SMMSN PGT Rubric List 2018

Guidance for rubric use

When choosing and using a rubric for marking an assignment, please take consideration of the following:

- The rubrics have been designed to standardise marking of the most commonly used types of assessment. However, not every assessment needs to be marked using a rubric. If none of the existing rubrics fit your assessment, you should use your own marking scheme.

- Within SMMSN PGT the term rubric refers to one of the approved rubrics given here. Anything else is referred to as a marking scheme.

- Some specific elements of the descriptions in the rubric criteria may not be applicable to your assignment so markers should use their discretion. Markers may need additional guidance on the specifics of the assignment.

- The rubrics here should not be altered, and should be used as presented.

- When choosing a rubric you should consider the intended learning outcomes (ILOs) of your course. Students should not be assessed against criteria that are not part of approved ILOs.

- Markers must be made aware of this rubric guidance and should mark in the context of the level of student i.e. 'excellent' should be read as 'excellent for a student at X stage' and material should not be marked against a level equivalent to staff output.

- As per university policy, markers should mark to the middle of band initially then adjust up or down accordingly.

- The feedback that students value the most is individual written feedback. This should be provided in addition to the rubric mark. Good practice is to identify what students could have done to achieve a higher mark.

Rubric List

Case Study Rubric

Assessment Criteria	%	Very Poor (G3-G1)	Poor (F3-F1)	Weak (E3-E1)	Pass (D3-D1)	Good (C3-C1)	Very Good (B3-B1)	Excellent (A5-A1)
Understanding	30	Token or no submission	Does not address the case study question correctly or effectively. Topic not covered in depth or detail. Very poor understanding and analysis	Case study question and scope is poorly covered; very little depth or detail. Inadequate demonstration of understanding and analysis.	Case study scope covered with some depth and detail, possibly some issues. Satisfactory demonstration of understanding and analysis.	Possibly some issues with scope/content, but generally good understanding. The case study is covered well, with good depth and detail. Good synthesis of information providing a good analysis.	The case study is covered well, with very good depth and detail. Demonstrates very good understanding. Information utilized effectively to compose very good analytical work.	The case study is covered in great depth and detail. Demonstrates excellent understanding, and utilisation of resources, culminating in a high standard of analysis.
Using an evidence base	30	Token or no submission	Very little evidence of background research and integration into analysis. Little or no literature referenced. References poorly or improperly executed. Many unreliable sources or websites referenced.	Little evidence of background research and integration into analysis. Limited suitable references and literature. Referencing methods not up to standard. Some references not from reliable sources.	Satisfactory evidence of background research and integration into analysis. Some suitable literature but some unreliable sources. Referencing mostly at standard.	Good evidence of background research and integration into analysis. Relevant literature clearly referenced. Sources are reliable with some inconsistencies. Correctly referenced to standards with minor mistakes.	Very good evidence of background research and integration into analysis. Many literature sources referenced. Almost all literature suitable, and reliably sourced. Sources correctly referenced to standards.	Excellent evidence of background research, wide range of literature from reliable sources, Excellent integration into analysis and application to arguments. Excellent overall referencing technique.
Critical Analysis	30	Token or no submission	Does not address case study question or provide critical insight Viewpoint poorly expressed or not at all. Arguments not made/weak.	Addresses case study content and arguments made, but does not provide critical insight/synthesis of evidence. Viewpoint weakly expressed.	Addresses case study question and provides some critical thought, and synthesis of evidence. Viewpoint suitably expressed.	There is a clear attempt to critically discuss the subject, synthesis of argument with suitable evidence. Good expression of viewpoint.	Provides very good critical evaluation and synthesis of the key points and arguments. Good reflective ability. Viewpoint expressed very well.	Provides excellent and insightful critical evaluation and synthesis of the evidence/arguments and key points. Excellent reflective writing with clearly expressed viewpoint.
Structure	5	Token or no submission	Very poor organisation and structure. Illegible. Unclear. Lots of uninformative rambling. Very poor flow and readability.	Poor organisation and structure. Not a very logical structure, unclear. Under-developed sections. Poor spelling. Some pointless rambling. Poor flow and readability.	Satisfactory organisation and structure. Generally logical structure, some inconsistencies. Generally clear but lacking clarity at points. Satisfactory readability.	Good organisation and structure. Logical structure. All sections required present and mostly developed, clear and neat. Good flow and readability. Few mistakes.	Very good organisation and structure. All sections well developed and present. Very neat and logical structure. Legible. Very good flow and readability.	Excellent organisation and structure. Highly logical and thought out structure with all required sections. Highly clear, and legible. Excellent flow and readability.
Referencing, Spelling & Grammar	5	Token or no submission	Referencing poor. Many errors in spelling and/or grammar. Exceeded/well below word limit.	Referencing could be improved. Some errors in spelling and/or grammar. Did not keep to word limit.	Referencing satisfactory. Few errors in spelling and/or grammar. Largely kept to word limit.	Referencing good. Minor errors in spelling and/or grammar. Kept to word limit.	Referencing very good. Occasional errors in spelling and/or grammar. Kept to word limit.	Referenced to a professional standard. No errors in spelling and/or grammar. Kept to word limit.

