

Question 4: Short Answer No Stimulus**3 points****General Scoring Notes**

- Each point is earned independently.
- **Accuracy:** These scoring guidelines require that students demonstrate historically defensible content knowledge. Given the timed nature of the exam, responses may contain errors that do not detract from their overall quality, as long as the historical content used to advance the argument is accurate.
- **Clarity:** Exam responses should be considered first drafts and thus may contain grammatical errors. Those errors will not be counted against a student unless they obscure the successful demonstration of the content knowledge, skills, and practices described below.
- **Describe:** Provide the relevant characteristics of a specified topic. Description requires more than simply mentioning an isolated term.
- **Explain:** Provide information about how or why a historical development or process occurs or how or why a relationship exists.

A Describe one significant feature of industrialization in Europe in the period 1750 to 1800. **1 point**

Examples of acceptable responses may include the following:

- Industrialization in Europe was prompted by the new discoveries of the Scientific Revolution.
- The Industrial Revolution began in Great Britain, which became the biggest power.
- Great Britain extracted resources from the colonies in the Americas to help launch its industrialization.
- Britain had significant natural resources that promoted the Industrial Revolution [coal, waterways, iron ore, etc.].

B Describe one significant change in industrialization in the period 1800 to 1900. **1 point**

Examples of acceptable responses may include the following:

- The Industrial Revolution spread from Great Britain to the European continent.
 - Industrialization on the continent oftentimes required state support and investment.
 - In the 1800s, countries adopted new technologies for transportation such as locomotives and steamships.
 - The availability of factory work in cities led to rapid urbanization.
 - Women and children were increasingly employed in work outside the home, particularly in factories and coal mines.
 - The Second Industrial Revolution diversified production and expanded consumerism.
-

- | | | |
|----------|---|----------------|
| C | Explain one way that industrialization affected European politics in the period 1800 to 1900. | 1 point |
|----------|---|----------------|

Examples of acceptable responses may include the following:

- Industrialization led to the emergence of unions and political parties devoted to the interests of the working class.
- New political ideologies, including Marxism, emerged as a response to the social problems caused by industrialization.
- Due to a rising awareness of industrial working conditions, particularly for children, political officials launched investigations and introduced regulatory legislation to ameliorate them.
- Relative degrees of industrialization exacerbated international tensions, as governments sought out sources of raw materials and developed new military technologies.
- Industrialization helped Prussia to become the leader of a unified Germany through economic and military dominance over other German states.

Question 1: Document-Based Question, French Revolutionary Government

7 points

General Scoring Notes

- Except where otherwise noted, each point of these rubrics is earned independently; for example, a student could earn a point for evidence without earning a point for thesis/claim.
- **Accuracy:** The components of these rubrics require that students demonstrate historically defensible content knowledge. Given the timed nature of the exam, essays may contain errors that do not detract from their overall quality, as long as the historical content used to advance the argument is accurate.
- **Clarity:** Exam essays should be considered first drafts and thus may contain grammatical errors. Those errors will not be counted against a student unless they obscure the successful demonstration of the content knowledge, skills, and practices described below.

Evaluate whether or not the French government upheld the ideals of the Revolution during the period 1789 to 1794.

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria	
Row A Thesis/Claim (0–1 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	1 point Responds to the prompt with a historically defensible thesis/claim that establishes a line of reasoning.
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes		
Responses that do not earn this point: - Are not historically defensible. - Only restate or rephrase the prompt. - Do not respond to the prompt. - Do not establish a line of reasoning. - Are overgeneralized.		
Responses that earn this point: Provide a historically defensible thesis or claim about whether or not the French government upheld the ideals of the Revolution in the period 1789 to 1794. The thesis or claim must either provide some indication of the reason for making that claim OR establish categories of the argument.		
Examples that do not earn this point:		
Examples that earn this point:		
Provide a restatement of the prompt <i>“In the years immediately following the Revolution, the revolutionary forces achieved their ideals.”</i>		
Establish a line of reasoning that evaluates the topic of the prompt <i>“The French Revolutionary government upheld some important ideals of the Revolution, such as ending arbitrary social distinctions, but it abandoned others when the Jacobins tried to impose their revolutionary principles by force.”</i>		
Do not respond to the prompt <i>“The Reign of Terror during the French Revolution killed thousands of people.”</i>		
Establish a line of reasoning that evaluates the topic of the prompt with analytic categories <i>“The French government upheld the early ideals of the revolution by writing a constitution, protecting natural rights, and establishing a representative government.”</i>		
Provide a historically defensible claim, but do not establish a line of reasoning <i>“The Revolution completely failed to match its ideals.”</i>		
Establish a line of reasoning <i>“The French revolutionary government succeeded in achieving the most important ideal—ending a corrupt monarchy.”</i> [Minimally acceptable thesis/claim]		
Additional Notes: - The thesis or claim must consist of one or more sentences located in one place, either in the introduction or the conclusion (which may not be limited to the first or last paragraphs). - The thesis or claim must identify a relevant development(s) in the period, although it is not required to encompass the entire period.		

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria	
Row B Contextualization (0–1 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	1 point Describes a broader historical context relevant to the prompt.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes	
	Responses that do not earn this point: - Provide an overgeneralized statement about the time period referenced in the prompt. - Provide context that is not relevant to the prompt. - Provide a passing phrase or reference.	Responses that earn this point: Accurately describe a context relevant to the principles of the French Revolution during the period 1789 to 1794.
	Examples that do not earn this point: Do not provide context relevant to the topic of the prompt <i>“Russian Revolutionaries took a lot of inspiration from France.”</i> Provide an overgeneralized statement <i>“Europe was changing before the French Revolution.”</i> Provide a passing phrase or reference <i>“France faced big economic and political problems before 1789.”</i>	Examples of relevant context that earn this point include the following, if appropriate elaboration is provided: - Enlightenment ideas of natural rights, popular sovereignty - Political discontent under the French monarchy - Financial crisis of the French monarchy - Political and social structure of France under the monarchy [clergy/nobility/everyone else] - Economic problems leading up to 1789 [food shortages, high bread prices] - Earlier attempts at government reform [Necker, the Assembly of Notables] - The discontent of the commercial classes regarding social privileges under the Old Regime - Earlier revolutions, such as the American Revolution - Absolutism in France [beginning with Louis XIV] - Wars of the 1700s [Seven Years War, War of the Austrian Succession, etc.] Examples of acceptable contextualization: <i>“In the 1700s, Enlightenment thinkers began imagining better forms of government based on universal rights and principles.”</i> <i>“Before 1789, France was ruled by an absolutist monarchy.”</i> [Minimally acceptable contextualization]
	Additional Notes: - The response must describe broader historical events, developments, or processes that occur before, during, or continue after the time frame of the question that are relevant to the topic of the prompt. - To earn this point, the context provided must be more than a phrase or reference.	

