

CASA0007 Assessment Criteria for Written Work (2021)

	19-20	17-18	15-16	12-14	10-11	7-9	4-6	2-3	0-1
Context and Review (20 Marks)	Evidence of considerable extra-curricular reading with original interpretation.	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.	Some evidence of extra-curricular reading understanding of literature, adequate referencing.	Limited evidence of extra-curricular reading, inadequate referencing.	Little evidence of reading, poor or sloppy referencing.	Very little evidence of any reading, very poor referencing with items missing.	No evidence of any reading and no referencing (or almost no referencing).
Structure and Communication (20 Marks)	Excellent write up both in terms of readability, clarity and structure, with faultless presentation of data.	Excellent write up with only minor faults, highly readable, extremely clear with excellent structure.	Very good academic structure. Clear & logical narrative. Good presentation of data.	Conforms well to correct structure for academic writing. Mostly clear & relevant. May have errors in presentation of data.	Broadly conforms to the correct structure for academic writing. May lack clarity/focus/relevance in places.	Failure to fully conform to correct structure, with important omissions. Perhaps not fully coherent/not fully relevant/rushed.	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.	Write up substantially absent, incomprehensible or wrong.
Ambition (20 Marks)	Extraordinarily ambitious and unquestionably original. Making an undeniable contribution to existing research.	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.	A basic research question is posed and addressed, with no extension.	The research question is either unclear, flawed or not properly addressed.	No clear or explicit research question or aims to support the work.	Actual goals very few or not apparent.	No possible contribution. No concrete goals or focus.
Accuracy (20 Marks)	Faultless execution, exemplary analysis with entirely appropriate methods.	Only very minor faults in execution or depth of understanding.	At most, some minor faults in execution or understanding.	Demonstration of good familiarity with techniques used although possibly some errors made.	Mostly demonstrates understanding of techniques used, but with occasional errors of judgement.	Some serious flaws in understanding methods and techniques used.	Topic has not been handled at all well, lack of understanding of techniques used.	All aspects of the topic have been handled badly, with no understanding or confusion of techniques used.	No evidence of understanding, perhaps some mention of relevant terms.
Technical Difficulty (20 Marks)	Challenging goals, elegant and impressive technical content.	Challenging goals, and substantial technical content.	Challenging approach, difficult twists required to achieve a result.	Project throws up some challenges.	Relatively easy goals. No attempt to do anything more than reproduce existing examples.	Unchallenging project. Perhaps existing examples are just copied without thought.	Completely undemanding project.	Technical content is very limited or very poorly handled.	Virtually no technical content whatsoever.