Essay Rubric

Assessment Criteria	%	Very Poor (G3-G1)	Poor (F3-F1)	Weak (E3-E1)	Pass (D3-D1)	Good (C3-C1)	Very Good (B3-B1)	Excellent (A5-A1)
Critical Analysis & Synthesis	25	Token or no submission	Essay does not address essay topic/questions. No evidence of critical thought or synthesis of evidence. Viewpoint poorly expressed or not at all.	Some attempt to address essay topic/question. Little evidence of critical thought or synthesis of evidence. Viewpoint weakly expressed.	Addresses most aspects of essay topic/question to satisfactory level. Limited evidence of critical thought, and synthesis of evidence. Viewpoint suitably expressed.	Addresses most aspects of essay topic/question clearly. Some evidence of critical thought and synthesis of evidence. Viewpoint expressed well.	Addresses all aspects of essay topic/question clearly. Clear evidence of critical thought and synthesis of evidence. Viewpoint expressed very well.	Addresses all aspects of essay topic/question clearly and to a high standard. Clear evidence of insightful critical thought and excellent synthesis of evidence. Viewpoint expressed extremely well.
Understanding & Originality	25	Token or no submission	Lack of originality and understanding. Arguments illogical or unclear throughout. Poor integration of literature into essay content.	Limited originality and understanding. Arguments illogical or not clearly expressed in places. Limited integration of literature into essay content.	Satisfactory originality and understanding. Arguments mostly logical. Some integration of literature into essay content.	Good originality and understanding. Arguments logical and relatively clearly expressed. Good integration of literature into essay content.	Very good originality and understanding. Arguments logical and clearly expressed. Very good integration of literature into essay content.	Excellent originality and understanding. Arguments highly logical and expressed extremely well. Excellent integration of literature into essay content.
Depth & Detail	25	Token or no submission	Insufficient depth and detail. Very little evidence of relevant background research. Few, if any suitable references and examples.	Limited depth or detail. Limited evidence of relevant background research. Some suitable references and examples.	Satisfactory depth and detail. Some evidence of relevant background research. Some suitable references and examples.	Good depth and detail. Evidence of relevant background research. Suitable references and examples.	Very good depth and detail. Clear evidence of lots of relevant background research. Many relevant references and examples given.	Excellent depth and detail. Clear evidence of extensive background research. All references and examples given high relevant.
Organisation, Structure & Style	20	Token or no submission	Poor organisation and structure. Poor style, flow and coherence.	Unsatisfactory organisation and structure. Weak style, flow and coherence.	Satisfactory organisation and structure. Satisfactory style, flow and coherence.	Good organisation and structure. Good style, flow and coherence.	Very good organisation and structure. Very good style, flow and coherence.	Excellent organisation and structure. Excellent style, flow and coherence.
Referencing, Spelling & Grammar	5	Token or no submission	Referencing poor. Many errors in spelling and/or grammar. Exceeded/well below word limit.	Referencing could be improved. Some errors in spelling and/or grammar. Did not keep to word limit.	Referencing satisfactory. Few errors in spelling and/or grammar. Largely kept to word limit.	Referencing good. Minor errors in spelling and/or grammar. Kept to word limit.	Referencing very good. Occasional errors in spelling and/or grammar. Kept to word limit.	Referenced to a professional standard. No errors in spelling and/or grammar. Kept to word limit.

