

	Absent (0 to 1.9)	Deficient (2 to 3.9)	Adequate (4 to 5.9)
Presentation (5%) Legibility, length and layout of the essay. Appropriate use of headings and sub headings.	No discernible structure or organisation to the essay.	Very poor structure and organisation to the essay. No headings, but information partly presented in the right order.	Adequate structure and organisation to the essay. Some headings and most information in right order. Work is too short or too long.
Writing Quality (15%) Fluency, spelling and grammar.	Indecipherable.	Very hard to follow with excessive need to rewrite.	Can be read and followed with difficulty. Much need to correct spelling or grammar.
Visual Materials (15%) Use of diagrams, maps, tables etc. These should be labelled, captioned and referenced in the text.	No diagrams, tables etc.	Maybe one diagram, but no caption and not referred to in text. This text is optional.	Insufficient diagrams and tables with sloppy labelling, captioning and referral.
Referencing (5%) Correct, consistent citing and referencing of appropriate range of sources. Including online data resources.	No or wholly inadequate citation and referencing, e.g. only web pages.	Incomplete citing and referencing of sources, e.g. only web pages.	Limited range of sources cited and referenced, with errors and inconsistencies in style and formatting of reference list.
Introduction (5%) Setting out the problem or research question being addressed	No Introduction	Does not get the reader's attention and does not adequately set out the research question.	Attention-getter needs some help and the research question and its relevance are poorly presented.
Coverage and Evidence (25%) Breadth, depth and accuracy of evidence presented. Knowledge of the methodology (pro and cons).	No relevant methodology or evidence is presented.	The essay evidence provides little to no support of the writer's main or key ideas.	The essay has some examples and evidence that somewhat support the main ideas, but no evidence of outside sources.
Discussion (20%) Discussion of the evidence showing critical ability to analyse, synthesise and evaluate, and create new understanding	No evidence of analysis, synthesis or evaluation of the evidence with regard to relevant theory and research. Either no discernible, or seriously flawed academic argument.	Some evidence of analysis, synthesis or evaluation of the evidence with regard to relevant theory and research. Argument is sometimes trivial, confused or flawed	Evidence of limited critical analysis, synthesis and evaluation in some areas, with some lost opportunities or misunderstandings. Argument is let down by occasional confusion or flaws.
Conclusions (10%) Capacity for Synthesis, Quality of summary (building discrete elements to a connected whole)	No conclusions are presented	No restatement of the research question. Inadequate presentation of the main conclusions from the Discussion section are presented but not in a logical and clear order.	Research question restatement needs much help. Some of the main conclusions from the Discussion section are presented but not in a logical and clear order.

Good (6 to 7.9)	Excellent (8 to 9.5)	Outstanding (9.6 to 10)
Clear structure shown by headings but could benefit from subheadings and better compliance to page/word count requirement.	Clear structure shown by headings/subheadings but could more closely match the required page/word count requirement.	Clear structure shown by headings/subheadings and matches the required page/word count requirement.
Mostly easy to read and follow but some need to correct spelling or grammar.	Extremely easy to read and follow but some need to correct spelling or grammar.	Extremely easy to read and follow with no need to correct spelling or grammar.
Range of appropriate diagrams and tables, but some significant errors in labels and/or captions or not referred to in the text. Or insufficient diagrams/tables all labelled and referred to in text.	Range of appropriate diagrams and tables, but some minor errors in labels and/or captions or not referred to in the text.	Range of appropriate (legible) diagrams and tables, all labelled and captioned and referred to in the text.
Inconsistent citing and referencing of sources, but most are indicated.	All sources cited but partly inaccurate referencing of sources	Consistent use of the recommended referencing style and an excellent approach to citing and referencing work overall.
Attention-getter, research question and relevance need some help, but broadly engage the reader.	Successful attention-getter that clearly outlines the research question but not its relevance.	Successful attention-getter that clearly outlines the research question and its relevance.
The presentation has examples and evidence that support the main ideas with evidence of reading a range of sources.	The presentation includes examples and evidence. The examples and evidence provide strong support of the main ideas from a wide range of sources.	The many examples and types of evidence are well chosen from a very wide range of sources and support the main ideas well.
Evidence of a general critical stance, although some material not evaluated Use of a range of appropriate sources, but without critical evaluation, or missing some significant items	Evidence of good critical appreciation and evaluation of relevant theory and research with regard to the topic, and a systematic attempt to relate it to the topic. Argument is sound and substantial, although not original.	Evidence of thorough critical appreciation and evaluation of relevant theory and research with regard to the topic, and a systematic and creative attempt to relate it to the topic. Argument is sound and substantial, with significant elements of originality
Research question restatement needs some help. Most of the main conclusions from the Discussion section are presented but not in a logical and clear order.	Restates research question in a new way and presents all of the main conclusions from the Discussion section are presented but not in a logical and clear order.	Restates research question in a new way and presents all of the main conclusions from the Discussion section in a logical and clear order.