

Internal assessment criteria—SL and HL

The historical investigation for both SL and HL is assessed against three criteria.

- Criterion A: Identification and evaluation of sources (6 marks)
- Criterion B: Investigation (15 marks)
- Criterion C: Reflection (4 marks)

Internal assessment criteria (SL and HL)

Criterion A: Identification and evaluation of sources (6 marks)

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	The question for investigation has been stated. The student has identified and selected appropriate sources, but there is little or no explanation of the relevance of the sources to the investigation. The response describes, but does not analyse or evaluate, two of the sources.
3–4	An appropriate question for investigation has been stated. The student has identified and selected appropriate sources, and there is some explanation of the relevance of the sources to the investigation. There is some analysis and evaluation of two sources, but reference to their value and limitations is limited.
5–6	An appropriate question for investigation has been clearly stated. The student has identified and selected appropriate and relevant sources, and there is a clear explanation of the relevance of the sources to the investigation. There is a detailed analysis and evaluation of two sources with explicit discussion of the value and limitations of two of the sources for the investigation, with reference to the origins, purpose and content of the two sources.

Criterion B: Investigation (15 marks)

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–3	<p>The investigation lacks clarity and coherence, and is poorly organized. Where there is a recognizable structure there is minimal focus on the task.</p> <p>The response contains little or no critical analysis. It may consist mostly of generalizations and poorly substantiated assertions. Reference is made to evidence from sources, but there is no analysis of that evidence.</p>
4–6	<p>There is an attempt to organize the investigation but this is only partially successful, and the investigation lacks clarity and coherence.</p> <p>The investigation contains some limited critical analysis but the response is primarily narrative/descriptive in nature, rather than analytical. Evidence from sources is included, but is not integrated into the analysis/argument.</p>
7–9	<p>The investigation is generally clear and well organized, but there is some repetition or lack of clarity in places.</p> <p>The response moves beyond description to include some analysis or critical commentary, but this is not sustained. There is an attempt to integrate evidence from sources with the analysis/argument.</p> <p>There may be awareness of different perspectives, but these perspectives are not evaluated.</p>
10–12	<p>The investigation is generally clear and well organized, although there may be some repetition or lack of clarity in places.</p> <p>The investigation contains critical analysis, although this analysis may lack development or clarity. Evidence from a range of sources is used to support the argument.</p> <p>There is awareness and some evaluation of different perspectives. The investigation argues to a reasoned conclusion.</p>
13–15	<p>The investigation is clear, coherent and effectively organized.</p> <p>The investigation contains well-developed critical analysis that is focused clearly on the stated question. Evidence from a range of sources is used effectively to support the argument.</p> <p>There is evaluation of different perspectives. The investigation argues to a reasoned conclusion that is consistent with the evidence and arguments provided.</p>

Criterion C: Reflection (4 marks)

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–2	<p>The reflection contains some discussion of what the investigation highlighted to the student about the methods used by the historian.</p> <p>The reflection demonstrates little awareness of the challenges facing the historian and/or the limitations of the methods used by the historian.</p> <p>The connection between the reflection and the rest of the investigation is implied, but is not explicit.</p>
3–4	<p>The reflection is clearly focused on what the investigation highlighted to the student about the methods used by the historian</p> <p>The reflection demonstrates clear awareness of challenges facing the historian and/or limitations of the methods used by the historian.</p> <p>There is a clear and explicit connection between the reflection and the rest of the investigation.</p>