Note to teachers:

This Annotated Rubric is specifically designed for the College Board's AP World History course, but could also be helpful in any world history survey course. The best source of information about how to teach essay skills is the AP World History Course Description, (aka the "Acorn" Book), published every 2 years by the College Board. It can be downloaded for no cost at
http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/public/courses/teachers_corner/4484.html

Another great source of learning how to teach good writing skills is by being an Essay Reader. You'll have direct, first-hand experience reading essays, and get an unforgettable amount of insight into the most common writing techniques, both effective and otherwise. You'll also enjoy meeting other dedicated, talented, and resourceful World History teachers from around the world who will encourage and challenge you in a myriad of ways. You can apply to be an AP Reader at http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/public/homepage/4137.html

The discussions on the AP World History Electronic Discussion Group (EDG) heavily influenced the comments & insights in this Annotated Rubric. The EDG is a great way to ask questions of 1,800+ world history professionals. You can register for the EDG at
http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/public/homepage/7173.html

This Annotated DBQ Rubric is by no means intended as a "turn-key" solution to improving your students' writing. If you want the *real* training as to how to teach a good AP World History course, go to an 1-day AP Workshop or a 5-day Summer Institute. See
http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/Pageflows/InstitutesAndWorkshops/InstitutesAndWorkshopsController.jpf

How to use this Annotated Rubric

The overall goals for this document are to help students improve their writing and to reinforce the "Habits of Mind" discussed in the Acorn book. In my high school, I am fortunate to have an excellent English department that teaches students the importance of clear thesis statements and good writing mechanics. My job is made far easier in that

"all" I have to do is to show the students how to apply what they've already learned in their English classes to AP World History.

I've tried to show 3 levels of answers to each Rubric category: 1) an unacceptable response that fails to meet the criteria; 2) an acceptable response; and 3) an excellent response that demonstrates mastery of the required skill. Only you know your students' writing strengths and weaknesses. The danger here is that some students may see the excellent examples and give up, thinking, "I can't possibly do that." Encourage them to take it one step at a time, to improve incrementally towards mastery, and eventually they WILL master the subject. Keep in mind that there are six different categories on the Generic DBQ Rubric, with seven possible points. The national median score, at the *end* of the academic year, was 2.84.[1] A student who scores "only" three points on their first DBQ attempt should be heartily encouraged, and should not despair that they'll never achieve all seven points on the generic rubric.

Even though this question was from the 2007 test, I've used the Generic Rubric from the current Acorn book to illustrate the grading criteria. Given that this is the direction the World History Test Development Committee is moving, I think it's only appropriate to use the current standards, even though the actual rubric at the time was slightly different.

I hope this teaching tool helps your students to write and think better, and helps you enjoy grading their writing more.

Bill Strickland

East Grand Rapids HS
East Grand Rapids, MI
bstrickl@egrps.org
http://moodle.egrps.org/mod/resource/view.php?id=1855&subdir=/Annotated_Rubrics

---

[1] http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/members/exam/exam_questions/2090.html

Question:	Using the documents, analyze Han and Roman attitudes toward technology. Identify one additional type of document and explain briefly how it would help your analysis.	

Point #	Official Description *Commentary*	**Examples** and *Commentary*
1 Thesis	Has an acceptable thesis. • *Must be explicitly stated in the introduction or conclusion of the essay.* • *May appear as 1 sentence or as multiple (contiguous) sentences.* • *Must include both Han and Roman attitudes[2] toward technology with correct qualification of each empire.* • *May not be split, or a mere restatement of the question.* • *Does not have to include a comparison of Han and Roman attitudes.* ***The Thesis Should:[3]*** *1. Address all parts of the question* *2. Take a position on the question* *3. Set out categories for discussion*	**Unacceptable** Although the Han and Roman attitudes toward technology are different in some way, they are also alike. *This thesis merely restates the question and is too vague.[4]* • Overall, the advancements in technology were seen as necessary in both areas but with varying degrees of importance. *This statement does not adequately qualify each empire's attitude.* • In the Han and Roman empires, technology had the potential to elevate the standard of life, improve availability of water, make life easier with new tools, and make the cities more pleasing to live in. *Excellent summation of how the documents describe the <u>potential usefulness</u> of technology, but is not related to the question of Han and Roman <u>attitudes</u> toward technology.* **Minimally Acceptable** Han and Rome had both positive and negative attitudes toward technology. *or* Both Han and Rome had positive attitudes towards technology. *This was the "least acceptable" thesis.* **Acceptable** Throughout China there was a majority appreciation of technological advancement with a few against it, while in the Roman empire, the view was split between support and pessimism. *While not especially strong, this thesis meets all the criteria specified on the left.* • The Han dynasty emphasized efficiency in their tools, as well as using technology to prevent natural disasters. The Romans, however, marveled at their civilization's advancements, yet refused to glorify those who work with tools and crafts. *This example better characterizes each empire's attitude toward technology, along with comparing the two empires' attitudes. (which is not required)* **Excellent** Han China's attitude toward manufacturing and labor was more open and positive than the Romans who had a more systematic and class-divided society, therefore causing general attitudes of labor and technology to be low. *This thesis not only summarizes, it also compares the differences in attitude and even includes an analysis of the reasons behind those differences. This thesis would likely be eligible for the "Expanded Core" (Extra Credit) as a "clear, analytical, and comprehensive thesis."*

