

Assessment Task 1: Literature Review Marking Rubric (10 marks)

	Unsatisfactory	Acceptable	Good	Superior	Outstanding
Evidence of understanding and critical reading of the article (out of 4)	Does not demonstrate adequate understanding of key arguments / theories in the article. Lack of clarity or consistency in analysis. Too descriptive. The description of what is missing from / contribution of the article is absent or very unclear.	Some relevant arguments / theories are discussed but the review has over-reliance on quotations or poor paraphrases of the article. Shows limited understanding of what is required in critical analysis. Makes unsubstantiated assertions.	Relevant arguments / theories and contribution / limitations of the article are discussed. There may be gaps in reasoning but some evidence of critical analysis.	Relevant arguments / theories and contribution / limitations of the article are discussed in student's own words. Presents a nuanced and critical review, with substantial evidence of critical thought.	Relevant arguments / theories and contribution / limitations of the article are discussed thoroughly and clearly in student's own words. Analysis is sophisticated and nuanced.
Research skills and engagement (out of 4)	Does not have 3 scholarly references. No evidence of independent research. No evidence of engagement with relevant literature. Uses only immediately available information with little discrimination.	Has 3 + scholarly references but shows limited evidence of independent research. Use of literature and additional materials is very limited and/or largely irrelevant.	Has 3 + scholarly references. Shows evidence of engagement with relevant literature but does not always discriminate effectively between sources of information.	Has 3 + scholarly references. Evidence of independent research. Uses relevant literature on the topic effectively. Shows a good, sound knowledge of the literature and good research skills.	Has 3 + scholarly references. Demonstrates a thorough and critically reflective approach to source selection appropriate to the task. Demonstrates high level of independent thought in locating required information. Is selective and discriminates between sources of information in an appropriate and critical manner for the task.
Clarity of writing and writing technique (out of 2)	Argument is unclear and/or under-developed. Too difficult to read due to too many errors in expression, grammar, or spelling. Lack of proper referencing.	Argument is unclear and/or under-developed. Spelling and grammar require editing. Some sentences require rewriting for clarity and/or paragraph structure is poor in places. Writing style may be choppy in places and/or poor flow-on from one idea to the next. Lack of consistency in referencing.	Arguments need further development. Consistent referencing with minor errors of style or presentation. Occasional grammatical or spelling errors. Frequent awkward expressions. Perhaps some unexplained jargon.	Makes and supports persuasive arguments. Clearly written and free from grammatical errors. Consistent academic writing style, with well-structured sentences and paragraphs. Appropriate and correct referencing throughout the thesis.	Makes and supports persuasive arguments. Sophisticated, clear and fluent writing. Correct spelling and grammar used effectively throughout. Highly effective academic writing style, with clear and consistent links to arguments in the thesis. Use of academic conventions such as referencing and citation is both consistent and appropriate.