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria		
Row C Evidence from Documents	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	1 point Uses the content of at least three documents to address the topic of the prompt.	2 points Supports an argument in response to the prompt using at least four documents.
(0–2 points)	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes		
	Responses that do not earn points: - Use evidence from less than three of the documents - Misinterpret the content of the document - Quote the content of the documents without providing an accompanying description - Address documents collectively rather than considering separately the content of each document	Responses that earn 1 point: - Accurately describe—rather than simply quote—the content from at least three of the documents to address whether or not the French government upheld the principles of the Revolution during the period 1789 to 1794. Examples of describing the content of a document: Describe evidence from the documents relevant to the topic but do not use that evidence to support an argument [Document 1]: “<i>The Declaration lays out the principles of the revolutionaries at the beginning of the revolt.</i>” [Document 4]: “<i>Berr celebrates that Jewish citizens gained rights in France.</i>”	Responses that earn 2 points: - Support an argument in response to the prompt by accurately using the content of at least four documents. Examples of supporting an argument using the content of a document: [Document 5]: “<i>Vergniaud’s vicious condemnation of a rival faction demonstrates the problems faced by the government in upholding its original ideas.</i>” [Uses evidence from the document to support an argument about how the revolutionary government fell short of its original ideals] [Document 3]: “<i>The 1789 Constitution aligns very closely with the original Enlightenment principles of the revolutionaries.</i>” [Uses evidence from the document to support an argument about ways in which the French government fulfilled its original ideals]
	Additional Notes: To earn two points, the four documents do not have to be used in support of a single argument—they can be used across sub-arguments or to address counterarguments.		

Row C Evidence Beyond Documents (0–1 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	1 point Uses at least one additional piece of specific historical evidence [beyond that found in the documents] relevant to an argument in response to the prompt.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes	
	Responses that do not earn this point: - Provide evidence that is not relevant to an argument about the prompt. - Provide evidence that is outside the time period or region specified in the prompt. - Repeat information that is specified in the prompt or in any of the documents. - Provide a passing phrase or reference.	Responses that earn this point: - Must use at least one specific piece of historical evidence relevant to whether or not the French government upheld the principles of the Revolution during the period 1789 to 1794. Examples of specific and relevant evidence beyond the documents that earn this point include the following, if appropriate elaboration is provided: - The ideas of various Enlightenment thinkers - Abolition of clerical and noble privileges - Creation of the National Assembly - Changes from the liberal to the radical phase of the Revolution - The Reign of Terror - The Committee of Public Safety - Factions within the revolutionary government: Jacobins, Girondins, the Mountain - Anti-Revolutionary uprisings [e.g., the <i>Vendée</i>] and the revolutionary government's response - The actions of various revolutionary leaders [e.g., Lafayette, Robespierre, Danton] - The suppression of women's political clubs - Various events of the Revolution [e.g., the Tennis Court Oath, storming of the Bastille, executions of Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette] - The Civil Oath of the Clergy and backlash from Catholics upset by radical de-Christianization policies - Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette's attempted flight to Austria - Austria and Prussia declaring war on France [later joined by Britain, the Netherlands, and Spain] - The slave revolt in Saint-Domingue/The Haitian Revolution Examples of evidence beyond the documents relevant to an argument about the prompt: <i>"The early actions of the revolutionaries, such as the establishment of a popular legislature and the abolition of social privileges showed that the new government was serious about changing society for the better."</i> [Provides a piece of evidence not in the documents relevant to an argument about the prompt] <i>"Mass executions under the Jacobins during the Reign of Terror marked a retreat from the ideals of brotherhood and liberty that had started the revolution."</i> [Provides a piece of evidence not in the documents relevant to an argument about the prompt]
Additional Notes: - Typically, statements credited as evidence will be more specific than statements credited as contextualization. - To earn this point, the evidence provided must be different from the evidence used to earn the point for contextualization. - To earn this point, the evidence provided must be more than a phrase or reference. - The point for evidence beyond the documents may be awarded for evidence that appears in any part of the response.		

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria	
Row D Analysis and Reasoning Sourcing	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	1 point For at least two documents, explains how or why the document's point of view, purpose, historical situation, and/or audience is relevant to an argument.
(0–1 points)	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes	
	Responses that do not earn this point: - Explain sourcing for fewer than two of the documents. - Identify the point of view, purpose, historical situation, and/or audience but fail to explain how or why it is relevant to an argument. - Summarize the content or argument of the document without explaining the relevance of this summary to the point of view, purpose, historical situation, and/or audience. Examples that do not earn this point: Identify the point of view, purpose, historical situation, and/or audience, but do not explain how or why it is relevant to an argument <i>“Olympe de Gouges supported the expansion of women’s rights because she was a woman.”</i> Summarize the content of the document without explaining the relevance of this to the point of view, purpose, historical situation, and/or audience <i>“Document 3, the 1791 Constitution, outlines principles of legal equality and fairness.”</i>	Responses that earn this point: - Must explain how or why—rather than simply identifying—the document's point of view, purpose, historical situation, or audience is relevant to an argument that addresses the prompt for each of the two documents sourced. Example of acceptable explanation of the relevance of the author’s point of view: [Document 2]: <i>“As a woman who had welcomed the outbreak of the Revolution, De Gouges feels betrayed by the failure of male revolutionaries to apply their principles to gender equality.”</i> [Connects the point of view of the document relevant to an argument about the ideals of the French Revolution.] Example of acceptable explanation of the relevance of the author’s purpose: [Document 7]: <i>“The creator of the print was seeking to re-assure people that the abolition of slavery by the revolutionary government was in accordance with its principles of universal rights and equality.”</i> [Connects the purpose of the document relevant to an argument about the ideals of the French Revolution] Example of acceptable explanation of the relevance of the historical situation of a source: [Document 6]: <i>“Corday wrote her manifesto at a time when the excesses of the Jacobin regime had provoked a counter-revolution that threatened to undo all the progress that had been made.”</i> [Connects the historical situation of the document relevant to an argument about the ideals of the French Revolution] Example of acceptable explanation of the relevance of the audience: [Document 1]: <i>“The audience for the Declaration was supporters of the revolution who sought assurances that the new government supported Enlightenment principles.”</i> [Connects the audience of the document relevant to an argument about the ideals of the French Revolution]