[2] "Attitude" could be an emotional response, (e.g. good, bad, positive, negative) but could not be a related to technology's usefulness, value, or effectiveness.

[3] This advice is from the Social Studies Vertical teams guide book p. 140 and is directly generically at all thesis statements, not specifically this question.

[4] I have a rule in my classroom, "Any thesis that contains the words 'very,' 'many,' 'things,' 'lots,' or 'stuff' is automatically vetoed." Possibly the hardest skill to learn is the ability to form a sophisticated, complex thesis. One strategy I've learned (from Geri McCarthy of Barrington, RI) is to require students to begin their thesis with "While", "Although", or "Despite/In spite of." These words strongly encourage students to formulate a mature thesis that helps structure the rest of their essay. Once students can consistently write a competent thesis sentence, then I concentrate on having them develop an essay preview/outline of later paragraphs. The result should be a thesis <u>paragraph</u> that is several sentences long (the paragraph should NOT just be a <u>single sentence</u>).

Point #	Official Description *Commentary*	Examples and *Commentary*
2 Meaning	Addresses all of the documents and demonstrates understanding of all of all but one.[5] *There are* <u>*eight*</u> *documents. Students must* • *Address all documents in the essay,* • *Demonstrate understanding of the basic meaning in at least* <u>*seven*</u> *documents.* *Listing the documents separately or listing the documents as part of a group does not sufficiently demonstrate an understanding of basic meaning.*	*Unfortunately, too many students think that in order to correctly interpret a document they have to summarize that document. ("Doc #1 says …")* <u>*This directly contradicts the directions!*</u> *("Do not simply summarize the documents individually.") Summarization is an important skill in classroom discussion, but not in essay writing.* *Rather than trying to explicitly state a document's meaning, students should use their understanding of a document's meaning to make an argument or conclusion.[6] One's correct understanding of a document's meaning will be* <u>*implicitly*</u> *clear when using that document to make an argument.* **Unacceptable** • Huan Guan (Doc #6) clearly blames technology for making the peasants so poor that "now they have no choice but to till the soil with wooden plows and cannot afford salt to season their food. *This quotation of Doc #2 not only misinterprets, it also spends far too much time quoting the document. Higher quality writing is more effectively demonstrated in sophisticated analysis (POV and Grouping), not in mere summarization.* **Acceptable** • *There are a myriad of acceptable interpretations of documents. Readers take notes & are thoroughly familiar with the documents before reading. Suffice to say that readers will know a correct interpretation of a doc's meaning when they see it. See the following page for a short summary of each document.* **Excellent** • *Essay shows careful and insightful interpretation of the documents.*

---

[5] Note: This Rubric category has changed since this DBQ was administered. I have "retrofitted" it to reflect the current Rubric. Teachers should be careful to note that the while students can misinterpret the meaning of one document, they must at least *attempt* to interpret ALL documents. This Rubric Category requires two students to demonstrate two skills: 1) <u>Acknowledge the existence</u> of ALL relevant documents in their essay; and 2) <u>Correctly interpret</u> all or all but one of those documents. Students who correctly interpret all but one document but ignore the remaining document will not earn credit for this "Meaning" Rubric Category.

[6] This is the 'Habit of Mind' that is the <u>real</u> goal of all teaching and learning!

Document Summaries

Readers at the National Essay Reading were given a precís of each document's relevant information.

