

CASA0007 Assessment Criteria for Written Work

	80-100	60-80	40-60	20-40	0-20
Context and Review (10 Marks)	Evidence of extracurricular academic reading, critical thought, and original interpretation.	Demonstration of critical thought, extra-curricular reading, and excellent understanding of literature.	Evidence of extracurricular reading, good understanding, sound referencing.	Limited evidence of extra-curricular reading, inadequate referencing.	Very little evidence of any reading, very poor referencing with items missing.
Research question (10 Marks)	Relevant and meaningful research question. Significant contribution with clear original thought.	An interesting and well thought-out research question with good evidence of original thought.	A fair research question is posed, though with little extension. Limited evidence of original thought. Some questions are irrelevant and could be removed.	The research question is either unclear, flawed, or not properly addressed.	No specific research question. The research topic is very general.
Method (30 Marks)	Methods are selected and executed with excellent insight and innovation. Showing a deep understanding, with only minor or no faults in execution.	Methods are chosen and implemented effectively, showing clear relevance and understanding. Minor errors are present but do not compromise the overall results.	The choice and execution of methods are adequate, meeting basic requirements. Some errors and misinterpretations are evident, reflecting a moderate understanding. The approach is practical but lacks depth.	The selection and execution of methods show shortcomings, with errors affecting outcomes. There is a noticeable lack of thoroughness and insight. The work reflects a basic, but incomplete understanding of necessary methodologies.	Methods are inappropriately chosen and poorly executed, showing significant misunderstanding and neglect. Serious errors impact reliability and validity, indicating minimal effort or comprehension of necessary methodologies.
Discussion (30 Marks)	An outstanding discussion that is comprehensive and insightful, integrating results with broad contexts and relevant studies. Demonstrating a deep reflection on implications. The analysis extends the boundaries of existing knowledge.	A well-considered discussion that connects results to key contexts and studies, showing clear understanding and relevance and reflection on the implications. The discussion contributes to knowledge and understanding in the field.	An adequate discussion that somewhat connects results with relevant contexts, though it is limited in scope and insight. Basic implications are considered. The analysis is correct but lacks innovation or broader perspective.	A superficial discussion with minimal connection to wider contexts or relevant studies. The discussion is simplistic, offering little advancement of knowledge.	A deficient discussion that fails to adequately connect results with any relevant context or literature. Implications are either not addressed or misunderstood. Reflecting a misunderstanding of results.
Structure and Communication (20 Marks)	Excellent write up with only minor faults, highly readable, extremely clear with excellent structure.	Very good academic structure. Clear and logical narrative.	Following correct structure for academic writing. Mostly clear and relevant, but having some topos or grammar errors. Visuals are adequate but contain some problems.	Write up is poor, unstructured, some parts missing, writing needing significant improvement.	Major failure in write up structure with missing parts, very poor readability, not at all clear.