Row D Analysis and Reasoning Complex Understanding (0–1 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	1 point Demonstrates a complex understanding of the historical development that is the focus of the prompt through sophisticated argumentation and/or effective use of evidence.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes	
		Responses that earn this point: May demonstrate a complex understanding through sophisticated argumentation that is relevant to the prompt. This may be done in a variety of ways, such as: - Explaining multiple themes or perspectives to explore complexity or nuance; OR - Explaining multiple causes or effects, multiple similarities or differences, or multiple continuities or changes; OR - Explaining both cause and effect, both similarity and difference, or both continuity and change; OR - Explaining relevant and insightful connections within and across periods or geographical areas. These connections should clearly relate to an argument that responds to the prompt. May demonstrate a complex understanding through effective use of evidence relevant to an argument that addresses the prompt. This may be done in a variety of ways, such as: - Effectively using seven documents to support an argument that responds to the prompt; OR - Explaining how the point of view, purpose, historical situation, and/or audience of at least four documents supports an argument that responds to the prompt; OR - Using documents and evidence beyond the documents effectively to demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of different perspectives relevant to the prompt. Demonstrating a complex understanding might include any of the following, if appropriate elaboration is provided: - Explains how the pressures of politics and resistance by many groups forced successive ruling groups into more coercive measures to protect revolutionary principles. [Explains continuity and change] - Presents evidence for alternative views of the regime’s fidelity or abandonment of revolutionary ideals before making a final determination [Explaining multiple themes or perspectives to explore complexity or nuance] - Makes an extended nuanced comparison between the French Revolution and another revolution [e.g., the American Revolution, with respect to their adherence to original principles.] [Explaining relevant and insightful connections within and across periods] - Explains the effects of the spread of revolutionary ideals across Europe during the Napoleonic Wars. [Explaining relevant and insightful connections across periods and geographical areas]
	Additional Notes: - This complex understanding must be part of the argument and may be demonstrated in any part of the response. - While it is not necessary for this complex understanding to be woven throughout the response, it must be more than merely a phrase or reference. - To earn a point for complexity by using seven documents in support of an argument, there must be an attempt to use all seven documents to effectively support an argument, but the use of the documents may be unevenly or inconsistently developed, or the document use may be weaker in one or two instances.	

Document Summaries

Document	Summary of Content	Explains the relevance of point of view [POV], purpose, situation, and/or audience by elaborating on examples such as:
1. Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen, 1789	- States that all men are equal and have natural rights - States that the purpose of government is to preserve these rights - Declares the end of hereditary social distinctions of the Old Regime - Declares the importance of free expression of opinions, but preserves the possibility that “abuse of free expression” may be punished by law	- The Declaration is intended to clearly convey the core principles of the new government—individual rights and popular sovereignty. [purpose] - The Declaration was a “broadcast” to all French and other Europeans who favored enlightened principles of government. [audience]
2. De Gouges, <i>Declaration of the Rights of Woman</i> , 1791	- Calls for women to join the struggle for their rights - Claims that men have failed to liberate women, despite winning their own freedom - Asserts that men will admire women if they stand up for their rights	- De Gouges is writing at a period of intense debate over the scope and nature of rights that the new government should offer, and she is anxious that women not be left out. [historical situation] - As a female supporter of the revolution, de Gouges is concerned that male supporters of the revolution seem unwilling to extend equality and legal recognition to women. [POV]
3. French Constitution, 1791	- Allows all citizens to hold any offices - Declares equality of taxation and legal punishments - Declares the right of free expression and assembly - Denies the ability of the government to restrict these rights	- As a legally binding document, the constitution attempts to spell out as clearly as possible the rights that the government will guarantee. [purpose] - The constitution’s stress on the value of free expression is a reaction to years of government censorship under the absolute monarchy before 1789. [historical situation]
4. Berr Isaac Berr, “Letter to fellow Jews,” 1791	- Calls for all Jewish people to celebrate that they have obtained equal rights and are now considered Frenchmen - Advises them to act as individuals and Frenchmen in support of the good of the country	- Berr is writing during an optimistic period of the revolution when formerly marginalized groups are gaining new rights in accordance with Enlightenment principles of tolerance. [historical situation] - As a member of a group that had suffered significant discrimination and persecution, Berr is anxious to advise his co-religionists to avoid any actions that could draw the same reactions again. [POV]
5. Vergniaud, speech to the National Assembly, 1793	Claims people no longer understand the difference between treason and the “great revolution of liberty.”	As a member of a rival faction to the dominant Jacobin faction, Vergniaud, paints them in the darkest terms as enemies of the true principle of liberty. [POV]

	• Attacks Jacobins for trying to enforce conformity and using fear of the mob • Raises the possibility that the revolution will destroy itself	• Speaking at a time when the Committee of Public Safety was executing the Jacobins' political rivals, Vergniaud highlights what he considers the betrayal of revolutionary principles. [historical situation]
6. Corday, manifesto, 1793	• Laments the divisions and factionalism within the French government • Reminds her readers of the counter-revolutionary uprisings and foreign invasions that threaten Paris • Declares that Marat's death is necessary to weaken the Jacobin's hold on power	• As an enemy to the Jacobins, Corday seeks to portray them as betrayers of the revolution. [POV/purpose] • Writing just before she is about to commit an act of political violence that will probably result in her own death, Corday wants to emphasize her own credentials as a true believer in the revolution. [purpose/historical situation]
7. Print commemorating the abolition of slavery, 1794	• Asserts that freed slaves are equal to other Frenchmen • Implies that freedom is in accordance with reason and nature	• In a period of factional fighting among revolutionaries and attempts to overturn the republican government, the print is celebrating the government's fulfillment of an important revolutionary value—liberty. [historical situation] • The artist's choice of symbolism is intended to remind viewers of the fundamental values of the revolution. [purpose]

Question 2: Long Essay Question, Reformation in England vs. France**6 points****General Scoring Notes**

- Except where otherwise noted, each point of these rubrics is earned independently; for example, a student could earn a point for evidence without earning a point for thesis/claim.
- **Accuracy:** The components of these rubrics require that students demonstrate historically defensible content knowledge. Given the timed nature of the exam, essays may contain errors that do not detract from their overall quality, as long as the historical content used to advance the argument is accurate.
- **Clarity:** Exam essays should be considered first drafts and thus may contain grammatical errors. Those errors will not be counted against a student unless they obscure the successful demonstration of the content knowledge, skills, and practices described below.

Evaluate the most significant difference between the Protestant Reformation in England and the Protestant Reformation in France.

