RWAC IWA Descriptors 2024/2025

	Task Fulfilment (50%)	Cohesion & Coherence (30%)	Academic Language (20%)
10	<ul> <li>Question answered comprehensively, with no irrelevant content         A sophisticated response</li> <li>Ideas fully developed using appropriate evidence</li> <li>Exemplary referencing skills:         <ul> <li>reference list is entirely accurately formatted</li> <li>reference list matches citations</li> <li>citation formatting is entirely accurate</li> <li>information from sources is acknowledged when appropriate*</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Highly effective introduction and conclusion, with all expected elements present</li> <li>Highly effective body paragraph organisation. No structural issues</li> <li>Highly effective use of cohesive devices which supports the flow of information</li> <li>An uninterrupted logical flow through the entire essay</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Academic register used throughout</li> <li>Successful and non-mechanical paraphrasing throughout</li> </ul>
9	Shared features of 10 & 8		
8	<ul> <li>Question answered well, with no irrelevant content</li> <li>Ideas well-developed using appropriate evidence</li> <li>Strong referencing skills:         <ul> <li>reference list is accurately formatted with occasional slips</li> <li>reference list matches citations</li> <li>citation formatting is mostly accurate</li> <li>information from sources is acknowledged when appropriate*</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Effective introduction and conclusion, with all required elements present</li> <li>Effective body paragraph organisation. Body paragraph(s) may have minor structural issues</li> <li>Effective use of cohesive devices which supports the flow of information with occasional slips</li> <li>A mostly uninterrupted logical flow through the entire essay</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Academic register used, with only occasional lapses in style and appropriacy</li> <li>Mostly successful and non-mechanical paraphrasing. May contain one short chunk but no long chunks</li> </ul>
7	Shared features of 8 & 6		
6	<ul> <li>Question answered reasonably well; may have a small amount of irrelevance</li> <li>Ideas reasonably well-developed using evidence, but one or two ideas lack depth</li> <li>Good referencing skills:         <ul> <li>reference list is accurately formatted with some slips</li> <li>reference list does not match citations on one occasion</li> <li>citation formatting has some inaccuracies</li> <li>information from sources may not be acknowledged on one or two occasions*</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Mostly effective introduction and conclusion, although background information and/or summary and/or final comment is somewhat simplistic</li> <li>Mostly effective body paragraph organisation. Body paragraphs have some structural issues</li> <li>Mostly effective use of cohesive devices which generally supports the flow of information, but there may be overuse or incorrect usage on occasion</li> <li>A logical flow through much of the essay</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Academic register used, with some lapses in style</li> <li>Often successful but somewhat mechanical paraphrasing. May contain two short chunks but no long chunks</li> </ul>
	Shared features of 6 & 4		
5		Shared features of 6 & 4	
5 4 PASS	Question answered adequately; may have some irrelevance Ideas adequately developed using evidence, but lack depth Evidence of referencing skills: - reference list has frequent formatting issues - reference list does not match citations on <b>two</b> occasions - citation formatting has frequent inaccuracies - information from sources may not be acknowledged on <b>three</b> occasions*	• Adequate introduction and conclusion. One or both have structural issues or conclusion is missing summary and/or final comment • Adequate body paragraph organisation. Both have structural issues, but the reader can still identify each paragraph's purpose • Adequate use of cohesive devices; however, these may be misleading and do not always support the flow of information. There may be more frequent overuse, underuse, repetitive use and/or incorrect usage • A logical flow through some parts of the essay	Academic register is attempted, with limited success      Attempts paraphrasing, but frequently mechanical. May contain <b>three</b> short chunks and/or <b>one</b> long chunk
	<ul> <li>Ideas adequately developed using evidence, but lack depth</li> <li>Evidence of referencing skills:         <ul> <li>reference list has frequent formatting issues</li> <li>reference list does not match citations on two occasions</li> <li>citation formatting has frequent inaccuracies</li> <li>information from sources may not be acknowledged on three</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Adequate introduction and conclusion. One or both have structural issues or conclusion is missing summary and/or final comment</li> <li>Adequate body paragraph organisation. Both have structural issues, but the reader can still identify each paragraph's purpose</li> <li>Adequate use of cohesive devices; however, these may be misleading and do not always support the flow of information. There may be more frequent overuse, underuse, repetitive use and/or incorrect usage</li> <li>A logical flow through some parts of the essay</li> <li>Inadequate introduction and/or conclusion. One or both are poorly structured and/or introduction is missing the purpose statement</li> <li>Inadequate body paragraph organisation. One or both have structural issues impacting reader's ability to identify paragraph's purpose</li> <li>Use of cohesive devices is frequently misleading and does not support the flow of information. There is a large amount of overuse and/or underuse and/or incorrect usage</li> <li>A lack of logical flow through much of the essay</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Attempts paraphrasing, but frequently mechanical. May contain three short chunks and/or one long chunk</li> <li>Academic register rarely attempted or unsuccessful</li> <li>Very little attempt made to paraphrase, with four short chunks and/or two</li> </ul>