Han Documents

Doc #1 - Han government official - 2nd Century B.C.E.
- Importance of water, waterways, and other engineering needs
- Government authority over development of these needs; Seen as the proper scope of government to regulate
- *Attitude - technology is essential part of empire and requires government intervention*

Doc #2 - Huan Guan, Han government official, *Discourses on Salt and Iron* - 1st Century B.C.E.
- Government created sub-standard tools due to monopolies
- As a government official, Huan Guan implies that good government should rectify the situation; Confucianism
- Misinterpreted as negative about technology, rather he is negative about the government's role
- *Attitude - technology is essential part of peasant production, responsibility of government to support*

Doc #3 - Huan Tan, Han philosopher, *New Discourses* - about 20 C.E.
- Listing Fuxi as mythical emperor as inventor of pestle and mortar
- Listing of progress of technology after emperor's first invention
- At time misinterpreted as Fuxi as author
- *Attitude - technology is a "gift" from enlightened emperors; Confucian benevolence through progress*

Doc #4 - *History of the Early Han Dynasty*, government-sponsored history - about 200 C.E.
- Governor of province, Tu Shih, was peaceful, destroyed evil-doers, planner, and loved common people
- Developed labor-saving device, water-powered blowing engine, to facilitate cast-iron agricultural implements
- At times misinterpreted Fuxi as the author
- *Attitude - technology is a "gift" from enlightened leadership; Confucian benevolence and harmony*

Roman Documents

Doc #5 - Cicero, Roman political leader, *On Duty*, - 1st Century B.C.E.
- Those who work with hands are "vulgar" or common; gentlemen do not work with their hands
- Craftsmen and "hired workers" are not fit occupations for gentlemen
- *Attitude - technology is necessary, but not enlightened or fit for enlightened minds*

Doc #6 Plutarch, Greek-born Roman citizen and high official - 1st Century B.C.E.
- Regarding Roman leader Gaius Gracchus' road building enterprises
- Glowing report of roads and amenities encouraged by Gracchus for imperial good, no mention of populace
- At time misinterpreted Gracchus as the author
- *Attitude - technology has a practical/pragmatic side, but also one of aesthetics*

Doc #7 Seneca, Roman philosopher and adviser to Emperor Nero - 1st Century C.E.
- Individual technology's creator and creation is less important than its use
- Differentiation between those who work with hands and those who work with their mind
- *Attitude - technology is necessary and takes "smarts," but not enlightened*

Doc #8 Frontinus, Roman general, governor of Britain, water commissioner for Rome - 1st Century C.E.
- Glowing report of aqueducts and their uses in city of Rome
- *Attitude - emphasizes the practical and aesthetic nature of Roman technology over Egyptian or Greek*

Point #	Official Description *Commentary*	**Examples** and ***Commentary***
3 Evidence	Supports thesis with appropriate evidence from all or all but one document. **2 pts** *Evidence must be drawn from 7 or 8 documents and must address the question.* (Supports thesis with appropriate evidence from all but two documents.) (1 pt) *Evidence must be drawn from 6 documents and must address the question.* *The most common mistake students make is to merely quote, summarize, para-phrase, or attribute some-thing to a document, rather than truly support the thesis with evidence from the document. (See comments for Meaning on p. 2)*	*Students and teachers need to remember that to receive the point for "supports thesis with appropriate evidence from documents, "students must unambiguously explain why a document is significant or supports their thesis. It was possible to earn the points for evidence even w/ an "unacceptable" thesis.* **Unacceptable** • Doc #2 says that the government has monopolized the tool-making industry, but has done so in an inferior way, resulting in useless, crude, brittle tools. *This is merely a (correct) summary of the document's meaning, not evidence used IN SUPPORT OF a thesis that has to do with the attitudes toward technology. Any paragraph that begins, "Doc #X says …" is almost sure to be nothing more than a summarization, paraphrasing, or quotation. Students MUST go beyond mere summarization to connect the documents to their thesis.* **Acceptable** Huan Guan (Doc #2) embodies the Confucian Han view that technology is good, as long as the government uses technology to benefit the people. Crude or brittle tools are of no help, and reflect poorly on the government. *Here the evidence from a document is used to support the thesis/topic sentence. The document is used to support the essay, rather than the other way around.* **Excellent** *Essays that recognized temporal differences, change over time, or historical context of the documents, or that analyzed all documents well.*