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria	
Row A Thesis/Claim (0–1 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	1 point Responds to the prompt with a historically defensible thesis/claim that establishes a line of reasoning.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes	
	Responses that do not earn this point: - Are not historically defensible. - Only restate or rephrase the prompt. - Do not respond to the prompt. - Do not establish a line of reasoning. - Are overgeneralized. Examples that do not earn this point: Provide a restatement of the prompt <i>“There were many important differences between the Reformation as it played out in England and in France.”</i> Provide a historically defensible claim, but do not establish a line of reasoning <i>“The Reformation led to different levels of religious diversity in the two countries.”</i> Are not historically defensible <i>“Protestantism led to the permanent collapse of the monarchy in England and France.”</i>	Responses that earn this point: - Provide a historically defensible thesis or claim about the most significant difference between the Protestant Reformation in England and the Protestant Reformation in France. The thesis or claim must either provide some indication of the reason for making that claim OR establish categories of the argument. Examples that earn this point: Establish a line of reasoning that evaluates the topic of the prompt <i>“The most significant difference between the two countries’ experience with Protestantism was that it left the English monarchy stronger, but the French monarchy temporarily weaker.”</i> Establish a line of reasoning that evaluates the topic of the prompt with analytic categories <i>“The most important difference was the type of government that emerged in the two countries. Largely as a result of religious struggle, England became a constitutional monarchy while France went toward absolutism.”</i> Establish a line of reasoning <i>“Most important was the fact that France remained officially Catholic while England became officially Protestant.”</i> [Minimally acceptable thesis/claim]
Additional Notes: - The thesis or claim must consist of one or more sentences located in one place, either in the introduction or the conclusion (which may not be limited to the first or last paragraphs). - The thesis or claim must identify a relevant development(s) in the period, although it is not required to encompass the entire period.		

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria	
Row B Contextualization (0–1 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	1 point Describes a broader historical context relevant to the prompt.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes	
	Responses that do not earn this point: - Provide an overgeneralized statement about the time period referenced in the prompt. - Provide context that is not relevant to the prompt. - Provide a passing phrase or reference.	Responses that earn this point: Accurately describe a context relevant to the Reformation in England and France.
	Examples that do not earn this point: Do not provide context relevant to the topic of the prompt <i>“The cultural change known as the Renaissance was spreading to England and France at this time.”</i> Passing phrase or reference <i>“Many individuals were seeking to reform religious life in the 1500s.”</i>	Examples of relevant context that earn this point include the following, if appropriate elaboration is provided: - Protestant reformers and their critiques of the Roman Catholic Church [e.g., Luther, Calvin] - New monarchies and centralization of power - New monarchical dynasties and conflicts [e.g., Tudor, Valois, Bourbon] - The impact of the printing press - Economic expansion of trade including trade from the overseas colonies - Dynastic struggles in England [Wars of the Roses] and France [Valois-Bourbon struggle] - Christian humanism and its critiques of the Roman Catholic Church - The role of the papacy in pre-Reformation politics of France and England - The Hundred Years’ War Example of acceptable contextualization: <i>“In the early 1500s, both England and France were ruled by monarchs striving to increase their power and centralize their states.”</i> <i>“Protestant reformers first attacked the Catholic Church for its corruption and failure to live up to its own values.”</i> [Minimally acceptable contextualization]
	Additional Notes: - The response must describe broader historical events, developments, or processes that occur before, during, or continue after the time frame of the question that are relevant to the topic of the prompt. - To earn this point, the context provided must be more than a phrase or reference.	

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria		
Row C Evidence (0–2 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	1 point Provides specific examples of at least two pieces of evidence relevant to the topic of the prompt.	2 points Supports an argument in response to the prompt using at least two pieces of specific and relevant evidence.
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
Responses that do not earn points: - Identify a single piece of evidence. - Provide evidence that is not relevant to the topic of the prompt. - Provide evidence that is outside the time period or region specified in the prompt. - Repeat information that is specified in the prompt.			
Examples that do not earn points: Provide evidence outside the time period or region <i>“The Reformation also tore apart the Habsburgs’ empire.”</i>			
Responses that earn 1 point: Identify at least two specific historical examples relevant to the Protestant Reformation in England or France.			
Examples of evidence that are specific and relevant include the following (two examples required): - Henry VIII’s break with Rome over his divorce - Consolidation of Anglicanism under Elizabeth I - Puritans vs mainstream Protestants in England/English Civil War - French Wars of Religion/Edict of Nantes/Huguenot wars - Absolutism in France as a reaction to religious strife - Revocation of the Edict of Nantes under Louis XIV - Calvinism in England and France - French Protestants (Calvinists) often called “Huguenots” - Oliver Cromwell and the Commonwealth - The exclusion of Catholics from political life in England - The publication of the King James Bible			
Example of a statement that earns one point for evidence: <i>“The results of the English Civil War and the Glorious revolution show how Protestantism led England to develop a more representative government as Parliament resisted the possibility of restoring Catholicism.”</i>			
Responses that earn 2 points: Use at least two specific historical examples to support an argument regarding the most significant difference between the Protestant Reformation in England and the Protestant Reformation in France.			
Examples that successfully support an argument with evidence: <i>“As part of his reforms, Henry VIII took the opportunity to grab the wealth of the Catholic Church and increase the monarchy’s power and influence.”</i> [Uses evidence to support an argument about the political dimensions of the Reformation in England] <i>“Even though Henri IV himself converted from Calvinism to Catholicism to confirm his kingship, he issued the Edict of Nantes to secure religious and civil rights for France’s large Protestant minority.”</i> [Uses evidence to support an argument about the Reformation’s spread in France] <i>“Although Henry VIII split with the papacy, it was under his daughter Elizabeth that English Protestantism became a truly separate denomination.”</i> [Uses evidence to support an argument about the consolidation of the Reformation in England]			
Additional Notes: - Typically, statements credited as evidence will be more specific than statements credited as contextualization. - If a response has a multipart argument, then it can meet the threshold of two pieces of evidence by giving one example for one part of the argument and another example for a different part of the argument, but the total number of examples must still be at least two.			

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria		
Row D Analysis and Reasoning (0–2 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	1 point Uses historical reasoning [e.g. comparison, causation, continuity and change] to frame or structure an argument that addresses the prompt.	2 points Demonstrates a complex understanding of the historical development that is the focus of the prompt through sophisticated argumentation and/or effective use of evidence.
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
Responses that do not earn points: - May include evidence but offer no reasoning to connect the evidence to an argument. - May assert the use of historical reasoning but does not use it to frame or structure an argument.	Responses that earn 1 point: Must demonstrate the use of historical reasoning to frame or structure an argument about the most significant difference between the Protestant Reformation in England and the Protestant Reformation in France. The reasoning might be uneven or imbalanced, or the evidence may be overly general or lacking specificity.	Responses that earn 2 points: May demonstrate a complex understanding through sophisticated argumentation that is relevant to the prompt. This may be done in a variety of ways, such as: - Explaining multiple themes or perspectives to explore complexity or nuance; OR - Explaining multiple causes or effects, multiple similarities or differences, or multiple continuities or changes; OR - Explaining both cause and effect, both similarity and difference, or both continuity and change; OR - Explaining relevant and insightful connections within and across periods or geographical areas. These connections should clearly relate to an argument that responds to the prompt. May demonstrate a complex understanding through effective use of evidence relevant to an argument that addresses the prompt. This may be done in a variety of ways that might include: - Explaining how multiple pieces of specific and relevant evidence [at least four] support a nuanced or complex argument that responds to the prompt; OR - Using evidence effectively to demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of different perspectives relevant to the prompt.	
Examples that do not earn points: May include evidence but offer no reasoning to connect the evidence to an argument <i>“Henry’s divorce led to a split from the papacy.”</i>	Using a historical reasoning process to frame or structure an argument could include: - Discussing the Reformation in England and France by using continuity and change over time to describe how the nature and strength of Protestantism changed in England and France in the 1500s and 1600. - Explaining the differences between the Reformation in England and in France, to point out differences in the consequences of the Reformation in each country.	Demonstrating a complex understanding might include any of the following, if appropriate elaboration is provided: - Discussing the long-term consequences of the Reformation in both England and France into the 1700s, such as discussing the Act of Union creating the United Kingdom and imposing a requirement for a Protestant monarch, compared with the critiques of the French Catholic Church by Voltaire and other <i>philosophes</i>. [Explaining relevant and insightful connections within and across periods] - Considering more than one difference between the Reformation in the two countries before arguing for one as more significant. [Explaining multiple similarities or differences]	