4 PASS	<ul> <li>Ideas adequately developed using evidence, but lack depth</li> <li>Evidence of referencing skills:         <ul> <li>reference list has frequent formatting issues</li> <li>reference list does not match citations on two occasions</li> <li>citation formatting has frequent inaccuracies</li> <li>information from sources may not be acknowledged on three occasions*</li> </ul> </li> <li>Question not answered adequately; may have substantial irrelevance</li> <li>Ideas not adequately developed, with a lack of appropriate evidence</li> <li>Insufficient evidence of referencing skills:         <ul> <li>reference list has extensive formatting issues</li> <li>reference list does not match citations on three occasions</li> <li>citation formatting has extensive inaccuracies</li> <li>information from sources may not be acknowledged on four or more</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Adequate introduction and conclusion. One or both have structural issues or conclusion is missing summary and/or final comment</li> <li>Adequate body paragraph organisation. Both have structural issues, but the reader can still identify each paragraph's purpose</li> <li>Adequate use of cohesive devices; however, these may be misleading and do not always support the flow of information. There may be more frequent overuse, underuse, repetitive use and/or incorrect usage</li> <li>A logical flow through some parts of the essay</li> <li>Inadequate introduction and/or conclusion. One or both are poorly structured and/or introduction is missing the purpose statement</li> <li>Inadequate body paragraph organisation. One or both have structural issues impacting reader's ability to identify paragraph's purpose</li> <li>Use of cohesive devices is frequently misleading and does not support the flow of information. There is a large amount of overuse and/or underuse and/or incorrect usage</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Attempts paraphrasing, but frequently mechanical. May contain three short chunks and/or one long chunk</li> <li>Academic register rarely attempted or unsuccessful</li> <li>Very little attempt made to paraphrase, with four short chunks and/or two</li> </ul>
4 PASS	<ul> <li>Ideas adequately developed using evidence, but lack depth</li> <li>Evidence of referencing skills:         <ul> <li>reference list has frequent formatting issues</li> <li>reference list does not match citations on two occasions</li> <li>citation formatting has frequent inaccuracies</li> <li>information from sources may not be acknowledged on three occasions*</li> </ul> </li> <li>Question not answered adequately; may have substantial irrelevance</li> <li>Ideas not adequately developed, with a lack of appropriate evidence</li> <li>Insufficient evidence of referencing skills:         <ul> <li>reference list has extensive formatting issues</li> <li>reference list does not match citations on three occasions</li> <li>citation formatting has extensive inaccuracies</li> <li>information from sources may not be acknowledged on four or more</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Adequate introduction and conclusion. One or both have structural issues or conclusion is missing summary and/or final comment</li> <li>Adequate body paragraph organisation. Both have structural issues, but the reader can still identify each paragraph's purpose</li> <li>Adequate use of cohesive devices; however, these may be misleading and do not always support the flow of information. There may be more frequent overuse, underuse, repetitive use and/or incorrect usage</li> <li>A logical flow through some parts of the essay</li> <li>Inadequate introduction and/or conclusion. One or both are poorly structured and/or introduction is missing the purpose statement</li> <li>Inadequate body paragraph organisation. One or both have structural issues impacting reader's ability to identify paragraph's purpose</li> <li>Use of cohesive devices is frequently misleading and does not support the flow of information. There is a large amount of overuse and/or underuse and/or incorrect usage</li> <li>A lack of logical flow through much of the essay</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Attempts paraphrasing, but frequently mechanical. May contain three short chunks and/or one long chunk</li> <li>Academic register rarely attempted or unsuccessful</li> <li>Very little attempt made to paraphrase, with four short chunks and/or two</li> </ul>

RWAC IWA Descriptors 2024/2025

This construct table shows the main features evaluated in this assessment. It is designed to link directly with the skills needed by learners in their future academic study.

