

| | Task Fulfilment (50%) | Cohesion & Coherence (30%) | Academic Language (20%) |
|--------|--|---|--|
| 10 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Question answered comprehensively, with no irrelevant content; a clear line of argument supporting the stance throughout. A sophisticated response• Ideas fully developed using appropriate evidence; understanding fully apparent• Exemplary referencing skills:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- reference list is entirely accurately formatted- reference list matches citations- citation formatting is entirely accurate- information from sources is acknowledged when appropriate* | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Highly effective introduction and conclusion, with all required elements present• Highly effective body paragraph organisation. No structural issues• Highly effective use of cohesive devices which supports the flow of information• An uninterrupted logical flow through the entire essay | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Academic register used throughout• Successful and non-mechanical paraphrasing throughout |
| 9 | Shared features of 8 & 10 | Shared features of 8 & 10 | Shared features of 8 & 10 |
| 8 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Question answered well, with no irrelevant content; a clear line of argument supporting the stance throughout• Ideas well-developed using appropriate evidence; may show minor misunderstanding in a few spots• Strong referencing skills:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- reference list is accurately formatted with occasional slips- reference list matches citations- citation formatting is mostly accurate- information from sources is acknowledged when appropriate* | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Effective introduction and conclusion, with all required elements present• Effective body paragraph organisation. Body paragraphs may have minor structural issues• Effective use of cohesive devices which supports the flow of information with occasional slips• A mostly uninterrupted logical flow through the entire essay | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Academic register used, with only occasional lapses in style and appropriacy• Mostly successful and non-mechanical paraphrasing. May contain one short chunk but no long chunks |
| 7 | Shared features of 6 & above | Shared features of 6 & above | Shared features of 6 & above |
| 6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Question answered reasonably well; may have a small amount of irrelevance; a line of argument supporting the stance all or most of the time• Ideas reasonably well-developed using evidence, but one or two ideas lack depth; may show some misunderstanding• Good referencing skills:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- reference list is accurately formatted with some slips- reference list does not match citations on one occasion- citation formatting has some inaccuracies- information from sources may not be acknowledged on one or two occasions* | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mostly effective introduction and conclusion, although background information and/or summary and/or final comment is somewhat simplistic• Mostly effective body paragraph organisation. Body paragraphs have some structural issues• Mostly effective use of cohesive devices which generally supports the flow of information, but there may be some overuse, underuse, repetitive use and/or incorrect use• A logical flow through much of the essay | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Academic register used, with some lapses in style• Often successful but somewhat mechanical paraphrasing. May contain two short chunks but no long chunks |
| 5 | Shared features of 4 & above | Shared features of 4 & above | Shared features of 4 & above |
| 4 PASS | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Question answered adequately; may have some irrelevance; a recognisable line of argument supporting the stance some of the time• Ideas adequately developed using evidence, but lack depth; may show more frequent misunderstanding• Evidence of referencing skills:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- reference list has frequent formatting issues- reference list does not match citations on two occasions- citation formatting has frequent inaccuracies- information from sources may not be acknowledged on three occasions* | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Adequate introduction and conclusion. One or both have structural issues or conclusion is missing re-statement of the thesis statement, summary or final comment• Adequate body paragraph organisation. Body paragraphs have structural issues, but the reader can still identify each paragraph’s purpose• Adequate use of cohesive devices, but these may sometimes not support the flow of information. There may be more frequent overuse, underuse, repetitive use and/or incorrect use• A logical flow through some parts of the essay | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Academic register is attempted, but lapses in style are frequent• Attempts paraphrasing, but frequently mechanical. May contain three short chunks and/or one long chunk |
| 3 FAIL | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Question not answered adequately; may have substantial irrelevance; barely recognisable or no stance• Ideas not adequately developed, with a lack of appropriate evidence; may show more extensive misunderstanding• Insufficient evidence of referencing skills:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- reference list has extensive formatting issues- reference list does not match citations on three occasions- citation formatting has extensive inaccuracies- information from sources may not be acknowledged on four or more occasions* | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Inadequate introduction and/or conclusion. One or both are poorly structured and/or introduction is missing the thesis statement• Inadequate body paragraph organisation. One or more have structural issues impacting reader’s ability to identify paragraph’s purpose• Use of cohesive devices is frequently misleading and does not support the flow of information. There is a large amount of overuse, underuse, repetitive use and/or incorrect use• A lack of logical flow through much of the essay | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Academic register rarely attempted or unsuccessful• Very little attempt made to paraphrase, with four short chunks and/or two long chunks |
| 2 | Shared features of 1 & above | Shared features of 1 & above | Shared features of 1 & above |
| 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Question not answered; an irrelevant response• Ideas barely or not at all developed, with a severe lack of appropriate evidence; little evidence of understanding• Little evidence of referencing skills:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- there is no reference list- reference list does not match citations on four or more occasions- there are no citations- information from sources is barely acknowledged, if at all | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Indistinguishable or missing introduction and/or conclusion• Indistinguishable or missing body paragraph(s)• Use of cohesive devices is limited and/or mostly inaccurate• A severe breakdown in logical flow through much of the essay | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Academic register is not attempted: hardly any evidence of taught skills• (Almost) no attempt to paraphrase. Extensive copying from the source(s) |
| 0 | • No submission | | |

*Please apply **the principle of charity** when judging whether a student should have acknowledged a source. If you are saying to yourself, ‘this information clearly comes from a source - there really should be a citation here’, consider this as an occasion where information from sources has not been acknowledged. If, however, you are not feeling confident that a citation is required, this may be a sign that you should give the student the benefit of the doubt.