Lab-based Practical Report Rubric

Assessment Criteria	%	Very Poor (G3-G1)	Poor (F3-F1)	Weak (E3-E1)	Pass (D3-D1)	Good (C3-C1)	Very Good (B3-B1)	Excellent (A5-A1)
Context	15	Token or no submission	Insufficient depth and detail. Very little background.	Limited depth or detail. Limited background with no logical reason for practical.	Satisfactory depth and detail. Some background relating to practical's purpose but reason for practical not clear.	Good depth and detail. Enough background presented to suggest reason for practical.	Very good depth and detail. Reason for practical logically follows from background given.	Excellent depth and detail. All background information relevant to reason for practical.
Aims	5	Token or no submission	No obvious aims listed.	Aims suggested but not clear to reader.	Statement of aims included.	Aims clearly outlined and mostly logical based on background.	Aims clearly outlined and logical. Minimal but possible queries over logic.	Clear, obvious statement of aims following logically from background.
Methods	15	Token or no submission	Could not carry out experiment based on the information provided.	Could make some attempt to carry out experiment from these instructions but mistakes likely.	Instructions could be followed to reach correct end-point, but some information is irrelevant or confusing	Good description of methods used. Clear and mostly concise. Some irrelevant detail but would not cause mistakes if followed.	Very good level of instruction provided. Minimal irrelevant information included. Easy to follow.	Clear, concise, and relevant. No questions over whether experiment could be reproduced from instructions.
Data presentation	20	Token or no submission	Results shown but cannot be followed in any way.	Results presented but text and data cannot stand apart to be interpreted.	Results are clear and labelled correctly. Data and text can stand apart.	Good and clear presentation of results. Data integrated into text. Some improvement possible but mistakes do not detract from meaning.	Very good. Results are clear and logically presented. Very good integration of data into text. Minor improvements possible.	Excellent. Results clearly logical based on aims and methods. Excellent integration of data into text.
Interpretation	30	Token or no submission	No attempt to evaluate the data.	Some attempt made to evaluate data but not related to original aims.	Data interpreted and linked back to original aims of practical.	Data evaluated and compared to aims of practical. Good attempt to critique practical.	Very good interpretation of data and aims answered. Minor improvements required in critically evaluating practical.	Excellent interpretation of data and reference to aims. All key points covered relating to critical evaluation of practical.
Structure	10	Token or no submission	No logical structure to report. Confusing to reader.	Some attempt made to present the information in a logical order but reader frequently has to refer to earlier or later information.	Information generally presented in a logical order. Some occasions where reader might have to cross-reference.	Good flow to report. Thought clearly given to the order that information was presented but some improvements possible.	Very good logical flow to report. Minimal suggestions made to improve the structure.	Excellent structure and logical flow in report. Arguments all presented in corect order.
Referencing, Spelling & Grammar	5	Token or no submission	Referencing poor. Many errors in spelling and/or grammar. Exceeded/well below word limit.	Referencing could be improved. Some errors in spelling and/or grammar. Did not keep to word limit.	Referencing satisfactory. Few errors in spelling and/or grammar. Largely kept to word limit.	Referencing good. Minor errors in spelling and/or grammar. Kept to word limit.	Referencing very good. Occasional errors in spelling and/or grammar. Kept to word limit.	Referenced to a professional standard. No errors in spelling and/or grammar. Kept to word limit.