	Example of acceptable use of historical reasoning: <i>“Ultimately, Protestantism in England became the dominant religion, appealing to people in all regions and social classes, but it remained a minority religion in France.”</i> [Indicates a difference between the Reformation in the two countries]	Discussing both political and social aspects of the Reformation in England and France. [Explaining multiple themes or perspectives to explore complexity or nuance]
Additional Notes: - To earn the first point for analysis and reasoning, the response must use historical reasoning to structure a response to the prompt, although the reasoning might be uneven or imbalanced, or the evidence may be overly general or lacking in specificity. - This complex understanding must be part of the argument and may be demonstrated in any part of the response. - While it is not necessary for this complex understanding to be woven throughout the response, it must be more than merely a phrase or reference.		

Question 3: Long Essay Question, Differences in the Arts 1750 to 1950**6 points****General Scoring Notes**

- Except where otherwise noted, each point of these rubrics is earned independently; for example, a student could earn a point for evidence without earning a point for thesis/claim.
- **Accuracy:** The components of these rubrics require that students demonstrate historically defensible content knowledge. Given the timed nature of the exam, essays may contain errors that do not detract from their overall quality, as long as the historical content used to advance the argument is accurate.
- **Clarity:** Exam essays should be considered first drafts and thus may contain grammatical errors. Those errors will not be counted against a student unless they obscure the successful demonstration of the content knowledge, skills, and practices described below.

Evaluate the most significant difference between approaches to the arts in the period from 1750 to 1850 and approaches to the arts in the period from 1850 to 1950.

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria	
Row A Thesis/Claim (0–1 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	1 point Responds to the prompt with a historically defensible thesis/claim that establishes a line of reasoning.
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes		
Responses that do not earn this point: - Are not historically defensible. - Only restate or rephrase the prompt. - Do not respond to the prompt. - Do not establish a line of reasoning. - Are overgeneralized.		Responses that earn this point: Provide a historically defensible thesis or claim about the most significant difference between approaches to the arts in the period 1750 to 1850 and in the period 1850 to 1950. The thesis or claim must either provide some indication of the reason for making that claim OR establish categories of the argument.
Examples that do not earn this point: Provide a restatement of the prompt <i>“There were lots of big differences between the arts in these two periods.”</i> Provide a historically defensible claim, but do not establish a line of reasoning <i>“The arts shifted in response to social shifts among those who bought and appreciated artwork.”</i> Are not historically defensible <i>“A big difference between the arts of the two periods was that in the later period there was a complete abandonment of realistic portrayals of people or objects.”</i>		Examples that earn this point: Establish a line of reasoning that evaluates the topic of the prompt <i>“While art in the period 1750 to 1850 typically strived to depict recognizable subjects, beginning with Impressionism and especially in the 20th century, artists chose to experiment with light and space.”</i> Establish a line of reasoning that evaluates the topic of the prompt with analytic categories <i>“Artists’ purpose shifted from trying to portray the objective and the ideal to portraying the subjective and the real.”</i> Establish a line of reasoning <i>“Unlike the early period, art of the later period broke conventional rules of traditional art.”</i> [Minimally acceptable thesis/claim]
Additional Notes: - The thesis or claim must consist of one or more sentences located in one place, either in the introduction or the conclusion (which may not be limited to the first or last paragraphs). - The thesis or claim must identify a relevant development(s) in the period, although it is not required to encompass the entire period.		

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria	
Row B Contextualization (0–1 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	1 point Describes a broader historical context relevant to the prompt.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes	
	Responses that do not earn this point: - Provide an overgeneralized statement about the time period referenced in the prompt. - Provide context that is not relevant to the prompt. - Provide a passing phrase or reference. Examples that do not earn this point: Do not provide context relevant to the topic of the prompt <i>“Medieval art was almost entirely religious.”</i> Provide a passing phrase or reference <i>“The Enlightenment was important in the earlier period.”</i>	Responses that earn this point: - Accurately describe a context relevant to approaches to the arts in the period 1750 to 1950. Examples of relevant context that earn this point include the following, if appropriate elaboration is provided: - Renaissance techniques of geometric perspective - The spread of affordable print materials; rise in literacy rates - Royal, aristocratic, church patronage of the arts - The growth of nationalism and Romanticism - The French Revolution and Napoleonic wars - The Industrial Revolution and social problems that emerged as a result of mass urbanization and class conflict - New Imperialism and the expansion of European settlement across the world - The Scientific Revolution [anatomical studies and discoveries] - The Enlightenment - The First and Second World Wars Example of acceptable contextualization: <i>“The Romantic movement was fueled by the rise of nationalist sentiments following the French Revolution and Napoleonic Wars.”</i> <i>“Artists had flocked to Paris for centuries because of its opportunities and support for the arts.”</i> [Minimally acceptable contextualization]
	Additional Notes: - The response must describe broader historical events, developments, or processes that occur before, during, or continue after the time frame of the question that are relevant to the topic of the prompt. - To earn this point, the context provided must be more than a phrase or reference.	

