

Historiographical Essay

	<i>Excellent (A)</i>	<i>Good (A-/B+)</i>	<i>Fair (B)</i>	<i>Poor (B- and below)</i>
<i>Knowledge and comprehension of works under review</i>	Paper provides a highly accurate and precise description, summarization, and/or paraphrasing of the key claims of the texts and their methodologies, as well as all pertinent information about each author, the time period in which each work was written, and/or the historiographical trends of the time.	Paper provides a fairly accurate and precise description, summarization, and/or paraphrasing of the key claims of the texts and their methodologies, as well as most pertinent information about each author, the time period in which each work was written, and/or the historiographical trends of the time.	Paper provides a fairly accurate, but not precise, description, summarization, and/or paraphrasing of the key claims of the texts and their methodologies. Provides minimal pertinent information about each author, the time period in which each work was written, and/or the historiographical trends of the time.	Paper provides a cursory, vague, and occasionally inaccurate description, summarization, and/or paraphrasing of the key claims of the texts and their methodologies. Provides almost no pertinent information about each author, the time period in which each work was written, and/or the historiographical trends of the time.
<i>Ability to place texts within the broader context of the literature</i>	Paper provides a highly accurate and precise summarization, description, and/or paraphrasing of the important historical questions, interpretations, arguments, and debates that relate to the books/topic. Paper thoroughly and accurately explains how each text under review relates to that broader context.	Paper provides a fairly accurate and precise summarization, description, and/or paraphrasing of the important historical questions, interpretations, arguments, and debates that relate to the books/topic. Paper fairly accurately explains how each text under review relates to that broader context.	Paper provides a fairly accurate, but not precise, summarization, description, and/or paraphrasing of the important historical questions, interpretations, arguments, and debates that relate to the books/topic. Paper explains how each text under review relates to that broader context, but that explication is cursory or vague.	Paper provides a cursory, vague, and occasionally inaccurate summarization, description, and/or paraphrasing of the important historical questions, interpretations, arguments, and debates that relate to the books/topic. Paper does not explain how each text under review relates to that broader context.
<i>Knowledge of history of US since 1945</i>	When, in the course of its analysis, the paper discusses particular historical events, people, movements, transitions, etc., it provides a highly accurate and precise summarization and/or description of those subjects.	When, in the course of its analysis, the paper discusses particular historical events, people, movements, transitions, etc., it provides a fairly accurate and precise summarization and/or description of those subjects.	When, in the course of its analysis, the paper discusses particular historical events, people, movements, transitions, etc., it provides a fairly accurate, but not precise, summarization and/or description of those subjects.	When, in the course of its analysis, the paper discusses particular historical events, people, movements, transitions, etc., it provides a cursory, vague, and occasionally inaccurate summarization and/or description of those subjects.
<i>Ability craft thesis and advance argument about historiography</i>	Paper provides an insightful, original, and persuasive thesis about the authors'	Paper provides a persuasive thesis about the authors' approaches, orientations,	Paper provides a vague, confusing, or somewhat unpersuasive thesis about the	Paper does not provide a thesis about the authors' approaches, orientations,

	approaches, orientations, assumptions, analyses, methodologies, etc., in relation to one another. The paper offers coherent, incisive, and original analysis of the books under review to advance a clear argument about the <i>writing</i> of history, not the history that the books discuss.	assumptions, analyses, methodologies, etc., in relation to one another. The paper offers a coherent analysis of the books under review to advance an argument about the <i>writing</i> of history, not the history that the books discuss.	authors' approaches, orientations, assumptions, analyses, methodologies, etc., in relation to one another. The paper analyzes the books under review to advance a somewhat muddled argument about the <i>writing</i> of history, not the history that the books discuss.	assumptions, analyses, methodologies, etc., in relation to one another, or that thesis is indecipherable or largely unpersuasive. The paper does not advance an argument about the writing of history by analyzing the books under review, or that argument is largely unpersuasive.
<i>Thoroughness of analysis</i>	The author persuasively explains and justifies any decisions s/he has made to delimit the scope of his/her analysis. Within those bounds, his/her analysis is thorough, leaving no unanswered questions or unaccounted for discrepancies in the analysis.	The paper's analysis is reasonably thorough, but it leave some questions unanswered and/or some aspects of the texts unaccounted for. The author has not persuasively explained or justified those lapses in analysis.	The paper's analysis is not very thorough, leaving many questions unanswered and/or many aspects of the texts unaccounted for. The author has not explained or justified those lapses in analysis.	The paper's analysis leaves most questions about the texts unanswered and unaccounted for.
<i>Ability to anticipate and respond to counterarguments</i>	Paper introduces, carefully considers, and responds to both obvious and not-so-obvious alternative analyses and potential counter-arguments that could be made about these texts.	Paper introduces and responds to obvious alternative analyses and potential counter-arguments that could be made about these texts.	Paper introduces only the most obvious alternative analyses and potential counter-arguments that could be made about these texts. Responses are minimal, non-existent, or mere claims of refutation.	Paper does not introduce or consider alternative analyses and potential counter-arguments that could be made about these texts.
<i>Structure</i>	Paper has a clear structure. It begins with a clear and concise introduction that provides the reader with the paper's main claims and a brief overview of how it will argue those claims. It follows with body paragraphs that thoroughly explicate and explain all the necessary background information and analysis needed to support	Paper has a clear structure. It begins with a reasonably clear introduction that provides the reader with the paper's main claims, but it does not provide much insight into how those claims will be advanced or developed in the paper. It follows with body paragraphs that explicate most of the necessary	Paper has an introduction, body, and conclusion, but these parts of the paper do not fully accomplish their purposes in the paper. The introduction introduces the topic of the paper, but does not provide the reader with a clear understanding of the paper's main claims or argumentation. The body paragraphs contain	Paper might make an attempt at having an introduction, body paragraphs, and conclusion, but these parts of the paper are not well defined.

