

Historical Thinking Skills Scoring Rubric – Secondary

	Close Reading Strategies		Strategies/Procedural Concepts		Procedural Concepts	
Criteria	Sourcing	Critical Reading	Corroboration	Contextualizing	Claim	Evidence
4	<p>Identification: Fully understands the meaning and content of sources.</p> <p>Attribution: Cites all authors and all original dates of primary and secondary sources.</p> <p>Perspective: Evaluates the reliability of sources based on the author’s perspective and when and why they were produced.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Questions the author’s thesis and determines viewpoint and evidence to evaluate claims, highlighting what the author leaves out. ▪ Cites accurate examples of how the author uses persuasive language and specific words and phrases to influence the reader. ▪ Seeks answers to questions left unanswered in the source to formulate an interpretation. 	Constructs an interpretation of events using information and perspectives in multiple sources. Identifies inconsistencies and inconsistencies among various accounts.	Applies prior and new knowledge to determine the historical setting of sources. Uses that setting to interpret the sources within the historical context as opposed to a present-day mindset.	Formulates a plausible interpretation, argument, or claim based on the evaluation of evidence found in a variety of primary and secondary sources.	Justifies claims using appropriate direct evidence from a variety of reliable sources.
3	<p>Identification: Mostly understands the meaning and content of sources.</p> <p>Attribution: Cites most authors and most original dates of primary and secondary sources.</p> <p>Perspective: Examines the reliability of sources based on the author’s perspective and when and why they were produced.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Analyzes the author’s thesis, determines the viewpoint and evidence to evaluate the claims; may highlight what the author leaves out. ▪ Cites examples of how the author uses persuasive language and specific words and phrases to influence the reader. ▪ Notes that the author has left some questions unanswered. 	Explains similarities and differences by comparing information and perspectives in multiple sources.	Applies prior and new knowledge to determine the historical setting of the sources. May attempt an interpretation of some sources with a present-day mindset or with a limited application to the historical context.	Generates a reasonable interpretation, argument, or claim based on an evaluation of the evidence found in selected primary and secondary sources.	Justifies claims using some appropriate direct evidence from a variety of reliable sources.
2	<p>Identification: Understands the meaning and content of sources with appropriate scaffolding and support.</p> <p>Attribution: Cites some authors and some original dates of primary and secondary sources.</p> <p>Perspective: Attempts to evaluate the reliability of sources.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ States the author’s claims and evidence presented to prove those claims. ▪ Determines the author’s viewpoint. ▪ Notes how language is used to persuade. 	Identifies similarities and differences in information in multiple sources.	Attempts to determine the historical setting of sources without fully understanding the historical context.	States an interpretation, argument, or claim that may or may not be based on evidence found in selected primary and secondary sources.	Justifies claims using generalizations or limited appropriate direct evidence.
1	<p>Identification: Attempts to understand the meaning and content of sources with the appropriate scaffolding and support.</p> <p>Attribution: Cites few authors and few original dates of primary and secondary sources.</p> <p>Perspective: Does not adequately examine reliability.</p>	Attempts to identify the author’s claims, viewpoint, or evidence.	Demonstrates little to no attempt to examine sources for corroborating or conflicting evidence.	Demonstrates no attempt to understand the historical setting of sources.	Does not state an original claim, argument, or interpretation.	Does not justify or support claims using appropriate direct evidence.