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria		
Row C Evidence (0–2 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	1 point Provides specific examples of at least two pieces of evidence relevant to the topic of the prompt.	2 points Supports an argument in response to the prompt using at least two pieces of specific and relevant evidence.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes		
	Responses that do not earn points: - Identify a single piece of evidence. - Provide evidence that is not relevant to the topic of the prompt. - Provide evidence that is outside the time period or region specified in the prompt. - Repeat information that is specified in the prompt. Examples that do not earn points: Provide evidence outside the time period <i>“The religious conflict of the Reformation led many Protestants to be suspicious of artwork since they thought it could lead to idolatry and superstition.”</i>	Responses that earn 1 point: - Identify at least two specific historical examples relevant to approaches to the arts in the period 1750 to 1950. Examples of evidence that are specific and relevant include the following (two examples required): - Art styles and movements before 1850 [Rococo, Baroque, Neo-Classicism, Romanticism] - Art styles and movements after 1850 [Academic painting, Impressionism, Cubism, Surrealism, Dadaism, Futurism, Existentialism] - Specific examples of artists and their works - Realism as social critique - Expressionism and attempts to portray subjective internal states of mind - Effects of World War I, “the lost generation” - The increase in depictions of non-European subjects as a result of colonial expansion - Mass media Example of a statement that earns one point for evidence: <i>“Romantic artists and writers often set their works in the idyllic countryside to further their themes of emotion and beauty, while the later Realists favored the grit and grime of the cities and factories to push for social reform.”</i>	Responses that earn 2 points: - Use at least two specific historical examples to support an argument regarding the most significant difference between approaches to the arts in the period 1750 to 1850 and 1850 to 1950. Examples that successfully support an argument with evidence: <i>“Picasso’s Guernica is a good example of the changed approach to arts. The painting uses non-realistic Cubist technique to portray the horror and confusion of war inflicted on innocent civilians.”</i> [Uses evidence to support an argument about the new approaches to art in the later period] <i>“The art of the earlier period, for example, Neo-Classicism retained certain idealism and optimism, while later art was more about realism or, like Dadaism, disenchantment with the ruling elites.”</i> [Uses evidence to support an argument about differences in philosophies around the arts] <i>“Art before 1850 usually depicted wealthy people or idealized scenes, while art after 1850, especially Realism, focused on the everyday reality of ordinary people.”</i> [Uses evidence to support an argument about different themes and ideals of the arts]
Additional Notes: - Typically, statements credited as evidence will be more specific than statements credited as contextualization. - If a response has a multipart argument, then it can meet the threshold of two pieces of evidence by giving one example for one part of the argument and another example for a different part of the argument, but the total number of examples must still be at least two.			

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria		
Row D Analysis and Reasoning (0–2 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	1 point Uses historical reasoning [e.g. comparison, causation, continuity and change] to frame or structure an argument that addresses the prompt.	2 points Demonstrates a complex understanding of the historical development that is the focus of the prompt through sophisticated argumentation and/or effective use of evidence.
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	Responses that do not earn points: - May include evidence but offer no reasoning to connect the evidence to an argument. - May assert the use of historical reasoning but does not use it to frame or structure an argument.	Responses that earn 1 point: Must demonstrate the use of historical reasoning to frame or structure an argument about the most significant difference between approaches to the arts in the period 1750 to 1850 and in the period 1850 to 1950. The reasoning might be uneven or imbalanced, or the evidence may be overly general or lacking specificity.	Responses that earn 2 points: May demonstrate a complex understanding through sophisticated argumentation that is relevant to the prompt. This may be done in a variety of ways, such as: - Explaining multiple themes or perspectives to explore complexity or nuance; OR - Explaining multiple causes or effects, multiple similarities or differences, or multiple continuities or changes; OR - Explaining both cause and effect, both similarity and difference, or both continuity and change; OR - Explaining relevant and insightful connections within and across periods or geographical areas. These connections should clearly relate to an argument that responds to the prompt. May demonstrate a complex understanding through effective use of evidence relevant to an argument that addresses the prompt. This may be done in a variety of ways that might include: - Explaining how multiple pieces of specific and relevant evidence [at least four] support a nuanced or complex argument that responds to the prompt; OR - Using evidence effectively to demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of different perspectives relevant to the prompt.
	Examples that do not earn points: May include evidence but offer no reasoning to connect the evidence to an argument <i>“Avant-garde art criticized traditional values.”</i>	Using a historical reasoning process to frame or structure an argument could include: - Explaining the differences in the purpose of art over the periods. - Discussing the effects of major events or social shifts on approaches to the arts using causation. Example of acceptable use of historical reasoning: <i>“Global conflicts, such as World War I, accelerated a shift in the arts as the artists searched for new methods to express the shocks of the industrial warfare.”</i> [Indicates an effect of the global conflicts on art]	Demonstrating a complex understanding might include any of the following, if appropriate elaboration is provided: - Considering multiple differences, such as mediums, reach, popularity, themes, etc. before arguing that one difference is the most significant. [Explains multiple differences] - Explaining both similarity and difference in approaches to the arts, such as how government sponsorship was important in both periods and then analyzing the differences in how that sponsorship worked. [Explains both similarity and difference] - Explaining how specific examples of at least four art styles, for example, Rococo, Neo-Classicism, Impressionism, Surrealism, demonstrate the most significant difference between approaches to the arts. [Explaining how at least four pieces of specific and relevant

	evidence support a nuanced or complex argument that responds to the prompt]
--	---

Additional Notes:

- To earn the first point for analysis and reasoning, the response must use historical reasoning to structure a response to the prompt, although the reasoning might be uneven or imbalanced, or the evidence may be overly general or lacking in specificity.
- This complex understanding must be part of the argument and may be demonstrated in any part of the response.
- While it is not necessary for this complex understanding to be woven throughout the response, it must be more than merely a phrase or reference.

Question 4: Long Essay Question, Nazism vs. Communism**6 points****General Scoring Notes**

- Except where otherwise noted, each point of these rubrics is earned independently; for example, a student could earn a point for evidence without earning a point for thesis/claim.
- **Accuracy:** The components of these rubrics require that students demonstrate historically defensible content knowledge. Given the timed nature of the exam, essays may contain errors that do not detract from their overall quality, as long as the historical content used to advance the argument is accurate.
- **Clarity:** Exam essays should be considered first drafts and thus may contain grammatical errors. Those errors will not be counted against a student unless they obscure the successful demonstration of the content knowledge, skills, and practices described below.

Evaluate the most significant difference between the Nazi regime in Germany and the communist regime in the Soviet Union.

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria	
Row A Thesis/Claim (0–1 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	1 point Responds to the prompt with a historically defensible thesis/claim that establishes a line of reasoning.
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes		
Responses that do not earn this point: - Are not historically defensible. - Only restate or rephrase the prompt. - Do not respond to the prompt. - Do not establish a line of reasoning. - Are overgeneralized.		Responses that earn this point: Provide a historically defensible thesis or claim about the most significant difference between the Nazi regime in Germany and the communist regime in the Soviet Union. The thesis or claim must either provide some indication of the reason for making that claim OR establish categories of the argument.
Examples that do not earn this point: Provide a restatement of the prompt <i>“There were huge differences between communism and Nazism.”</i> Provide a historically defensible claim, but do not establish a line of reasoning <i>“A major difference between the regimes was their attitudes towards private property.”</i> Are overgeneralized <i>“The two regimes differed in how they ran their countries.”</i>		Examples that earn this point: Establish a line of reasoning that evaluates the topic of the prompt <i>“Though both Nazi and Communist regimes were extremely brutal, communism proved more lasting and arguably self-destructed.”</i> Establish a line of reasoning that evaluates the topic of the prompt with analytic categories <i>“Even though both regimes were based on the cults of personality of Hitler and Stalin, respectively, the communist regime was more stable, rooted in strong bureaucracy, and designed to function with a replaceable leader.”</i> Establish a line of reasoning <i>“Both the Nazi and communist regimes were totalitarian, but only Hitler’s ideology was based on antisemitism.”</i> [Minimally acceptable thesis/claim]
Additional Notes: - The thesis or claim must consist of one or more sentences located in one place, either in the introduction or the conclusion (which may not be limited to the first or last paragraphs). - The thesis or claim must identify a relevant development(s) in the period, although it is not required to encompass the entire period.		

