**APUSGP Persuasive Writing Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Thesis** (1) Comments | | | | | | | |
|  | Thesis- Responds to prompts with historically defensible thesis/ claim that establishes a line of reasoning | | | | | |  |
|  | **Improvements:** | | | | | |
|  | Properly argumentative but too simplistic | | | | | |
|  | Needs better organization or just restates the prompt | | | | | |
|  | Confusing, off topic or jumbled | | | | | |
| **Contextualization/Use if Role (1)** | | | | | | | |
|  | Relates the topic of the prompt to broader historical events, developments or processes that occurred before, during, or after the time frame of the question.  Attention is paid to the characteristics, positions, and perspectives of the assigned role. | | | | | |  |
|  | **Improvements:** | | | | | |
|  | Attempts are underdeveloped | | | | | |
|  | No attempts | | | | | |
| **Document Evidence and Analysis (2)** | | | | | | | |
|  | Utilizes the content of at least 2 of the documents to address the prompt (1 point)  **OR**  Supports the argument in response to the prompt using at least 2 of the documents (2 points) | | | | | |  |
|  | Analysis- explains purpose, point of view, audience and or historical context for at least 3 of the documents (1 point) | | | | | |
| **Document Usage** |  | **Doc 1** | **Doc 2** | **Doc 3** | **Doc 4** |  |
| **Content** |  |  |  |  |
| **Support** |  |  |  |  |
| **Analysis** |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Improvements:** | | | | | |
|  | Analysis fails to take into account historical situation, audience, purpose and POV. | | | | | |
|  | Utilizes the content of fewer than 2 documents in support of argument | | | | | |
|  | Docs are described superficially or simply quoted, listed and summarized. | | | | | |
|  | Docs are interpreted incorrectly | | | | | |
| **Evidence Beyond the documents (1)** | | | | | | | |
|  | Provides additional pieces of evidence that support the argument beyond the scope of the documents. | | | | | |  |
|  | **Improvements:** | | | | | |
|  | Evidence covers same material in documents | | | | | |
|  | Outside evidence is not relevant | | | | | |
|  | Evidence is not explained or is inaccurate | | | | | |
|  | Evidence is not used | | | | | |
| **Analysis and Reasoning: Complex understanding (1)** | | | | | | | |
|  | Essay as a whole is coherent and employs effective use of historical reasoning and evidence to demonstrate complex understanding of nuances of topic. Essay may:   * Show nuances * Connect topic across or within time periods and eras * Discuss alternative views and/or evidence | | | | | |  |
|  | **Improvements:** | | | | | |
|  | One of more paragraphs is ineffective in addressing the prompt and supporting an argument | | | | | |
|  | Topic sentences are vague and/or do not support the argument | | | | | |
|  | Essay is too simplistic and/or incoherent; does not show nuance or depth of historical understanding | | | | | |

Total Score:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Student Name:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Period:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Topic:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DBQ Score | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Points | 60 | 50 | 40 | 30 | 20 | 10 |