Rubric

Task: Briefing Paper (50marks) Late Penalty (2.5marks/day)

CRITERION	HD 80-100%	D 70-79%	C 60-69%	P 50-59%	NN 0-50%
Research (10 Marks):	Includes significantly more than the required number of sources and shows discernment in choosing appropriate research sources. Well-justified and evidence-based paper that show a sophisticated understanding of potential impacts, ethical considerations, and stakeholder perspectives.	Includes more than the required number of sources and shows some discernment in choosing appropriate research sources. Evidence-based paper with a clear understanding of potential impacts and ethical considerations.	Includes more than the required number of sources but there are major gaps in the chosen research sources. Evidence is present but may lack depth or clarity in terms of justification of potential impacts and ethical considerations.	Paper uses the minimum number of peer review sources and policy documents. Basic evidence is present but lacking in-depth justification or evidence.	Paper does not have a minimum of 5 peer review journal articles and 2 policy documents OR Paper uses the minimum number of peer review sources and policy documents BUT included papers are not relevant to topic. Evidence is missing, unsupported or significantly flawed.
	(8-10 Marks)	(7 Marks)	(6 Marks)	(5 Marks)	(0-4 Marks)
Analysis (15 Marks)	Articulates a sophisticated understanding of the topic and insightful analysis of key literature and policy including strengths, weaknesses, and broader implications for the research.	Demonstrates a solid understanding of the topic and clear identification and analysis of policies, highlighting their limitations effectively.	Demonstrates an adequate understanding of the topic is adequate but may lack depth or critical analysis. Identification is accurate, and limitations are addressed, but the analysis may lack depth.	Demonstrates an adequate understanding of the topic but without meaningful analysis. Identification of policies is present but may lack detail or accuracy.	Paper incomplete, or irrelevant. Identification and analysis of literature and or policies are missing or significantly flawed.
	(14-15 Marks)	(12-13 Marks)	(9-11 Marks)	(7.5-9 Marks)	(0-7 Marks)
Professional Conduct (10 Marks)	Exemplary demonstration of academic integrity. Briefing paper is rigorously researched, well-cited, and entirely free from AI use. Active and consistent participation in class	Strong adherence to academic integrity principles. Briefing paper is well-researched and avoids AI use. Consistent participation in class, demonstrating a good	Briefing paper shows adequate research effort but may have minor citation issues but entirely free from AI use. Participates in class discussions, but	Briefing paper lacks sufficient research but avoids AI use. Participation in class is inconsistent and demonstrates a	Briefing paper demonstrates serious academic misconduct or heavy reliance on AI. Minimal or no participation in class, with

	discussions and activities, demonstrating a high level of engagement with course content.	understanding of course material.	engagement with course content could be deeper.	limited understanding of course material.	a clear lack of engagement with course content.
	(8-10 Marks)	(7 Marks)	(6 Marks)	(5 Marks)	(0-4 Marks)
Academic Writing: (5 Marks)	A well-structured and comprehensive qualitative research project that focuses on a specific and highly relevant community services challenge in Australia. Demonstrates an advanced level of academic writing. Exceptionally well-organized, clear, and concise. Including the use of advanced paraphrasing skills. i.e. use of direct quotes is minimal but insightful. Paper is between 2000-2200 words, but additional words significantly enhance overall argument.	A well-chosen qualitative research project that is clearly relevant to community services in Australia. Demonstrates a high level of academic writing. Writing is clear and concise. Paraphrasing is of a high standard but may still overuse direct quotes. Paper is between 2000-2200 words, but additional words do not always enhance overall argument.	Qualitative research project is relevant to community services in Australia, though lacking some depth or specificity. Organization is acceptable, but there may be minor issues with clarity or conciseness. Paraphrasing is adequate but overuses a single author OR overuses direct quotes. Paper is between 2000-2200 words, but additional words do not enhance overall argument.	Qualitative research project is relevant to community services in Australia but needs further clarification or more specific focus. Research has some noticeable gaps or inconsistencies. Some organisational issues may lack some key elements or lack of clarity in academic writing. Genuine attempt to paraphrase but overuses a single author AND direct quotes. Paper is 2000 words.	Project does not relate to community services in Australia. Research is missing components or significantly flawed. Academic writing demonstrates poor organisation and lack of clarity that significantly alters readability or meaning. Paper is less than 2000 words (excluding reference list).
	(5 Marks)	(4 Marks)	(3 Marks)	(2.5 Marks)	(0-2 Marks)
Referencing, formatting and presentation (10 Marks)	Strict adherence to formatting and referencing guidelines and instructions, meeting all specified requirements with precision.	Adheres well to formatting and referencing guidelines and instructions, with only minor deviations.	Generally, follows formatting and referencing guidelines and instructions but may have some notable deviations.	Follows formatting and referencing guidelines to a basic extent but with significant deviations or omissions.	Fails to follow formatting and referencing guidelines and instructions.
	(8-10 Marks)	(7 Marks)	(6 Marks)	(5 Marks)	(0-4 Marks)