

# ILA HISTORY ESSAY RUBRIC

## I. HISTORY CONTENT

*To give an account of historical events, changes, and developments*

Score Point	CRITERIA FOR SCORING
4	<p>The response demonstrates a <b>WELL-DEVELOPED</b> understanding and knowledge of the target history content. This may be evidenced in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The response addresses <b>all</b> parts of the prompt.</li><li>• The response incorporates relevant information from <i>at least</i> two documents.</li><li>• The response analyzes <b>more than</b> describes information.</li><li>• The response includes <b>significant</b> prior knowledge.</li><li>• The content is <b>exceptionally</b> clear, focused, and thoroughly explained with supportive evidence.</li><li>• The response relies <b>very little</b> on simple (word-for-word) repetition of document text.</li></ul>
3	<p>The response demonstrates <b>ADEQUATE</b> understanding and knowledge of the target history content. This may be evidenced in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The response addresses <b>most</b> of the prompt.</li><li>• The response incorporates <b>mostly</b> relevant information from two documents.</li><li>• The response <b>equally</b> analyzes and describes information.</li><li>• The response includes <b>adequate</b> prior knowledge.</li><li>• The content is mostly clear, focused, and elaborated with <b>some</b> supportive evidence.</li><li>• The response relies <b>little</b> on simple (word-for-word) repetition of document text.</li></ul>
2	<p>The response demonstrates <b>LOW</b> understanding and knowledge of the target history content. This may be evidenced in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The response addresses <b>some</b> of the prompt.</li><li>• The response includes <b>limited</b> information from the documents.</li><li>• The response <b>mostly</b> describes information, with little or faulty analysis.</li><li>• The response includes <b>limited</b> prior knowledge.</li><li>• The content's main ideas are <b>understandable</b>, but may be <b>overly broad, simplistic, and lack clarity of purpose</b>. The evidence is <b>insufficient</b> to support the main ideas.</li><li>• The response may include inaccuracies that detract from the overall essay.</li><li>• The response may <b>somewhat</b> rely on simple (word-for-word) repetition of document text.</li></ul>
1	<p>The response represents <b>VERY LOW</b> or <b>NO</b> understanding and knowledge of the target history content. This may be evidenced in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The response may <b>minimally</b> address the prompt or not at all.</li><li>• The response includes <b>little to no</b> information from the documents.</li><li>• The response lacks <b>any</b> analysis.</li><li>• The response <b>does not</b> include <b>any</b> prior knowledge.</li><li>• The response includes <b>little or no</b> evidence to support the main ideas.</li><li>• The response includes <b>frequent</b> inaccuracies that detract from the overall essay.</li><li>• The response <b>excessively</b> relies on simple (word-for-word) repetition of document text.</li></ul>

## II. LANGUAGE

*To effectively communicate ideas in a written explanation genre*

Score Point	CRITERIA FOR SCORING
4	<p>The response is an <b>EXCELLENT</b> historical explanation with very good academic language use. This may be evidenced in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Most</b> or <b>all</b> of the essay's organizational components are strong.</li><li>• The response includes an introduction with a strong thesis and conclusion that is beyond a restatement of the thesis.</li><li>• The response demonstrates <b>very good</b> text cohesion through the efficient use of various sentence structures, expression of causality by utilizing nominalizations (i.e. noun phrases being used in place of a verb form), causative verbs (i.e. led to, resulted from, etc.), and/or transitional expressions.</li><li>• The response demonstrates <b>consistent</b> use of precise and varied words, including frequent specific historical terms and expanded noun phrases to support analysis.</li><li>• The tone is <b>impersonal</b> and <b>authoritative</b> with no or minimal speech markers.</li><li>• The response relies <b>very little</b> on simple (word-for-word) repetition of document text.</li></ul>
3	<p>The response is an <b>ADEQUATE</b> historical explanation with good academic language use. This may be evidenced in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The content's organization is <b>satisfactory, generally clear, and coherent</b>.</li><li>• The response includes a basic introduction and conclusion.</li><li>• The response demonstrates a <b>good level</b> of text cohesion through the use of appropriate language features such as various sentence structures, and some expression of causality.</li><li>• The response demonstrates an <b>adequate</b> use of precise and varied words, including some specific historical terms and expanded noun phrases to support analysis.</li><li>• The tone is often <b>impersonal</b> and <b>authoritative</b>, though the writing may contain some speech markers and personal references.</li><li>• The response relies <b>little</b> on simple (word-for-word) repetition of document text.</li></ul>
2	<p>The response is a <b>WEAK</b> historical explanation with only some academic language. This may be evidenced in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The content's organization may be <b>skeletal</b> and/or <b>loosely planned</b>.</li><li>• The response may lack an introduction and/or conclusion.</li><li>• The response demonstrates <b>some</b> text cohesion, though the ideas are not linked well with appropriate language features.</li><li>• The response occasionally demonstrates use of precise and varied words, but generally the vocabulary is <b>ordinary</b> and there is <b>little expansion</b> of noun phrases.</li><li>• The tone may be <b>somewhat informal</b> with regular uses of speech markers and first or second person references.</li><li>• The response may <b>somewhat</b> rely on simple (word-for-word) repetition of document text.</li></ul>
1	<p>The response is a <b>POOR</b> historical explanation with minimal to no academic language use. This may be evidenced in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The writing may be <b>haphazard</b> and <b>disjointed, with weak organization</b>.</li><li>• The response does not include an introduction or conclusion.</li><li>• The response demonstrates <b>minimal to no</b> text cohesion.</li><li>• The <b>word usage is simplistic</b>, repetitive, inappropriate, or overused with <b>little to no evidence</b> of expanded word groups.</li><li>• The tone is usually <b>informal</b> and personal with an overuse of speech markers.</li><li>• The response <b>excessively</b> relies on simple (word-for-word) repetition of document text.</li></ul>