

Criteria	Strongly meets or exceeds requirements	Soundly meets requirements	Meets requirements	Meets limited requirements	Does not meet requirements
30 Marks	27-30	23-26	19-22	15-18	< 15
Content	<p>Exceptionally defines inclusion and key terms using their own words without the use of direct quotations.</p> <p>Exceptionally summarises each article and has highlighted more than 5 similar and/or different views between the 3 articles and other research.</p> <p>Exceptionally demonstrates knowledge of material by accurately linking to hypothetical and relevant classroom examples.</p> <p>Flawless text referencing</p>	<p>Can define inclusion and key terms using their own words at a very good standard without the use of direct quotations.</p> <p>Ability to summarise each article is very good, and has highlighted 5 similar and/or different views between the 3 articles and other research.</p> <p>Ability to demonstrates knowledge of material by accurately linking to hypothetical and relevant classroom examples is very good.</p> <p>Minor text referencing errors</p>	<p>Can define inclusion and key terms at an acceptable standard but is starting to rely on the use of direct quotations (2-5 quotes).</p> <p>Gives a summary of each article and briefly highlights similar and/or different views between the 3 articles and other research</p> <p>Demonstrates knowledge of material by accurately linking to hypothetical and relevant classroom examples at an acceptable level.</p> <p>Minor and consistent text referencing errors</p>	<p>Can partially define inclusion and key terms but is starting to rely on the use of direct quotations (2-5 quotes).</p> <p>Gives a summary of each article, but the ability to highlight similar or different views between the articles and other research is limited.</p> <p>Partial demonstration of knowledge of material as the links to hypothetical and relevant classroom examples are unclear.</p> <p>Consistent text referencing errors.</p>	<p>Can define inclusion and key terms but there is an overuse of direct quotations (>5).</p> <p>Gives a summary of each article, fails to highlight similar or different views between the articles and other research.</p> <p>Unable to demonstrate knowledge of material as no links to hypothetical and relevant classroom examples were given.</p> <p>Consistent errors in text referencing throughout the review, needs support.</p>

10 marks	8-10	7	6	5	< 5
<p>Academic writing</p> <p>Organisation</p> <p>Proofread for spelling and grammar</p> <p>Word count</p>	<p>The review is exceptionally well organised.</p> <p>Information is presented in a neat, clear and logical sequence that is easy follow.</p> <p>Accurate grammar is used with minimal spelling, or typographical errors.</p> <p>The word limit is within guidelines.</p>	<p>The review is well organised.</p> <p>Information is presented in a neat, clear and logical sequence that is easy to follow.</p> <p>There is occasional incorrect use of grammar and spelling, or typographical errors.</p> <p>The word limit is within guidelines.</p>	<p>The review is reasonably well organised.</p> <p>Information is not always presented in a neat, clear and logical sequence that is easy to follow.</p> <p>There is an occasional inaccurate use of grammar and spelling, or typographical errors.</p> <p>The word limit is within guidelines.</p>	<p>The review is reasonably well organised.</p> <p>Information is not always presented in a neat, clear and logical sequence that is easy to follow.</p> <p>There is an occasional inaccurate use of grammar and spelling, or typographical errors.</p> <p>The word limit may not be within guidelines.</p>	<p>One or more of the following:</p> <p>The plan is poorly organised with Information not presented in a neat, clear and logical sequence that is easy to follow.</p> <p>There is regular inaccurate use of grammar and many spelling, or typographical errors.</p> <p>The word limit is clearly not within guidelines.</p>
Total Marks:	/40				