**Assessment for Historical Thinking**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| **Establishes/**  **Argues Position** | Clearly stakes out a position on what was thought (or occurred), argues convincingly, refutes other possible interpretations | Stakes out position – argument not as clear, concise, direct, or as strong. Weaker, refutation of other interpretations | Takes a position, supported, but questionable argument, no refutation of other positions despite use of conditional language | Takes a position but does little to effectively argue that position, may use some conditional language | Takes no position, avoids interpretation, argues that making one is too difficult and thus does not address the prompt |
| **Citing Evidence** | Refers directly to specific accounts (more than one); mentions by name | Refers to accounts; does not cite consistently by name or frequency | Generally alludes to evidence, but draws from only one account; ignores accounts not aligned to interpretation | No mention of evidence despite offering an interpretation | No mention of evidence as though accounts were not read/did not exist |
| **Corroboration** | Compares/contrast multiple accounts/perspectives directly to form interpretation | Compares/contrasts accounts to form interpretation but not as direct, consistent, or clear | Allusions (indirect) to comparing/contrasting perspectives, but ignores some accounts or perspectives | No evidence of corroboration because of unidirectional, simplistic interpretation | No evidence of corroboration as though multiple perspectives in accounts did not exist/not possible |
| **Assessing Account Status** | Direct presence of evaluations of specific sources’ qualitities/  reliability in forming interpretation | Occasional evaluations of sources’ qualities/reliability, but not direct or consistent | Evaluates only that/those sources used in singular interpretation | Non-existent evaluations; singular, unidirectional interpretation | No evaluations, as though none were necessary because establishing a thesis and conducting an interpretation is considered impossible or too difficult |
| **Contextualization** | Stays within historical context and makes comments that reflect self-awareness of doing so; no presentism | Stays within historical context, no presentism | Argument analyses/mixes both past and presentist perspectives | Solely presentist as though decision event happened yesterday and contemporaneous normative standards apply | No bounding within historical context because establishing context was not seen as necessary |

Adapted from Source: VanSledright, Bruce A. (2013). *Assessing Historical Thinking and Understanding: Innovative Designs for New Standards.*