

<p>O/F-</p>	<p>Does not meet the descriptors below. Is not complete. Does not include proper references. Is not written in historical past tense. Has instances of plagiarism or evidence of lack of student's own work.</p>
<p>F</p>	<p>The investigation is poorly organized. The investigation lacks clarity and coherence. Little attempt at an argument is made, though there may be an unsubstantiated thesis. The structure may also lack the form of an essay (lack of paragraphs, use of bullet points, etc...)</p> <p>There are few, if any attempts at analysis. Factual details are missing, and/or are incorrect.</p> <p>Reference is made to evidence from sources, but there is little to no analysis of that evidence. Sources lack credibility and/or are mostly encyclopedic generalizations rather than academic scholarly sources and/or there are too few sources. Paper reads like a book report.</p> <p>Conclusion may contradict and/or blatantly oppose conventional historical thinking (without evidence to support).</p>
<p>D</p>	<p>There is little evidence of an attempt to organize the investigation. The investigation lacks clarity and coherence. There is an attempt at an argument but it is unsuccessful.</p> <p>There is little to no critical analysis. Factual details are mostly correct but there are occasional problems of accuracy. There are broad generalizations, and poorly substantiated assertions.</p> <p>Reference is made to evidence from sources, but there is little to no analysis of that evidence. Sources lack credibility and/or are mostly encyclopedic generalizations rather than academic scholarly sources and/or there are too few sources. Paper reads like a book report.</p> <p>Conclusion may contradict and/or blatantly oppose conventional historical thinking (without evidence to support).</p>
<p>C</p>	<p>There is an attempt to organize the investigation, but is only partially successful. The paper is somewhat lacking in clarity and coherence in some parts.</p> <p>The investigation is mostly description, though there may be occasional attempts at analysis, usually the analysis is "bolted on" with some attempt at integration. The paper reads more as a story or a collection of facts with little clarity as to why those facts are significant to the thesis or the investigation though there are occasional attempts.</p> <p>Mostly academic sources are used, but they are accepted with very little to no criticism or evaluation. There is little to no consideration as to how sources are related to each other.</p> <p>There is minimal awareness that other historical or contemporary perspectives are possible.</p> <p>There is a conclusion but it is one that does not seem to be drawn from the evidence presented. The conclusion, however, is not blatantly opposed to conventional historian thinking.</p>
<p>B</p>	<p>The investigation is generally clear and well organized, but there is some repetition and lack of clarity in a few places. There are some repetitive statements, but not enough to overly distract from the overall flow of the paper.</p> <p>The investigation moves beyond description to include some analysis and critical commentary, but it is not sustained. There are several instances where analysis is bolted on to narrative. A paper in this range generally reads like a collection of facts with an occasional reference to the significance of those facts in relation to the thesis or topic sentence, but this is not sustained throughout the paper.</p> <p>There is an attempt to integrate evidence from a range of sources, but sources are generally not critically analyzed. Only minimal evidence of source evaluation is apparent as most sources seem to be accepted without critical analysis or consideration for source relation to each other though there may appear to be an attempt.</p> <p>There is awareness of different perspectives but the different perspectives do not appear integrated into most of the argument.</p> <p>The investigation has a conclusion that is generally supported by the evidence and without major contractions.</p>
<p>A-</p>	<p>The investigation is clear, coherent, and organized. Repetitive statements are minimal, but some repetition exists. Each paragraph/section makes a clear point but those points occasionally feel disconnected to the thesis. But overall, the paper still flows from one section to the next leading from the thesis through the evidence to the conclusion.</p> <p>The investigation contains a thesis based on critical analysis of an appropriate range of sources which support the argument. Primary sources are included but not well-utilized. Some evidence of source evaluation is apparent, but it is not consistent; most sources seem to be accepted without critical analysis or consideration for source relation to each other.</p> <p>Different perspectives have been considered but only minimally.</p> <p>The investigation argues to a reasoned conclusion but there are some elements of uncertainty where the reader is unsure of the path from the thesis through the evidence to the conclusion.</p>
<p>A</p>	<p>The investigation is mostly clear, coherent, and well organized. Repetitive statements are minimal. Each paragraph/section makes a clear point and those points clearly support the thesis. Each paragraph/section flows from one to the next in a generally clear and well organized way from the thesis through the evidence to the conclusion.</p> <p>The investigation contains a strong thesis that is based on critical analysis of an appropriate range of sources which support the argument. Primary sources are included and utilized, but there may be a noticeable reliance on secondary sources where primary source material would have been more appropriate. Evidence of source evaluation is apparent throughout the paper.</p> <p>It is evident that different perspectives have been considered when developing the thesis and sub-arguments.</p> <p>The investigation argues to a reasoned conclusion supported by evidence that has been clearly laid out for the reader with only minimal instances of uncertainty.</p>
<p>A+</p>	<p>The investigation is clear, coherent, and effectively developed, illustrating a direct path from the thesis through the evidence in a clear, articulate, easy to follow structure to a well-reasoned conclusion.</p> <p>It contains a well-developed thesis clearly based on critical analysis drawn from a wide range of appropriate primary and secondary sources with clear evidence of consideration for each source's values and limitations and their relationship to each other. (It is clear that the investigation questioned sources rather than simply accepting them without evaluation).</p> <p>It is clear that the evaluation/analysis has been informed by various historiographical perspectives as well as various perspectives of contemporaries.</p> <p>The investigation argues to a reasoned conclusion supported by the evidence and laid out in a clear, coherent, and effectively developed way.</p>