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria	
Row B Contextualization (0–1 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	1 point Describes a broader historical context relevant to the prompt.
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes		
Responses that do not earn this point: - Provide an overgeneralized statement about the time period referenced in the prompt. - Provide context that is not relevant to the prompt. - Provide a passing phrase or reference.		Responses that earn this point: Accurately describe a context relevant to the regimes of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union.
Examples that do not earn this point: Do not provide context relevant to the topic of the prompt <i>“After the Napoleonic Wars, conservative monarchies sought to prevent revolution.”</i> Passing phrase or reference <i>“Karl Marx was a communist.”</i>		Examples of relevant context that earn this point include the following, if appropriate elaboration is provided: - Marxist-Leninist ideas of revolution - World War I and its aftermath - The Bolshevik Revolution - The Russian civil war - The German Weimar Republic - The Treaty of Versailles and its harsh treatment of Germany - Nationalism and racism/antisemitism - Social Darwinism - Stalin’s rise to power - Tsarism - Wilhelmine Germany - Bismarck - The 1905 Revolution - The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk - Comintern and Anti-Comintern - Prussian militarism - Cold War/Iron Curtain Example of acceptable contextualization: <i>“While antisemitism always existed in Europe, it was the developments of the 19th century that gave it a modern racist justification, which was then employed by Hitler in his ideology.”</i> <i>“Both regimes rose as a result of the devastating effects of the First World War.”</i> [Minimally acceptable contextualization]

Additional Notes:

- The response must describe broader historical events, developments, or processes that occur before, during, or continue after the time frame of the question that are relevant to the topic of the prompt.
- To earn this point, the context provided must be more than a phrase or reference.

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria		
Row C Evidence (0–2 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	1 point Provides specific examples of at least two pieces of evidence relevant to the topic of the prompt.	2 points Supports an argument in response to the prompt using at least two pieces of specific and relevant evidence.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes		
	Responses that do not earn points: - Identify a single piece of evidence. - Provide evidence that is not relevant to the topic of the prompt. - Provide evidence that is outside the time period or region specified in the prompt. - Repeat information that is specified in the prompt. Examples that do not earn points: Provide evidence that is not relevant to the topic of the prompt <i>“The United States remained neutral through the early part of the Second World War.”</i>	Responses that earn 1 point: - Identify at least two specific historical examples relevant to the regimes of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. Examples of evidence that are specific and relevant include the following (two examples required): - Totalitarian policies - Soviet control of industry and the economy - Nazi antisemitism and the Holocaust - The Holodomor [Ukrainian famine] - Anti-kulak policies - Racial hierarchy under Nazism and the “New Order” - Soviet championing of the workers and the proletarian class - Nazism’s aggressive foreign policy [“living space,” the return of German minorities to German rule] - The Soviet Union’s aggressive foreign policy [dividing Poland, the invasion of Finland, the Baltic states] - The Nazi invasion of Soviet Union [Operation Barbarossa] - Soviet internationalism - Length of the Nazi regime in Germany vs. Soviet regime in the USSR - Soviet repression and the Gulag - Nazi Gestapo and secret police - Soviet military purges - Comintern and Anti-Comintern	Responses that earn 2 points: - Use at least two specific historical examples to support an argument regarding the most significant difference between the Nazi regime in Germany and the communist regime in the Soviet Union. Examples that successfully support an argument with evidence: <i>“The central importance of racism to the Nazi regime can be seen in the attempt to kill the European Jewish population and other minorities that were thought of as undesirable or dangerous.”</i> [Uses evidence to support an argument about the centrality of racial ideology for Nazism in comparison to the Soviet Union] <i>“Communism, which was the root of the Soviet ideology was internationalist by design addressing all workers of the world while Nazism, by its design, was intended to promote the interests only of the Germans.”</i> [Uses evidence to support an argument about the potential universality of communism as ideology vs exclusivity of German Nazism] <i>“While communist terror mostly focused on internal enemies of the state, the majority of victims of German Nazism were from other countries occupied by Germany.”</i> [Uses evidence to support an argument about the different nature and methods of terror in both regimes]

	• Nuremberg Laws and Kristallnacht • New Economic Policy (NEP) • Imperial conquest and economic exploitation Example of a statement that earns one point for evidence: • <i>“Hitler aggressively sought to expand Germany from its post-Versailles boundaries, annexing areas with German populations and finally attacking non-German states. In the same period, the Soviet Union also expanded but claimed it was a defensive measure against capitalist countries.”</i>	
Additional Notes: • Typically, statements credited as evidence will be more specific than statements credited as contextualization. • If a response has a multipart argument, then it can meet the threshold of two pieces of evidence by giving one example for one part of the argument and another example for a different part of the argument, but the total number of examples must still be at least two.		

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria		
Row D Analysis and Reasoning (0–2 points)	0 points Does not meet the criteria for one point.	1 point Uses historical reasoning [e.g. comparison, causation, continuity and change] to frame or structure an argument that addresses the prompt.	2 points Demonstrates a complex understanding of the historical development that is the focus of the prompt through sophisticated argumentation and/or effective use of evidence.
Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	Responses that do not earn points: - May include evidence but offer no reasoning to connect the evidence to an argument. - May assert the use of historical reasoning but does not use it to frame or structure an argument.	Responses that earn 1 point: Must demonstrate the use of historical reasoning to frame or structure an argument about the most significant difference between the Nazi regime in Germany and the communist regime in the Soviet Union. The reasoning might be uneven or imbalanced, or the evidence may be overly general or lacking specificity.	Responses that earn 2 points: May demonstrate a complex understanding through sophisticated argumentation that is relevant to the prompt. This may be done in a variety of ways, such as: - Explaining multiple themes or perspectives to explore complexity or nuance; OR - Explaining multiple causes or effects, multiple similarities or differences, or multiple continuities or changes; OR - Explaining both cause and effect, both similarity and difference, or both continuity and change; OR - Explaining relevant and insightful connections within and across periods or geographical areas. These connections should clearly relate to an argument that responds to the prompt. May demonstrate a complex understanding through effective use of evidence relevant to an argument that addresses the prompt. This may be done in a variety of ways that might include: - Explaining how multiple pieces of specific and relevant evidence [at least four] support a nuanced or complex argument that responds to the prompt; OR - Using evidence effectively to demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of different perspectives relevant to the prompt.
	Examples that do not earn points: Provide evidence but offer no reasoning to connect the evidence to an argument <i>“Nazis had Hitler and the Soviet Union had Lenin and Stalin.”</i>	Using a historical reasoning process to frame or structure an argument could include: - Using comparative reasoning to explain differing features of cults of personality in the Nazi and Soviet regimes. - Structuring an argument thematically to highlight differences in a thematic category, such as imperial expansion, ideology, and longevity of the regimes. Example of acceptable use of historical reasoning: <i>“Communists believed in the abolition of private property, while the Nazi Party regulated but ultimately supported private ownership and</i>	Demonstrating a complex understanding might include any of the following, if appropriate elaboration is provided: - Explaining differences between the development of the two ideologies based on detailed discussion of the political structures of Germany and Russia prior to the Nazi and Bolshevik takeovers. [Demonstrating sophisticated understanding] - Explaining connections within and across periods, including the rise of the Nazi and communist regimes, the period of the war, and the collapse of two regimes at different times. [Explaining relevant and insightful connections within and across periods] - Considering multiple differences, such as racial ideology, economic policy, leadership structure, popular support, etc. before arguing one was the most significant. [Explains multiple similarities or differences]