Literature Review Rubric

Assessment Criteria	%	Very Poor (G3-G1)	Poor (F3-F1)	Weak (E3-E1)	Pass (D3-D1)	Good (C3-C1)	Very Good (B3-B1)	Excellent (A5-A1)
Context	15	Token or no submission	Insufficient depth and detail. Very little evidence to justify review.	Limited depth or detail. Limited evidence to justify review.	Satisfactory depth and detail. Some evidence to justify review.	Good depth and detail. Evidence of research to justify the review.	Very good depth and detail. Clear evidence and justification of review.	Excellent depth and detail. No question as to why review should be carried out.
Content	25	Token or no submission	Few, if any suitable references and examples. Many unreliable sources.	Some suitable references and examples. Some references not from reliable sources.	Some suitable references and examples. Most references from reliable sources.	Suitable references and examples. Sources are reliable.	Many relevant references and examples given. Almost all literature from reliable sources.	All references and examples given highly relevant. All literature from reliable sources.
Evaluation	25	Token or no submission	No comparison between literature sources.	Some comparison of findings from literature but mostly just listing results.	Findings from different sources are compared in most cases.	Good level of comparison between sources. Similarities and contradictions highlighted.	Very good level of comparison between sources. Some suggestion as to why differences occurred.	Excellent comparison of literature sources. Like findings grouped and contradictory reports suggested with discussion as to why this might be.
Conclusion	15	Token or no submission	No obvious hypothesis suggested	Some suggestion of a hypothesis but not clearly stated.	Obvious statement that concludes the review and suggests future work.	Clear statement concluding the review with valid hypothesis suggested.	Clear statement concluding the review with valid and novel hypothesis suggested.	Clear statement concluding the review with valid and novel hypothesis suggested, and substantiated by evidence presented.
Structure	15	Token or no submission	Little or no thought given to the logical way to present the information or how it is structured for the reader.	Small amount of thought applied to the order of the information presented but lack of logic clearly detracts from content.	Information presented with some logical order but often the reader has to go back and forth to understand the writing.	Good organisation. Mostly the order of information presented is logical but could be improved.	Very good organisation. Minor improvements could be made to make reading easier.	Excellent organisation of the literature presented. Logical flow.
Referencing, Spelling & Grammar	5	Token or no submission	Referencing poor. Many errors in spelling and/or grammar. Exceeded/well below word limit.	Referencing could be improved. Some errors in spelling and/or grammar. Did not keep to word limit.	Referencing satisfactory. Few errors in spelling and/or grammar. Largely kept to word limit.	Referencing good. Minor errors in spelling and/or grammar. Kept to word limit.	Referencing very good. Occasional errors in spelling and/or grammar. Kept to word limit.	Referenced to a professional standard. No errors in spelling and/or grammar. Kept to word limit.

Oral Presentation – Conference Style Rubric

Assessment Criteria	%	Very Poor (G3-G1)	Poor (F3-F1)	Weak (E3-E1)	Pass (D3-D1)	Good (C3-C1)	Very Good (B3-B1)	Excellent (A5-A1)
Context	10	Token or no presentation	Poor explanation of motivation for study. Poor or incorrect summary of background information. No evidence of relevant reading / appropriate sources.	Weak explanation of motivation for study. One- sided or incomplete summary of background information. Little evidence of relevant reading/ appropriate sources.	Suitable explanation of motivation for study. Satisfactory summary of relevant background information. Some evidence of relevant reading/ appropriate sources.	Good explanation of motivation for study. Good summary of relevant background information. Evidence of relevant reading / appropriate sources.	Very good explanation of motivation for study. Very good summary of relevant background information. Clear evidence of relevant reading / appropriate sources.	Excellent explanation of motivation for study. Excellent summary of relevant background information sources. Clear evidence of wide and relevant reading / appropriate sources.