Point #	Official Description *Commentary*	**Examples** and *Commentary*
4 POV (External Evidence)	Analyzes Point of View (POV) in at least two documents. • *Explains why this particular person might have this particular opinion OR what particular feature informs the author's or intended audience's POV.* • *Must move beyond a mere description of that individual by considering and explaining the tone, characteristics of the author, intended audience, and/ or how the intended outcome may have influenced the author's opinion.* • *Mere <u>attribution</u> (copying or repeating info verbatim from the source line of the doc) is <u>not</u> sufficient.*	**Unacceptable** • The source, though, was a Greek-born roman citizen, so it is questionable exactly how reliable the source is. *Many students simply stated that "an individual is biased because they are X, Y, or Z" and then believed they had fulfilled the requirements for POV. Instead, students must go beyond a mere description of an individual or defining characteristic and explain <u>why</u> this fact is significant in the analysis of the document. Mere attribution does NOT constitute POV.* • Huan Tan (Doc #3) was an upper class philosopher who had the point of view that the invention of the pestle and the mortar was made by the great and mythological emperor. *Here the student has merely summarized the document's content, and tried to claim POV by using the phrase 'POV' and attribution taken verbatim from the source info.* **Acceptable** • This is interesting, because although you'd expect a Han government official to praise the current government and its decisions, he is opposed to what the government is doing and is showing concern for the poor peasants. *This example not only recognizes the author's occupation, but explains how that relates to the author's attitude.*[7] *This statement would apply toward rubric categories #2 (Meaning), #3 (Evidence) & #4 (POV) simultaneously.* • The writer (Doc #4) could've possibly been trying to please the emperor in order to obtain or maintain a higher ranking in office. *This is a credible theory at the author's motives behind a document's creation.* **Excellent** *An essay that analyzes point of view in most or all documents.* *For additional suggestions on how to analyze documents, see the 2008, 2009 APWH Course Description ("Acorn" Book) p. 30* [8]

---

[7] This also brings up an important point. Note how in this example this student cited <u>*the author*</u> as the source, NOT just the document <u>#</u>. While this may seem an unimportant distinction, students who recognize that documents are created *by people* are more likely to consistently practice good POV analysis skills. *Documents* have POV only because *people* do.

[8] "Awareness of the documents' sources and their authors' points of view requires students to demonstrate the analytic skills of understanding context, point of view, and frame of reference. Students should pay attention to both internal evidence (the context and tone of each document in relation to the others) and external evidence (identification of author, purpose or intended audience, and the date when each document was written)."

Point #	Official Description *Commentary*	**Examples** and *Commentary*
5 Grouping (Internal Evidence)	Analyzes documents by grouping them in two or three ways, depending on the question. *Must explicitly group the documents in at least <u>two</u> ways.* *Look for some characteristic that more than one document share, then create a group under the title of that characteristic.* *Noting the Han docs (#1-4) and/or Roman docs (#5-8) does NOT count as a group, but noting Han or Roman <u>officials</u>, or Han or Roman <u>upper classes</u> as groups is acceptable.*	*Most students grouped the documents appropriately, (e.g. highlighting the documents' authors' social class), but relatively few identified more subtle, sophisticated groupings.* **Unacceptable** • "Docs 1, 2, 3, and 6 are all from high ranking government officials. Doc #8 is the only one written by a military general. *A single doc cannot be a "group." However, a single doc CAN belong to more than one group.* **Acceptable** • Roman government officials' (Docs #5 and 7) attitude toward technology was consistently colored by their attitudes toward the 'vulgar' or 'not elevated' people that used that technology. *This is an acceptable topic sentence that may lend itself to document analysis and appropriately relates back to the thesis. It also properly interprets the meaning of two documents (Rubric Category #2), and uses evidence from those documents as well. (Rubric Category #3)* **Excellent** An essay that analyzes the documents in additional ways—groupings, comparisons, synthesis. *Superb examples of content analysis could include multiple groupings, comparisons of specific characteristics of documents, or synthesizing information in the documents.* **Example(s) of common document groupings:** • Type(s) of technology • Social class of author • Pro vs. Con technology • Philosophers vs. officials • Role(s) of government vis a vis technology *Special Note: Occasionally students attempt to 'Group Analyze POV' by saying that 3 doc's all share a particular POV. While this statement earns credit for Grouping, it does not "double dip" to earn POV credit as well. Both point #4 (POV) and #5 (Grouping) require analysis, but there is a subtle and important difference between the two types of analyses: POV applies to a <u>single</u> document; while Grouping applies to a specific characteristic shared by <u>multiple</u> documents.*

