence & paragraph construction make sections of the paper unintelligible.	Problems in spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence & paragraph construction make sections of the paper unintelligible.	Problems in spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence & paragraph construction so severe as to make the paper unintelligible.
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>500-450 points: "A" range</b> 500-485: A+; 484-465: A; 464-450: A- <b>449-400 points: "B" range</b> 449-440: B+; 439-415: B; 414-400: B- <b>399-350 points: "C" range</b> 399-385: C+; 384-361: C; 360-350: C- <b>349-300 points: "D" range</b> 349-340: D+; 339-315: D; 314-300: D- <b>299- 0 points: "F" range</b>	exs.:	475 pts. equivalent to 95 / A  425 pts. equivalent to 85 / B  375 pts. equivalent to 75 / C  325 pts. equivalent to 65 / D  275 pts. equivalent to 55 / F		

<b>LETTER</b> <b>GRADE:</b>	
--------------------------------	--