Content	30	Token or no presentation	Lots of irrelevant or inappropriate content. Poor coverage and explanation of design/methods/data / analysis / results. Insufficient or excessive level of detail throughout. Poor coverage of the topic and most aspects not covered.	Some irrelevant or inappropriate content. Limited coverage and explanation of methods/data/design / analysis / results. Insufficient or excessive level of detail in most places. Weak coverage of the topic and many aspects not adequately covered.	Mostly relevant and appropriate content. Satisfactory coverage and explanation of methods/data /design / analysis / results. Reasonable level of detail in most places. Satisfactory coverage of the topic and most aspects covered adequately.	Relevant and appropriate content. Good coverage of methods/data/design/analysis / results. Appropriate level of detail in most places. Good coverage of the topic and most aspects covered.	Very relevant and appropriate content. Very good coverage of methods/data/design/analysis/results. Appropriate level of detail throughout. Very good coverage of the topic and virtually all aspects covered.	Interesting, highly relevant and appropriate content. Excellent explanation of methods/data/design/analysis /results. Ideal level of detail throughout. Excellent coverage of the topic and all aspects covered.
Understanding	20	Token or no presentation	Poor understanding of topic/content/meaning. Unable to answer questions.	Limited understanding of topic/content/meaning. Weak answers to questions.	Satisfactory understanding of topic/content/meaning. Satisfactory answers to most questions.	Good understanding of topic/content/meaning. Good answers to questions.	Very good understanding of topic/content/meaning. Very good answers to questions.	Excellent understanding of topic/content/meaning. Excellent answers to questions.
Structure & Timing	20	Token or no presentation	No clear structure, random and messy. Little attempt to adhere to prescribed format. Substantially over/under time limit.	Unsatisfactory structure with very little/no linkages between sections. Some attempt to adhere to prescribed format. Went over/under time limit.	Satisfactory structure with some effort to make linkages between sections. Largely adheres to prescribed format. May have gone slightly over/under time limit, but acceptable.	Good structure with clear linkages between most sections. Adheres to prescribed format. Awareness of time limit, kept roughly to time limit.	Very good structure with clear linkages between sections. Adheres to prescribed format. Awareness of time limit, clearly designed presentation with time limit in mind, kept to time limit.	Excellent structure with very clear linkages between all sections. Adheres completely to prescribed format. Kept perfectly to time limit, clearly designed presentation with time limit in mind whilst losing no communication of information.
Presentation Skills	10	Token or no presentation	Poor delivery. Tempo completely inappropriate. Inaudible or jumbled speech. Language use completely unsuitable for audience. No attempt to engage audience or to use eye contact.	Weak delivery. Much too fast or slow. Inaudible in places. Language use inappropriate for audience. Unsatisfactory eye contact /little attempt to engage audience.	Satisfactory delivery. Too fast or slow in places. Mostly audible. Language use mostly adequate for audience. Some eye contact with audience.	Good delivery. Appropriate tempo, not too fast or slow. Audible. Language use appropriate for audience. Satisfactory eye contact with audience.	Very good delivery. Good tempo. Interesting and energetic delivery of content. Clear speech. Language use well suited for audience. Very good eye contact and engagement with audience.	Excellent delivery. Excellent tempo. Interesting, energetic and stimulating delivery, maintaining audience interest throughout. Very clear speech with varied tone. Language use perfectly suited for audience. Excellent eye contact and engagement with audience.
Slides/ Supportive material	10	Token or no presentation	Poor slides. Very little apparent effort put into appearance. If slides present – too few/uninformative/ boring. Amount of text / font size completely inappropriate. No suitable images which support presentation.	Weak slides. Little apparent effort put into appearance. Far too much text throughout / font size illegible. Few suitable images which support presentation.	Satisfactory slides. Some evidence of effort put into appearance. Too much text throughout. Font size too small. Suitable composition. Some suitable images which support the presentation.	Good slides. Clear effort put into appearance. About the right amount of text but too much in places. Font size about right / mostly legible. Good composition. Good choice of images which support the presentation.	Very good slides. Lots of effort put into the appearance. Appropriate amount of text. Font size good / legible. Very good composition. Very good choice of images which support the presentation. Clean and organised look.	Excellent slides. Obviously a lot of effort put into appearance. Ideal amount of text. Font size excellent / legible. Excellent composition. An excellent range of relevant supporting images. Professional look to the slides.