Point #	Official Description *Commentary*	**Examples** and ***Commentary***
6 Additional Document	Identifies and explains the need for one type of appropriate additional document or source. *Students must identify an appropriate additional document or source <u>and</u> explain how that document or source will contribute to an analysis of Han and/or Roman attitudes toward technology.*	**Unacceptable** • It would be good to have a document from a peasant. *WHY would it be good to hear from a peasant? How do you think a peasant might have thought about these issues DIFFERENTLY from any of the given documents? What questions would an historian be able to answer with a peasant's perspective that aren't possible to answer now?* • None of these documents represent a woman's perspective. *True, but be more explicit. How do you anticipate women felt DIFFERENTLY from men? What difference would a woman's perspective make to an historian?* **Acceptable** • Doc's #5 & #7 reflect only the opinion of the upper-class. An additional document explaining the view of a craftsman would provide a balance of opinions. " *Simple, effective description of an additional document and an explanation of the use/need of it.* • After seeing the opinions of high government officials and upper-class philosophers, it was made clear that the opinion of a common worker or civilian may have been helpful on the level of technology required to sustain a healthy society. **Excellent** *An essay that explains why additional types of document(s) or sources are needed.* **Common examples of Additional Documents often asked for:** • Docs by women: to explore whether there are similarities or differences in Han/Roman attitudes according to gender • Docs by workers: to explore the attitudes of those classes who might be most affected by various technologies or those classes who would do the physical implementation of a new technology • Docs with data about the effects various technologies (road building, irrigation) to help explain the positive/negative attitudes • Docs re: the economic effects of technologies to help explain the positive/negative attitudes

Thesis Paragraph
- Background/Context
- Thesis Statement
- "Road Map" (outline of later categories of document Groupings/Analysis)
- Additional Document (Optional)

Body Paragraph #1 (1st Group of Analyzed Doc's)
- Topic Sentence (what characteristic do these doc's share, and how does that support the thesis?)
- Evidence Doc #1 (what text from doc #1 supports this paragraph's topic/thesis?)
    POV/Analysis of doc #1
- Evidence Doc #2 (what text from doc #2 supports this paragraph's topic/thesis?)
    POV/Analysis of doc #2
- Evidence Doc #3 (what text from doc #3 supports this paragraph's topic/thesis?)
    POV/Analysis of doc #3
- How these doc's relate/compare to each other. (The fullest understanding of any particular document emerges only when that document is viewed within the wider context of all the documents.)
- Additional Doc (be sure to relate how/why this doc would be useful in answering question)
- Conclusion

Additional Body Paragraphs as needed
- Check to make sure that all doc's are included, with discussion of Evidence and POV from each doc.

Conclusion
- Include Additional Doc (if not included previously)
- Restatement/Summarization of Thesis

Writing Tip: Avoid any sentence in your essay that begins, "Doc #___ says '…'" This is merely *summarizing* the document. Your teacher/reader already knows that information better than you do. Your job is to *interpret* the information in the doc's to *make an argument* or *draw a conclusion*.

Document Analysis Organization Technique

When students sit for the APWH exam, they obviously don't have unlimited time and space in which to write their notes re: the documents. Below is a suggested note-taking system[9] that students can use to quickly summarize and organize their notes.

Additional Document
(think of some more information that would help "flesh out"
the information contained in this document.)

**SOAPSTONE
or AP PARTS**

(List of significant characteristics from this document, noting of doc meaning and evidence to be referenced later.)

Source: Wang Xijue, Ming dynasty court official, report to the emperor, 1593.

The venerable elders of my home district explain that the reason grain is cheap despite poor harvests in recent years is due entirely to the scarcity of silver coin. The national government requires silver for taxes but disburses little silver in its expenditures. As the price of grain falls, tillers of the soil receive lower returns on their labors, and thus less land is put into cultivation.

Grouping
What characteristics does this document share with other documents?

POV
What is the POV of this document?

If students are trained to write their comments on each document <u>in a uniform manner</u> they will find it much easier to organize their paragraphs. ("What's my topic sentence for next paragraph? [Look at notes written *to the right* of each document.] Need to include the POV from a document? [Refer to your notes written *below* each document.] etc.")

---

[9] Adopted from Bill Zeigler's "Hot Topics in AP World History" presentation at the 2006 AP Annual Conference, July 15, 2006.