

LL102 and LL202 Marking rubric for essay (2014)

Coordinator: Matthew Hayward

		E <40%	D 40–49%	C 50– 56%	C+ 57– 63%	B 64– 70%	B+ 71– 77%	A 78– 84%	A+ 85– 100%	Mark
a) Embark & Clarify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outlines scope and argument clearly in introduction, and sums up appropriately in the conclusion. - Accurately employs analytical terminology and uses language appropriate to academic discourse. 	Poorly presented introduction and conclusion. Inapt use of analytical terms and academic language.		Introduction and conclusion sufficient. Terminology and language adequate, but may be partial.		Clear and competent introduction and conclusion. Proficient use of analytic vocabulary.				
b) Find & Generate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demonstrates that research has been conducted in the library and/or on online databases to identify and implement a suitable range of critical and theoretical resources. - Builds on and extends the lecture material, and avoids simply repeating it. 	Insufficient research. Ignorance of the lectures, or merely repeats lecture material without further work.		Demonstrates research, although may at times be problematic (out-dated/irrelevant/insufficiently utilised). Some dependence on lecture material.		Excellent research, accurately employing credible and well-chosen sources. Builds on lecture in innovative ways.				
c) Evaluate & Reflect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establishes a clear and well-researched conceptual/theoretical framework, identifying its advantages and limitations in the context of the assignment. - Evaluates the claims and assumptions of relevant secondary criticism. - Establishes the relevance of the work, positioning it within a broader academic context. - Avoids generalisations and poorly researched, anecdotal evidence. 	Lack of clear framework. Insufficient evaluation of research. Relevance of work not clear. Dependence upon anecdote/hearsay.		Evidence of an established framework, but this requires greater elaboration or depth. Engagement with criticism may be superficial. Partially relevant work, not always clearly positioned in a broader context.		Employs a solid, convincing framework. Critical material is clearly evaluated. Relevance in a broader academic context clearly demonstrated.				
d) Organise & Manage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Follows a logical pattern of thought and development, with each paragraph making a clear point and avoiding repetition. - Ensures that points made are supported by quotations or relevant textual information. 	A disordered and/or repetitive argument, with insufficient textual support.		A structured argument, but may be disordered or repetitive at times. Argument has some support, but may need further or more detailed textual evidence.		A well-structured argument, with ordered paragraphs building in a logical progression, avoiding repetition and well-supported with textual evidence.				
e) Analyse &	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generates new and original perspectives by examining chosen texts in detail, paying close 	Repeats common or received ideas and/or		Offers some insights, but may be limited in		Presents original perspectives on texts				

Synthesise	attention to the various dimensions of the texts (e.g. language, structure, narrative form, context, etc.). - Analyses the material in relation to relevant concepts/theories in a thoughtful, precise and inventive manner. - Ensures at all times that the piece specifically engages with the precise wording of the question, and contains no irrelevant or digressive material.	aspects of the text. Offers no or limited analysis. Omits or misinterprets theories. Fails to address the question.	attention to the various dimensions of the text. Incorporates theory only briefly or partially. Engages with question, but may at times drift or lack close analysis.	and topics, with rich and sophisticated attention to textual dimensions. Analysis and use of theory is thoughtful and mature, and the question is answered directly and without digression.	
f) Communicate & Apply Ethically	- Presents a grammatically accurate, typographically clean, appropriately stylish academic work. - Adheres to the Chicago Style Guide, especially with citations and bibliography. - Where relevant, reflects upon ethical or cultural assumptions made in the course of the analysis. - Where relevant, makes appropriate and creative use of IT, multimedia or other materials.	Contains many grammatical errors, poor referencing, repeats unquestioned assumptions, and shows little creativity.	Sound grammar and writing style, but room for improvement. References adequately, but may be imperfectly presented. Partial reflection on cultural assumptions. Some creativity.	Stylish academic writing. Thoroughly accurate referencing. Thoughtful reflection upon assumptions. Strong creative aspect.	
General Feedback					Final Mark

Copyright © The University of the South Pacific, 2014. Rubric designed by course coordinator Matthew Hayward. Available under [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License](#) Reference: Willison, J. and O'Regan, K., 2006 and 2013. *The Research Skills Development Framework*.