	<i>corporations.</i> " [Indicates a difference between economic systems of the two regimes]	
--	---	--

Additional Notes:

- To earn the first point for analysis and reasoning, the response must use historical reasoning to structure a response to the prompt, although the reasoning might be uneven or imbalanced, or the evidence may be overly general or lacking in specificity.
- This complex understanding must be part of the argument and may be demonstrated in any part of the response.
- While it is not necessary for this complex understanding to be woven throughout the response, it must be more than merely a phrase or reference.

Question 2: Short Answer Primary Source**3 points****General Scoring Notes**

- Each point is earned independently.
- **Accuracy:** These scoring guidelines require that students demonstrate historically defensible content knowledge. Given the timed nature of the exam, responses may contain errors that do not detract from their overall quality, as long as the historical content used to advance the argument is accurate.
- **Clarity:** Exam responses should be considered first drafts and thus may contain grammatical errors. Those errors will not be counted against a student unless they obscure the successful demonstration of the content knowledge, skills, and practices described below.
- **Describe:** Provide the relevant characteristics of a specified topic. Description requires more than simply mentioning an isolated term.
- **Explain:** Provide information about how or why a historical development or process occurs or how or why a relationship exists.

[a] Describe a goal that the artist likely intended to support in the painting. **1 point**

Examples that earn this point include the following:

- The German states should become a unified country under a single government.
- Germany should embrace modernization while preserving its past traditions.
- Germany should revive the Holy Roman Empire as a means of unifying the German nation.
- A unified Germany would afford greater protection to German peoples.

[b] Explain one way in which political conditions in the period 1800 to 1850 hindered the goal referenced in the painting. **1 point**

Examples that earn this point include the following:

- The conservative Concert of Europe was attempting to maintain traditional political divisions such as the German states.
- Metternich attempted to suppress the nationalist movements that followed the French Revolution.
- The governments of the various small German states were often wary of giving up too much independence.
- Disagreements between liberal reformers who sought a unified Germany under a constitutional government and conservatives and traditionalists who preferred a monarchical form of government prevented the formation of a single movement for German unification.
- Napoleon formally abolished the Holy Roman Empire, and it was not revived after his defeat, which eliminated a possible means of unification.
- Rivalry between Prussia and Austria after the Napoleonic Wars slowed Prussian efforts to unify German-speaking areas outside the Austrian Empire.

-
- | | | |
|------------|---|----------------|
| [c] | Explain one way in which political developments in the period after 1850 helped to achieve the goal referenced in the painting. | 1 point |
|------------|---|----------------|
-

Examples that earn this point include the following:

- Under the leadership of Otto von Bismarck, Prussia led an aggressive campaign of unification through war, military alliances, and manipulation of nationalist sentiment.
- The fall of Metternich and the decline of Austrian influence in the German States after the Revolutions of 1848 removed a major obstacle to unification.
- The collapse of the Concert of Europe, which marked the end of the cooperation of conservative regimes to restrain nationalist movements, allowed German unification efforts to gain momentum.
- Liberal revolutionaries in 1848 tried but failed to achieve German unification under a constitutional form of government, giving Prussia the opportunity to lead a more conservative effort.

Total for question 2 3 points

Question 3: Short Answer, No Stimulus, Concert of Europe**3 points****General Scoring Notes**

- Each point is earned independently.
- **Accuracy:** These scoring guidelines require that students demonstrate historically defensible content knowledge. Given the timed nature of the exam, responses may contain errors that do not detract from their overall quality, as long as the historical content used to advance the argument is accurate.
- **Clarity:** Exam responses should be considered first drafts and thus may contain grammatical errors. Those errors will not be counted against a student unless they obscure the successful demonstration of the content knowledge, skills, and practices described below.
- **Describe:** Provide the relevant characteristics of a specified topic. Description requires more than simply mentioning an isolated term.
- **Explain:** Provide information about how or why a historical development or process occurs or how or why a relationship exists.

(A) Describe one cause for the development of the Concert of Europe in the early 1800s. **1 point**

Examples that earn this point include the following:

- An alliance of countries that came together to defeat Napoleonic/Revolutionary France.
- The agreements reached at the Congress of Vienna to contain France and prevent Napoleon's return.
- The desire to forestall revolutionary sentiment and maintain the conservative political order.
- Fears of the political effects of the spread of nationalism during and after the French Revolutionary wars/Wars of Napoleon.

(B) Explain one way in which the Concert of Europe affected Europe in the first half of the 1800s. **1 point**

Examples that earn this point include the following:

- Conservative monarchies intervened to suppress revolutions and liberal movements.
- Nationalist movements for independence/unification were suppressed.
- Resentment toward conservative institutions grew across Europe, helping lead to the Revolutions of 1848.
- France sought to divide the Concert of Europe and create a new diplomatic order. Balance of power was maintained in Europe after the Napoleonic Wars.

(C) Explain one reason why the Concert of Europe broke down in the mid-1800s. **1 point**

Examples that earn this point include the following:

- The Revolutions of 1848 challenged conservative governments and pushed Metternich, the architect of the Concert of Europe, out of office.
- Nationalist movements grew in strength, eventually forcing some constitutional reforms and/or revolutionary change.
- European countries were increasingly concerned with Russian expansionism, leading to open conflict between members of the Concert of Europe in the Crimean War.
- Great Britain's parliament was increasingly liberal and highly skeptical of the commitment to intervene in internal European affairs on behalf of conservative monarchies.

Total for question 3 3 points