

**IB HoA**  
**IA Complete Rough Draft**

The rough draft of your complete IA is due on Thursday, 1/23.

**Directions:**

Your paper should be typed, double-spaced, and printed single-sided.

Do not include a title page for this draft.

See the “IA Formatting Sample” on the Metro website or on Teams for instructions on what it should look like and how it should be written and formatted.

Use 12 pt. Times New Roman, 12 pt. Garamond, or 11 pt. Georgia as the font.

You must submit a hard copy and upload it to TurnItIn.

**What should be in Section 1:**

The first one to two sentences need to be a dramatic setup explaining your topic and drawing your reader in.

The last sentence of the first paragraph should restate the question.

Identify the two main sources selected for detailed analysis, explain what they are, and explain their relevance to the investigation.

With reference to the origins, purpose and content, analyze the value and limitations of the two sources in relation to the investigation. Keep the following questions in mind:

- How would the origin of this source make it valuable/useful for helping learn about the topic?
- How would the origin of this source limit its usefulness for helping learn about the topic?
- How would the original purpose of this source make it valuable/useful for helping learn about the topic?
- How would the purpose of this source limit its usefulness for helping learn about the topic?
- How would the contents of this source make it valuable/useful for helping learn about the topic? (This includes the information in the contents, but can also include reading between the lines and making inferences about what must have been going on to cause someone to write something like this.)
- How would the contents of this source limit its usefulness for helping learn about the era? (This may include things like: What does the source not tell us? Why not?)

**What should be in Section 2:**

Do not spend section 2 narrating events. If necessary, give some background information on the events or people being discussed, but get to your actual question and focus on the facts surrounding it.

Explain all of the facts that are relevant to your question from all of your sources. Cite using Chicago Style footnotes. Footnotes should be single-spaced with the first line of each entry indented.

Analyze those facts. Analyze means “break down in order to bring out the essential elements or structure.” This might include explaining which facts are more important or relevant or more trustworthy based on your source evaluation in section 1 or explaining how those facts relate to your question.

Explain different perspectives on your question.

The last paragraph of the section should be a conclusion that answers your initial question and explains how that answer is based on and fits with the evidence.

**What should be in Section 3:**

This is the only section where you can write in first person. By writing the IA, you have been actually being a historian, so you need to reflect on what the IA experience has taught you about the methods used by historians, the challenges they face, the limitations of the methods historians use, and how it differs from challenges in other subjects like math or science.

Be sure to explicitly connect what you are saying about history methods and challenges to your own investigation and the methods you used to answer your question and the challenges or limitations you faced.

**What should be in the Bibliography:**

The bibliography should be on its own page with the word “Bibliography” centered in bold at the top and should be made up of correctly formatted Chicago style bibliography entries.

Each bibliography entry should be single-spaced with an extra blank line between each entry.

URLs should not be blue or underlined and should be split at a slash if they need to extend to the next line.

**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	<p>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.</p> <p>The response describes, but does not analyse or evaluate, two of the sources.</p>
3–4	<p>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.</p> <p>There is some analysis and evaluation of two sources, but reference to their value and limitations is limited.</p>
5–6	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

**Criterion B: Investigation (15 marks)**

<b>Marks</b>	<b>Level descriptor</b>
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)**

<b>Marks</b>	<b>Level descriptor</b>
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>