Internal Assessment Samples Commentary

**Sample A:**

*Section 1: 2/6*

*There is a brief explanation of the limitations of the origin for both sources. Bulk is descriptive of sources, rather than evaluative.*

*There is very limited explanation of the relevance of the sources to the investigation – implied but not explicit.*

*Section 2: 0/15*

*There are no in text citations pointing to the sources used in the essay.*

*Paper is minimally focused on the RQ.*

*Primarily narrative essay.*

*Section 3: 1/4*

*This section is meant to demonstrate connections to your investigation based upon the methods you used as an Historian. Extremely limited understanding of the demands of this section.*

*Total 3/25*

**Sample B:**

*Section 1: 2/6*

*Little explanation of the relevance of the sources to the investigation. OPCVL is strong, but the lack of relevance hinders this from being a much higher score.*

*Section 2: 5/15*

*The essay is primarily narrative. Even the references used were used to provide further narrative and story building, rather than evidence to prove/disprove a claim.*

*Evidence used does little to contribute to the conclusion that Ottoman tech led to advantages in trade.*

*Section 3: 2/4*

*Vague. Broad. No explicit connection to the investigation.*

*Total: 9/25*

**Sample C:**

*Section 1: 3/6*

*No explicit explanation of relevance to investigation for 2nd source, but implied.*

*Limited OPCVL for both; must hit values and limitations for both sources.*

*Section 2: 3/15*

*Descriptions of rhetoric and positions of B.P. but there is no connection to success/failure of social/economic gains. Large, unsubstantiated claims are being made without showing evidence that x leads conclusively to y.*

*Very general, unsubstantiated claims that rhetoric was not palatable to whites; what proof could be included?*

*Paper requires evidence.*

*Generalizations and unsubstantiated assertions permeate the paper.*

*Section 3: 1/4*

*No awareness of methods of the historian.*

*There is a description of what was done (methods?) but no detail about how these are limited/challenges faced.*

*Total: 7/25*

**Sample D:**

*Section 1: 5/6*

*Clear statement of RQ. Clear importance/relevance of documents to investigation. OPCVL is strong, but there are a few areas that are weak in terms of value and limitation.*

*Section 2: 11/15*

*Places where transitions between ideas and paragraphs needs to be more explicit, in order to strengthen the analysis throughout the paper. There is a strong structure to the paper, with good use of evidence throughout.*

*Conclusion is implicit, rather than an overt, explicit claim. There could be a strengthening of the development of various perspectives (5 year plans hindered/helped) or discussions of other factors and the impact on women that could provide movement into the 13-15 markband.*

*Section 3: 3/4*

*Focus more on limitations of the methods used within the investigation to improve this section.*

*Total: 19/25*

**Sample E:**

*Section 1: 3/6*

*Need a full development of source 2 with OPCVL as this source was minimally covered. VL missing content for both sources.*

*Section 2: 5/15*

*Very limited analysis of evidence. Primarily used quotes/paraphrasing to add to the construction of narrative of history, rather than to prove violence vs nonviolence success/failure as a tactic.*

*It may be better to restructure the essay in order to address tactics rather than through various strikes, as this is leading towards narrative focus.*

*Candidate never fully addressed success of tactics through definitions of success (membership rates increase? End to strike? Wage increase? Benefits received? Etc.), was limited to description of various strikes.*

*Section 3: 3/4*

*Needs to be a focus or mention of methods historians use when investigating: primary, secondary, and how these methods limited your own investigation. Does so in second submission, but minimally.*

*Total: 11/25*

**Sample F:**

*Section 1: 5/6*

*Section 2: 13/15*

*Section 3: 4/4*

*Total: 22/25*