Oral Presentation – General Rubric

Assessment Criteria	%	Very Poor (G3-G1)	Poor (F3-F1)	Weak (E3-E1)	Pass (D3-D1)	Good (C3-C1)	Very Good (B3-B1)	Excellent (A5-A1)
Content	20	Token or no presentation	Lots of irrelevant or inappropriate content. Insufficient or excessive level of detail throughout. Poor coverage of the topic and most aspects not covered.	Some irrelevant or inappropriate content. Insufficient or excessive level of detail in most places. Weak coverage of the topic and many aspects not adequately covered.	Mostly relevant and appropriate content. Reasonable level of detail in most places. Satisfactory coverage of the topic and most aspects covered adequately.	Relevant and appropriate content. Appropriate level of detail in most places. Good coverage of the topic and most aspects covered.	Very relevant and appropriate content. Appropriate level of detail throughout. Very good coverage of the topic and virtually all aspects covered.	Interesting, highly relevant and appropriate content. Ideal level of detail throughout. Excellent coverage of the topic and all aspects covered.
Understanding	20	Token or no presentation	Poor understanding of topic/content/meaning. Unable to answer questions.	Limited understanding of topic/content/meaning. Weak answers to questions.	Satisfactory understanding of topic/content/meaning. Satisfactory answers to most questions.	Good understanding of topic/content/meaning. Good answers to questions.	Very good understanding of topic/content/meaning. Very good answers to questions.	Excellent understanding of topic/content/meaning. Excellent answers to questions.
Structure & Timing	20	Token or no presentation	No clear structure, random and messy. Little attempt to adhere to prescribed format. Substantially over/under time limit.	Unsatisfactory structure with very little/no linkages between sections. Some attempt to adhere to prescribed format. Went over/under time limit.	Satisfactory structure with some effort to make linkages between sections. Largely adheres to prescribed format. May have gone slightly over/under time limit, but acceptable.	Good structure with clear linkages between most sections. Adheres to prescribed format. Awareness of time limit, kept roughly to time limit.	Very good structure with clear linkages between sections. Adheres to prescribed format. Awareness of time limit, clearly designed presentation with time limit in mind, kept to time limit.	Excellent structure with very clear linkages between all sections. Adheres completely to prescribed format. Kept perfectly to time limit, clearly designed presentation with time limit in mind whilst losing no communication of information.
Presentation Skills	20	Token or no presentation	Poor delivery. Tempo completely inappropriate. Inaudible or jumbled speech. Language use completely unsuitable for audience. No attempt to engage audience or to use eye contact.	Weak delivery. Much too fast or slow. Inaudible in places. Language use inappropriate for audience. Unsatisfactory eye contact /little attempt to engage audience.	Satisfactory delivery. Too fast or slow in places. Mostly audible. Language use mostly adequate for audience. Some eye contact with audience.	Good delivery. Appropriate tempo, not too fast or slow. Audible. Language use appropriate for audience. Satisfactory eye contact with audience.	Very good delivery. Good tempo. Interesting and energetic delivery of content. Clear speech. Language use well suited for audience. Very good eye contact and engagement with audience.	Excellent delivery. Excellent tempo. Interesting, energetic and stimulating delivery, maintaining audience interest throughout. Very clear speech with varied tone. Language use perfectly suited for audience. Excellent eye contact and engagement with audience.
Slides/ Supportive material	20	Token or no presentation	(If appropriate), slides / supportive materials / visual aids poor.	(If appropriate), slides / supportive materials / visual aids weak.	(If appropriate), slides / supportive materials / visual aids satisfactory.	(If appropriate), slides / supportive materials / visual aids good.	(If appropriate), slides / supportive materials / visual aids very good.	(If appropriate), slides / supportive materials / visual aids excellent.