	the author's argument. It finishes with a conclusion that reiterates the main points of the paper, ties up any loose ends, and points to larger issues for future scholarship to consider based on the claims of this paper.	background information and analysis needed to support the author's argument. It finishes with a conclusion that simply reiterates the main points of the paper.	information about the topic, books, etc., but they do not fully or clearly explicate the author's argument. The conclusion does not successfully reiterate those claims.	
<i>Organization</i>	Paper is superbly organized. It leads its reader seamlessly from one idea to the next in a logical order.	Paper is reasonably well organized. It leads its reader from one idea to the next in roughly logical order, but at points the organization is uneven.	Paper is not very well organized. It covers most of the necessary material and attempts to lay out its claims completely and thoroughly, but often in a way that makes it difficult for a reader to follow the author's argument and ideas.	Paper is poorly organized and difficult to follow. Does not seem to have much of an organizational pattern.
<i>Focused paragraphs</i>	Each paragraph of the paper presents a single idea that is developed and explained in the body of that paragraph. Each paragraph contributes to the larger claim of the paper.	In general, most (but not all) paragraphs of the paper present a single idea that is developed and explained in the body of that paragraph. Most paragraphs contribute to the larger claim of the paper.	A number of paragraphs in the paper present multiple ideas, or are muddy in terms of their contribution to the overall point of the paper.	Paragraphs are poorly written, with multiple points in some paragraphs, incomplete points in others. Many paragraphs do not contribute to the larger claim of the paper.
<i>Writing style</i>	The writing style is clear and accessible. It has clean and correct grammar, uses words correctly, and explains any complicated ideas, terms, or concepts thoroughly.	The writing style is reasonably clear and accessible. It has mostly correct grammar, uses most words correctly, and generally explains any complicated ideas, terms, or concepts.	The writing style is a bit difficult to follow. It makes a number of mistakes in terms of grammar, word usage, and the explication of complicated ideas, terms, or concepts.	The writing style is unclear, with frequent poor grammar and word usage.
<i>Use of evidence</i>	Paper explains and illustrates each point with ample analysis and evidence. Examples are well-suited to making the author's point, and are explained thoroughly in relation to the author's analysis.	Paper explains and illustrates each point with analysis and evidence. But some examples could have been better selected, some points could use more evidence or explication, and/or some examples could have been	Paper explains and illustrates most but not all points with analysis and evidence. Some examples are ill-chosen and some points lack evidence or explication. Not all evidence seems to relate back to the author's analysis.	Paper has minimal evidence and analysis.

		better explained in in relation to the author's analysis.		
<i>Synthesis</i>	Paper reads as a complete and unified piece of work. It synthesizes its various parts into a coherent whole, and the connections between its parts are clear and insightful.	Paper reads as a mostly coherent whole. The connections between its parts are generally clear.	The paper reads as a somewhat coherent whole, but the connections between its parts are somewhat unclear.	The paper does not read as a complete and unified piece of work. Instead it seems scattered, not always coherent, and incomplete.
<i>Citations</i>	Paper provides accurate and thorough citations for its evidence and ideas in Chicago Style.	All evidence is cited, but there are some minor problems with completeness or format of some citations.	Some pieces of evidence are unreferenced or inaccurately referenced, and there are problems with completeness and format of citations.	Evidence is frequently unreferenced and citations are improperly formatted.