

Long Essay Question

2. Evaluate the extent to which the ratification of the United States Constitution fostered change in the function of the federal government in the period from 1776 to 1800.

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) 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.

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the timed nature of the exam, essays may contain errors that do not detract from their overall quality, as long as the historical content used to advance the argument is accurate.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 extent to which the ratification of the United States Constitution fostered change in the function of the federal government in the period from 1776 to 1800.

Scoring Guidelines for Long Essay Question

6 points

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 historically defensible claim, but do not establish a line of reasoning "The Constitutional Convention was in 1787." Provide a restatement of the prompt "The ratification of the Constitution transformed the national government." Do not focus on the topic of the prompt "The national government changed socially, politically and economically."	Responses that earn this point: - Provide a historically defensible thesis or claim about how the ratification of the United States Constitution fostered change in the function of the government in the period from 1776 to 1800. 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 with analytic categories "The ratification of the Constitution dramatically changed the function of the federal government by significantly increasing the scope and the distribution of its power. Despite this significant change in the scope and distribution of political power, a considerable amount of authority remained with the states after ratification." Establish a line of reasoning "The ratification of the Constitution transformed the national government from a confederation of states into a more centralized government." <i>(Minimally acceptable thesis/claim)</i>
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 how the ratification of the United States Constitution fostered change in the function of the federal government in the period from 1776 to 1800.
Examples that do not earn this point: Do not provide context relevant to the topic of the prompt "Many Americans migrated to the West in the 1780s and 1790s."		Examples of relevant context that earn this point include the following, if appropriate elaboration is provided: - The American experience under British government rule - The United States government under the Articles of Confederation - Economic instability of the 1780s and 1790s - The international crises of the 1790s, such as the French Revolution Example of acceptable contextualization: "In the leadup to the American Revolution, the British government passed a variety of taxes on the American colonies without the colonists' consent. This led to many protests and widespread distrust in powerful central governments." "Under the Articles of Confederation, the national government did not have the power to tax." (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 13th Amendment is an example of the increase in the power of the federal government because it abolished slavery."</i>	Responses that earn 1 point: - Identify at least two specific historical examples relevant to ratification of the United States Constitution from 1776 to 1800. Examples of evidence that are specific and relevant include the following (two examples required): - Anti-Federalists' role in the ratification debate - Federalists' role in the ratification debate - The role of the Federalist papers in shaping the republic - Alexander Hamilton's role in shaping the republic - John Jay's role in shaping the republic - Thomas Jefferson's role in shaping the republic - James Monroe's role in shaping the republic - The passage of the Northwest Ordinance under the Articles of Confederation - The influence of Shays' Rebellion on the framers of the Constitution - George Washington's role in shaping the republic - The resistance to federal power that occurred during the Whiskey Rebellion Example of a statement that earns one point for evidence: <i>"John Jay and Alexander Hamilton wrote many of the Federalist papers."</i>	Responses that earn 2 points: - Use at least two specific historical examples to support an argument regarding how the ratification of the United States Constitution fostered change in the function of the federal government from 1776 to 1800. Examples that successfully support an argument with evidence: <i>"Alexander Hamilton's arguments in the Federalist papers were a key factor in the ratification of the Constitution and helped justify new and expanded functions of the federal government." (Uses evidence to support an argument about the causes for growing federal power)</i> <i>"The concerns of the Anti-Federalists during the ratification debates led to the addition of the Bill of Rights. The addition of the Bill of Rights actually changed the role of the federal government by explicitly making federal authority a significant guarantor of individual rights." (Uses evidence to support an argument about a change in federal authority)</i> <i>"The suppression of the Whiskey Rebellion is an example of the increased power and authority of the federal government after ratification to collect taxes and maintain domestic order." (Uses evidence to support an argument about the increased authority of the government after ratification)</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. (For example, using the whiskey tax as evidence of a change in the government's economic function and the proclamation of neutrality as evidence of change in the government's diplomatic function.)			

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:	Responses that earn 1 point:		
- 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.	Must demonstrate the use of historical reasoning to frame or structure an argument on how the United States Constitution fostered change in the function of the federal government in the period from 1776 to 1800. 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.	

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria		
Row D (continued)	Examples that do not earn points: Provide evidence but offer no reasoning to connect the evidence to an argument • <i>"The United States constitution, largely written by James Madison, describes the Senate and House of Representatives in article one."</i>	Using a historical reasoning process to frame or structure an argument could include: • Explaining changes in the United States national government from the period under the Articles of Confederation to the period under the Constitution. • Discussing continuities in United States national government—such as its relatively modest power—from the period under the Articles of Confederation to the period under the Constitution. Example of acceptable use of historical reasoning: • <i>"The United States national government changed after the ratification of the Constitution by assuming new functions and responsibilities for new issues, such as maintaining a national army." (Indicates a change as a result of the Constitution.)</i>	Demonstrating complex understanding might include any of the following, if appropriate elaboration is provided: • Assessing both Federalist arguments in favor of the Constitution and Anti-Federalist arguments against it (<i>Explains nuance</i>) • Explaining both continuities in government before and after the Constitution (such as many of the same leaders, the same context of economic crisis) and changes (such as the expansion of federal authority over taxes and economy). (<i>Explains both continuity and change</i>) • Making comparisons with the way that the functions of the federal government changed during the New Deal. (<i>Explains relevant and insightful connections</i>) • Arguing convincingly that the ratification of the Constitution did not significantly change social structures in the United States, or that it reinforced the power of the elite. (<i>Qualifies an argument by considering diverse or alternative views or evidence</i>) • Corroborating an argument about increased federal power with economic evidence (e.g. taxation), social evidence (e.g. regulation of slavery in the territories), and evidence regarding America's role in the world (e.g. Quasi-War). (<i>Uses evidence to demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of different perspectives relevant to the prompt</i>)
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.			