Poster Rubric

Assessment Criteria	%	Very Poor (G3-G1)	Poor (F3-F1)	Weak (E3-E1)	Pass (D3-D1)	Good (C3-C1)	Very Good (B3-B1)	Excellent (A5-A1)
Context	20	Token or no submission	Poor explanation of motivation for study. Poor or incorrect summary of background information. No evidence of relevant reading / appropriate sources.	Weak explanation of motivation for study. One-sided or incomplete summary of background information. Little evidence of relevant reading/ appropriate sources.	Suitable explanation of motivation for study. Satisfactory summary of relevant background information. Some evidence of relevant reading/ appropriate sources.	Good explanation of motivation for study. Good summary of relevant background information. Evidence of relevant reading / appropriate sources.	Very good explanation of motivation for study. Very good summary of relevant background information. Clear evidence of relevant reading/ appropriate sources.	Excellent explanation of motivation for study. Excellent summary of relevant background information sources. Clear evidence of wide and relevant reading / appropriate sources.
Content	30	Token or no submission	Poor, or largely inappropriate / irrelevant content. Many key elements of methods/data/ design /analysis/ results incorrect, not mentioned or not explained clearly. Supporting graphs, tables and figures missing, incorrect or incomplete.	Some inappropriate / irrelevant content. Some key elements of methods/data/design/analysis/ results incorrect, not mentioned or not explained clearly. Supporting graphs, tables and figures weakly presented or contain some errors.	Content satisfactory and mostly appropriate/relevant. Most elements of methods/data/design/analysis/ results explained to a satisfactory level. Supporting graphs, tables and figures presented satisfactorily.	Content good and appropriate/relevant. Most elements of methods/data/ design /analysis/ results explained well. Supporting graphs, tables and figures presented well.	Content very good; appropriate/relevant, interesting and clearly presented. All elements of methods/data/ design/analysis/ results explained very well. Supporting graphs, tables and figures presented very well.	Content excellent; appropriate/ relevant, interesting, presented at a professional standard. All elements of methods/data/ design/analysis/ results explained to excellent standard. Excellent supporting graphs, tables and figures.
Understanding	20	Token or no submission	Content demonstrates poor level of understanding and little or no grasp of concepts. Inaccurate interpretation of data. Many errors and misconceptions. No attempt to link findings to wider literature.	Content demonstrates a weak level of understanding and superficial grasp of concepts. Inaccurate interpretation of data in places. Some errors and misconceptions. Weak attempt to link findings to wider literature.	Content demonstrates an acceptable level of understanding and adequate grasp of some concepts. Largely accurate intepretation of data. Some attempt to link findings to wider literature.	Content demonstrates a good level of understanding and adequate grasp of most concepts. Accurate interpretation of data. Findings linked to wider literature.	Content demonstrates a thorough grasp of concepts and very good understanding of the subject. Data is accurately interpreted. Evidence of some critical thought / originality. Findings synthesised effectively with wider literature.	Content demonstrates excellent grasp of concepts and outstanding understanding of the subject. Data is accurately interpreted. Clear evidence of critical thought and originality. Superior synthesis of results with wider literature.
Readability and Organisation	20	Token or no submission	Pitched at completely the wrong level for the audience. Poor structure, layout and readability. Poor grammar and spelling. Font size far too small/big. Far too much/too little text.	Pitched at the wrong level for the audience. Weak structure, layout and readability. Weak grammar and spelling. Font size too small/big. Too much/too little text.	Pitched largely at correct level for the audience. Satisfactory structure, layout and readability. Satisfactory grammar and spelling. Font size appropriate in most places. Slightly too much/too little text in places.	Pitched at correct level for the audience. Good structure, layout and readability. Good grammar and spelling. Font size appropriate. Font size appropriate. About the right amount of text.	Pitched at correct level for the audience. Very good structure, layout and readability. Very good grammar and spelling. Very good font size for poster. Right amount of text. Text clear and flows well.	Pitched at the ideal level for the audience. Excellent structure, layout and readability. Perfect grammar and spelling. Ideal font size for a poster. Ideal amount of text. Text clear, informative and flows impeccably.
Aesthetics	10	Token or no submission	Poor aesthetics. No attempt to make content attractive. No pictures at all or pictures blurry/unclear and/or irrelevant to poster. Visually unappealing. Clashing/boring colour scheme or colour scheme that prevents content from being read.	Weak aesthetics. Little attempt to make content attractive. Pictures unclear and /or not relevant to poster. Overall visual appeal / colour scheme could be substantially improved. Dull and uninspiring.	Satisfactory aesthetics. Passable attempt to make content attractive. Pictures satisfactory and relevant to poster. Overall visual appeal / colour scheme of poster is satisfactory.	Good aesthetics. Good attempt to make content clear and attractive. Good use of relevant pictures. Overall visual appeal colour scheme of poster is good. Creative.	Very good aesthetics. Content clear and attractive. Very good use of clear, relevant pictures. Overall visual appeal / colour scheme of poster is very good. Very creative.	Excellent aesthetics. Content extremely clear and attractive. Excellent and imaginative use of clear and highly appropriate pictures. Overall visual appeal / colour scheme of poster is excellent. Very creative and eye-catching.

