

Criteria	Fail	Pass	Credit	Distinction	High Distinction
Quality of Evidence	Literature/research selected not relevant to the topic. There are inappropriate research sources, insufficient research articles cited or research is out of date.	Literature/research selected is vague and incomplete – components are missing, inaccurate or unclear. Adequate research articles but some may be outdated, inappropriate or irrelevant.	Literature/research is relevant to the argument/thesis & is mostly accurate & complete – there are some unclear components or some minor errors. Adequate use of research literature.	Literature/research is relevant to the argument and is mostly accurate and complete. Literature was reasonably well scoped but would have benefited from greater depth of exploration.	Literature/research selected is highly relevant to the argument, is presented accurately, completely & succinctly. Literature was comprehensively researched in breadth & depth.
Quality of Discussion	The description of the topic/issue is inaccurate or lacking depth & breadth of possible perspectives relevant to the topic. The discussion of the topic/issue does not inform the reader. Key ideas are missing or not relevant to the topic. Demonstrates a lack of critical analysis.	The description of the topic/issue is fairly accurate but not precise. Possible perspectives relevant to the topic are either not considered or ill-described. The topic/issue is unclear. Key ideas, while relevant to the topic, are unclear and inconsistent. Demonstrates poor critical analysis.	The description of the topic/issue is fairly accurate and precise, and possible perspectives relevant to the section are considered but needed greater depth of critical analysis. Key ideas are introduced at a basic level and are relevant to the topic. Demonstrates superficial critical analysis.	The description of the topic/issue is accurate and possible perspectives relevant to the section have been well considered, but have not been fully articulated. The topic/issue is presented clearly. Key ideas are introduced clearly & are relevant to the topic. Demonstrates critical analysis.	A highly accurate & precise description of the topic/issue, along with a careful consideration of possible perspectives relevant to the topic is provided. The topic/issue is clearly established. Key ideas are precisely introduced and highly relevant to the topic. Demonstrates high level of critical analysis.
Quality of Writing	Writing is poorly organised and difficult to read – does not flow logically from one part to another. There are numerous spelling and/or grammatical errors; technical	Writing is somewhat organised but difficult to read in large sections. There are several spelling and/or grammatical errors. Technical terms are poorly	Writing is generally well organised and most of the argument is easy to follow. There are some minor spelling or grammatical errors, or terms are not	Writing is well organised and the argument is easy to follow. There are few minor spelling or grammatical errors. Technical terms are	Writing is coherently organised and the logic is easy to follow. There are no spelling or grammatical errors and terminology is clearly defined. Writing is

	terms are not defined. Writing lacks clarity and conciseness.	defined Writing is clear in parts but is overly wordy and lacks conciseness.	clearly defined. Writing is mostly clear but may lack conciseness in parts.	clearly defined. Writing is clear and concise.	clear, concise and persuasive.
Presentation/Referencing	Little or no adherence to the presentation requirements and to the APA writing style.	Limited adherence to the presentation requirements and to the APA writing style & referencing requirements.	Basic adherence to the presentation requirements & to the APA writing style and referencing requirements.	Satisfactory adherence to the presentation requirements and to the APA writing style and referencing requirements.	Comprehensive adherence to the presentation requirements and to the APA writing style and referencing requirements.