

Answer Question 2 or Question 3 or Question 4.

In your response you should do the following:

- Respond to the prompt with a historically defensible thesis or claim that establishes a line of reasoning.
- Describe a broader historical context relevant to the prompt.
- Support an argument in response to the prompt using at least two pieces of specific and relevant evidence.
- Use historical reasoning (e.g., comparison, causation, continuity or change over time) to frame or structure an argument that addresses the prompt.
- Demonstrate a complex understanding of a historical development related to the prompt through sophisticated argumentation and/or effective use of evidence.

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

3. 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.

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

STOP
END OF EXAM

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the timed nature of the exam, essays may contain errors that do not detract from their overall quality, as long as the historical content used to advance the argument is accurate.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	
<p>Responses that do not earn this point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>Examples that do not earn this point:</p> <p>Provide a restatement of the prompt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>"There were many important differences between the Reformation as it played out in England and in France."</i> <p>Provide a historically defensible claim, but do not establish a line of reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>"The Reformation led to different levels of religious diversity in the two countries."</i> <p>Are not historically defensible</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>"Protestantism led to the permanent collapse of the monarchy in England and France."</i> <p>Additional Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>Responses that earn this point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>Examples that earn this point:</p> <p>Establish a line of reasoning that evaluates the topic of the prompt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <p>Establish a line of reasoning that evaluates the topic of the prompt with analytic categories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <p>Establish a line of reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>"Most important was the fact that France remained officially Catholic while England became officially Protestant."</i> [Minimally acceptable thesis/claim] 	

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>"The Reformation also tore apart the Habsburgs' empire."</i> 		Responses that earn 1 point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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] 	

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Avant-garde art criticized traditional values.” 	Using a historical reasoning process to frame or structure an argument could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “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.” [Indicates an effect of the global conflicts on art] 		Demonstrating a complex understanding might include any of the following, if appropriate elaboration is provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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]
<p>Additional Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.		