

## AP History ‘Modified 5-Document DBQ’ Rubric (10 points)

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria	Decision Rules					
<b>A) THESIS/CLAIM</b> (0-1 pt)	<b>1 pt.</b> Responds to the prompt with a historically defensible thesis/claim that establishes a line of reasoning.	<i>To earn this point, the thesis must make a claim that responds to the prompt rather than restating or rephrasing the prompt. The thesis must consist of one or more sentences located in one place, either in the introduction or the conclusion.</i>					
<b>B) CONTEXTUALIZATION</b> (0-1 pt)	<b>1 pt.</b> Describes a broader historical context relevant to the prompt.	<i>To earn this point, the response must relate 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. This point is not awarded for merely a phrase or a reference.</i>					
<b>C) EVIDENCE</b> (0-5 pts)	<b>Evidence from the Documents</b>	<i>To earn one point, the response must accurately describe — rather than simply quote — the content from at least <b>one</b> of the documents.</i>  <i>To earn two points, the response must accurately describe — rather than simply quote — the content from at least <b>two</b> documents. In addition, the response must use the content of the documents to support an argument in response to the prompt.</i>  <i>To earn three points, the response must accurately describe — rather than simply quote — the content from at least <b>four</b> documents. In addition, the response must use the content of the documents to support an argument in response to the prompt.</i>					
	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;"><b>1 pt.</b> Uses the content of at least <b>two</b> documents to address the <b>topic</b> of the prompt.</td> <td style="width: 33%; text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;"><b>OR</b></td> <td style="width: 33%;"><b>2 pts.</b> Supports an argument in response to the prompt using at least <b>two</b> documents.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;"><b>OR</b></td> <td><b>3 pts.</b> Supports an argument in response to the prompt using at least <b>four</b> documents.</td> </tr> </table>		<b>1 pt.</b> Uses the content of at least <b>two</b> documents to address the <b>topic</b> of the prompt.	<b>OR</b>	<b>2 pts.</b> Supports an argument in response to the prompt using at least <b>two</b> documents.		<b>OR</b>
	<b>1 pt.</b> Uses the content of at least <b>two</b> documents to address the <b>topic</b> of the prompt.	<b>OR</b>	<b>2 pts.</b> Supports an argument in response to the prompt using at least <b>two</b> documents.				
		<b>OR</b>	<b>3 pts.</b> Supports an argument in response to the prompt using at least <b>four</b> documents.				
<b>Evidence beyond the Documents</b>	<i>To earn this point, the response must describe the 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.</i>						
<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;"><b>1 pt.</b> Uses at least <b>one</b> additional piece of the specific historical evidence (beyond that found in the documents) relevant to an argument about the prompt.</td> <td style="width: 50%;"><b>2 pts.</b> Uses at least <b>two</b> additional pieces of the specific historical evidence (beyond that found in the documents) relevant to an argument about the prompt.</td> </tr> </table>	<b>1 pt.</b> Uses at least <b>one</b> additional piece of the specific historical evidence (beyond that found in the documents) relevant to an argument about the prompt.	<b>2 pts.</b> Uses at least <b>two</b> additional pieces of the specific historical evidence (beyond that found in the documents) relevant to an argument about the prompt.					
<b>1 pt.</b> Uses at least <b>one</b> additional piece of the specific historical evidence (beyond that found in the documents) relevant to an argument about the prompt.	<b>2 pts.</b> Uses at least <b>two</b> additional pieces of the specific historical evidence (beyond that found in the documents) relevant to an argument about the prompt.						
<b>D) ANALYSIS AND REASONING</b> (0-3 pts)	<b>Sourcing</b>	<i>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 documents sourced.</i>					
	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;"><b>1 pt.</b> For at least <b>one</b> document, explain how or why the document’s point of view, purpose, historical situation, and/or audience is relevant to an argument.</td> <td style="width: 50%;"><b>2 pts.</b> For at least <b>two</b> documents, explain how or why the document’s point of view, purpose, historical situation, and/or audience is relevant to an argument.</td> </tr> </table>		<b>1 pt.</b> For at least <b>one</b> document, explain how or why the document’s point of view, purpose, historical situation, and/or audience is relevant to an argument.	<b>2 pts.</b> For at least <b>two</b> documents, explain how or why the document’s point of view, purpose, historical situation, and/or audience is relevant to an argument.			
	<b>1 pt.</b> For at least <b>one</b> document, explain how or why the document’s point of view, purpose, historical situation, and/or audience is relevant to an argument.	<b>2 pts.</b> For at least <b>two</b> documents, explain how or why the document’s point of view, purpose, historical situation, and/or audience is relevant to an argument.					
<b>Complexity</b>	<p><i>A response may demonstrate a complex understanding in a variety of ways, such as:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Explaining nuance of an issue by analyzing multiple variables</i></li> <li>• <i>Explaining both similarity and difference, or explaining both continuity and change, or explaining multiple causes, or explaining both cause and effect</i></li> <li>• <i>Explaining relevant and insightful connections within and across periods</i></li> <li>• <i>Confirming the validity of an argument by corroborating multiple perspectives across themes</i></li> <li>• <i>Qualifying or modifying an argument by considering diverse or alternative views or evidence</i></li> </ul> <p><i>This understanding must be part of the argument, not merely a phrase or reference.</i></p>						