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.

| CONSTRUCT | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|----------|---|-------------|---|------------|--|
| Task Fulfilment (50%) | Cohesion & Coherence (30%) | Academic Language (20%) | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Task response<ul style="list-style-type: none">provides an appropriate answer to the taskaddresses all elements of the taskavoids irrelevant content, incl. unnecessary repetition of ideas/paddingDevelopment of ideas<ul style="list-style-type: none">depth of ideas (explaining in detail to show understanding)ideas supported using evidence, i.e. explanations, examples, and/or data as appropriateavoiding misunderstanding of source information(Mechanics of) Referencing skills<ul style="list-style-type: none">correct formatting of references (incl. alphabetical order)matching citations and reference listaccuracy of citation formatting (incl. family names and punctuation)acknowledgement of sources <div></div> <div>ESACa source requirements<ul style="list-style-type: none">a minimum of 7 sources overalla minimum of 5 must come from the IWA Reading Lista minimum of 2 must be self-selected</div> <div>ESACb source requirements<ul style="list-style-type: none">a minimum of 7 sources overalla minimum of 3 must come from the IWA Reading Lista minimum of 4 must be self-selected</div> <div>Word Count for ESACa and ESACb 1500 words (+/-10%)</div> <div></div> <div>PENALTIES The overall TF grade should be dropped one band in the following circumstances: 1. WORD COUNT: if the essay is above/below the stated word count (1500 words +/- 10%). Note that students MUST write the correct word count 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>more than one body paragraph</u> is based on one source, 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 (READING LIST): if a student does not use the minimum number of sources from the IWA Reading List. 5. USE OF SOURCES (SELF-SELECTED): if a student does not use the minimum number of self-selected sources.</div> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">(Organisation of) Introduction & Conclusion<ul style="list-style-type: none">inclusion of introduction and conclusionintroduction should include:<ul style="list-style-type: none">appropriate background informationthesis statement, e.g. "this essay will..."overview/outline/roadmapconclusion should include:<ul style="list-style-type: none">re-statement of the thesis statementsummary of key ideas from the main bodya final comment on the topic that may be a prediction, a recommendation or other(Organisation of) Body Paragraphs<ul style="list-style-type: none">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 inclusionappropriate length of paragraphsCohesion<ul style="list-style-type: none">range of cohesive devices e.g. conjunctions (although; whereas; but; so), conjunctive adverbs (furthermore; however; therefore) and reference words (these; the latter)accuracy of cohesive devicesappropriacy of cohesive devices: avoiding overuse, underuse, or repetitive useCoherence<ul style="list-style-type: none">logical flow of information across the essay, e.g. logical links between the thesis statement and main ideaslogical flow of information within the essay*, e.g. logical links between main ideas and supporting ideas <div>* Logical flow of information can be supported using a range of techniques, e.g. general to specific, abstract to concrete, given/old to new (some techniques may be module-specific)</div> <div>Please note OFF-TOPIC If a student’s work is completely off-topic, flag the script with the Module Convenor and Assessment Development Team, who reserve the right to fail the student’s work across all three criteria. Please note MISAPPROPRIATION The Module Convenor and Assessment Development Team reserve the right to fail a student’s work for TF if the student misrepresents/misappropriates information from the source(s). Misrepresentation/Misappropriation of sources refers to a situation when a student attributes an idea to a source which does not mention it. If you suspect misappropriation, flag the script for second/third marking with the comment ‘suspected misappropriation’.</div> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Academic register<ul style="list-style-type: none">avoidance of contractions, slang words/colloquialisms, first- and second-person pronouns, emotive words, vague words, phrasal verbs, and direct questionshedgingappropriacy of language choice, e.g. concision, precision, use of technical language only when requiredParaphrasing A student showing evidence of successful paraphrasing:<ul style="list-style-type: none">accurately and non-mechanically (with sophistication) presents information in their own appropriately formed academic wordspreserves the original meaning of the paraphrased text <table><tr><td>No issue</td><td>below 11 words of continuous text copied from the source text</td></tr><tr><td>Short chunk</td><td>around 11-20 words of continuous text copied from the source text</td></tr><tr><td>Long chunk</td><td>around 21 words or more of continuous text copied from the source text</td></tr></table> <div></div> <div>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.</div> | No issue | below 11 words of continuous text copied from the source text | Short chunk | around 11-20 words of continuous text copied from the source text | Long chunk | around 21 words or more of continuous text copied from the source text |
| No issue | below 11 words of continuous text copied from the source text | | | | | | | |
| Short chunk | around 11-20 words of continuous text copied from the source text | | | | | | | |
| Long chunk | around 21 words or more of continuous text copied from the source text | | | | | | | |

IMPORTANT:
ESAC IWA Descriptors are not a standalone tool. To ensure their accurate use, markers are expected to go through the relevant rater training e.g. familiarisation with how to navigate the descriptors and active participation in standardisation and moderation involving marking and discussing anchor papers.