# Task Fulfilment (50%)

### Task response:

- provides an appropriate answer to the task, using source information
- addresses all elements of the task title (two reasons)
- avoids irrelevant content, incl. unnecessary repetition of ideas
- Development of ideas:
  - depth of ideas (explaining in detail to show understanding, e.g. using causal chains)
  - ideas supported using evidence, i.e. explanations, examples, and/or data when appropriate
- (Mechanics of) Referencing skills:
  - correct formatting of references (incl. alphabetical order)
  - matching citations and reference list
  - accuracy of citation formatting (incl. family names and punctuation)
  - acknowledgement of sources

#### Reading list:

- a minimum of 4 sources.
- all the sources must come from the IWA Reading List

#### Word Count:

- 800 words (+/-10%)

**NUMBER OF SOURCES:** a student receives **an automatic mark of 3 for TF** if they do not use the minimum number of sources. This is separate from any other penalties that may be applied.

**<u>PENALTIES:</u>** the <u>**overall**</u> TF grade should be dropped **one band** in the following circumstances:

- WORD COUNT: if the essay is above/below the stated word count (800 words +/10%). Note that students MUST write the correct word count in brackets at the
  end of the essay. If they forget to do this, they still drop a band even if their word
  count is within the correct range.
- 2. FORMATTING: if formatting guidelines are glaringly not followed. (This includes essays that still contain tutor annotations from the first draft).
- 3. NUMBER OF SOURCES PER BODY PARAGRAPH: if one body paragraph is based only on one source. <u>However</u>, if <u>both body paragraphs</u> are based on one source each, then **the overall TF grade should be dropped two bands.** Please note that students are required to use min. 2 sources per body paragraph.
- 4. USE OF SOURCES: if there is at least one source outside of the IWA Reading List. If two or more sources are outside of the IWA Reading List, then **the overall TF grade should be dropped two or three bands respectively**.

**Please note OFF-TOPIC:** If a student's work is completely off-topic, then the Module Convenor and Assessment Development Team reserve the right to fail the student's work across all three criteria.

# CONSTRUCT

# Cohesion & Coherence (30%)

- (Organisation of) Introduction & Conclusion:
  - inclusion of introduction and conclusion
  - introduction should include:
    - i) appropriate background information
    - ii) purpose statement, e.g. "this essay will..."
    - iii) overview/roadmap
  - conclusion should include:
    - i) re-statement of the purpose statement
    - ii) summary of key ideas from the main body
    - iii) a final comment on the topic that may be a prediction, a recommendation or other
- (Organisation of) Body Paragraphs:
  - each includes a main idea and corresponding supporting idea(s)
  - identifiable purpose throughout each body paragraph, i.e. the reader can see an overall direction for each body paragraph / a reason for its inclusion
  - appropriate length of paragraphs
- Cohesion:
  - range of cohesive devices e.g. conjunctions (although; whereas; furthermore; consequently) and reference words (these; the latter)\*
  - accuracy of cohesive devices

\*Overuse and underuse of cohesive devices should be penalised in the Cohesion bullet point.

### Coherence:

- logical flow of information across the essay, e.g. logical links between the purpose statement and main ideas
- logical flow of information within the essay, e.g. logical links between main ideas and supporting ideas

### Academic Language (20%)

- Academic register:
  - avoidance of contractions, slang words/colloquialisms, first- and second-person pronouns, emotive words, vague words, phrasal verbs, and direct questions
  - hedging
- Paraphrasing:

A student showing evidence of successful paraphrasing:

- accurately and non-mechanically (with sophistication) presents information in their own appropriately formed academic words
- preserves the original meaning of the paraphrased text

# Please note PLAGIARISM:

If a student's work contains a significant amount of text copied, then the Module Convenor and Assessment Development Team reserve the right to fail the student's work across all three criteria.