Reflective Assessment Rubric

Assessment Criteria	%	Very Poor (G3-G1)	Poor (F3-F1)	Weak (E3-E1)	Pass (D3-D1)	Good (C3-C1)	Very Good (B3-B1)	Excellent (A5-A1)
Reflection	40	Token or no submission	Poor attempt at reflection; little or no attempt to talk about the experience; lack of personal perspective. Demonstrates little or no understanding of the experience. Viewpoint poorly expressed or not at all.	Superficial level of reflection; does not talk enough about the experience; is limited to flimsy generalisations. Minimal personal perspective. Demonstrates limited understanding of the experience. Viewpoint weakly expressed	Sufficient amount of reflection; some attempt to talk about the experience. Some development of personal perspective. Demonstrates basic understanding of the experience. Viewpoint suitably expressed.	Good level of reflection. Is thoughtful and insightful; a personal perspective is present. Demonstrates thoughtful understanding of the experience. Viewpoint expressed well.	Very good level of reflection. Is very thoughtful and insightful; a personal perspective is evident. Demonstrates very thoughtful understanding of the experience. Viewpoint expressed very well.	Excellent in-depth reflection; memorably presents the experience; shows great depth of thought; implicitly reveals feelings and thoughts. A personal perspective is highly evident. Demonstrates conscious and thorough understanding of the experience. Excellent reflective viewpoint.
Critical thought / synthesis and structure	40	Token or no submission	No critical insight or synthesis. No evidence of synthesis of ideas and insights gained. No implications for the overall learning. No relevant examples discussed. Poor understanding of topic. Very poor organisation, structure and flow.	Little evidence of synthesis of ideas and insights gained. Few implications for the overall learning Weak understanding of topic. Weak organisation and structure. Thoughts are not expressed in a logical manner.	Some critical thought and synthesis, and some evidence insights gained. Implications of these insights for the overall learning are presented but limited. Suitable understanding of topic. Suitable organisation, structure and flow of thoughts. Generally logical, some inconsistencies.	Clear attempt to critically discuss the subject. Good evidence of synthesis of ideas and insights gained. Implications for the overall learning are presented well with some detail. Good understanding of topic. Good organisation, logical structure and flow.	Very good evaluation and synthesis of ideas and insights gained. Implications for the overall learning are presented very well with very good detail. Very good understanding of topic. Very good organisation, logical structure and flow. Thoughts are expressed in a coherent manner.	Excellent and insightful critical evaluation with strong evidence of excellent synthesis of ideas and insights gained. Implications for the overall learning are thoroughly detailed. Excellent understanding of topic. Excellent organisation and logical structure of thoughts. Thoughts are expressed in a highly coherent manner.
Presentation and formatting	20	Token or no submission	Illegible, unclear and visually unappealing. Very poor grammar and formatting. No attempt to keep to word limit. Lots of unrequired and uninformative content. Very poor readability. Incorrect use of punctuation. Very poor spelling.	Messy and not ideally clear. Poor grammar and formatting. Poor spelling. Little attempt to keep to word limit. Some pointless and unneeded content. Poor readability. Some cases of incorrect punctuation use.	Generally clear but lacking clarity at points. Suitable grammar and formatting. Satisfactory readability. Some attempt made to keep to the word limit. Mostly informative content. Generally suitable spelling and use of punctuation, some mistakes.	Clear and neat. Good grammar and formatting. Good attempt made to keep to word limit. Occasional uninformative content Good readability; Few cases of incorrect use of punctuation. No or very few spelling mistakes.	Very neat and legible; Visually appealing. Very good grammar and formatting. Kept to word limit. Minor deviation from topic. Very good readability. Generally very good and correct use of punctuation. No spelling mistakes.	Excellent presentation – clear, neat and legible, visually appealing. Excellent grammar and formatting. Kept strictly to the word limit with no uninformative content. Excellent standard of readability. Immaculate spelling, punctuation and word use.

Research Proposal or Protocol Rubric

Assessment Criteria	%	Very Poor (G3-G1)	Poor (F3-F1)	Weak (E3-E1)	Pass (D3-D1)	Good (C3-C1)	Very Good (B3-B1)	Excellent (A5-A1)
Context	15	No context provided	Insufficient evidence of relevant background research. Few, if any suitable references and examples and no attempt at a clear narrative.	Limited evidence of relevant background research. No real gap in the literature identified.	Some evidence of relevant background research. Some suitable references and examples. Narrative not narrow enough to determine aim.	Good evidence of relevant background research. Suitable references and examples. General area of aim could be concluded.	Very good depth evidence of background research. Many relevant references and examples given. Almost all literature from reliable sources. Aim almost implicit.	Excellent evidence of extensive background research. All references and examples given are highly relevant. Aim of research implicit.
Research Question	10	None given	Vague attempt at stating a research question.	Limited details given around research question.	Research question appropriate but lacks clarity.	Research question is clear and appropriate could be re-worded to improve.	Very good phrasing of question. Very clear and appropriate. Some minor improvements possible.	Excellently phrased research question. Clear and appropriate with no suggested improvement.
Study design	30	Not stated	Study design not suitable for study or hardly described. No consideration of validity or feasibility.	Study design not described to a suitable level. Limited thought given to validity of methods of feasibility.	Satisfactory description of study design. Valid methods identified but no consideration of feasibility.	Good description of study design. Methods used are valid for research question but practicalities not always considered.	Very good description of study design. Valid methods described but possible minor limitations for the research question.	Excellent description of study design, valid methods used that are suited to answering the research question.
Analysis	30	Not stated	Almost no attempt to describe what will happen once data has been collected. No consideration for best use of data.	Limited attempt to describe the way data will be analysed and interpreted. Suggestions unrealistic or impractical.	Satisfactory description of data interpretation but little insight into why the approach is used. Many unrealistic expectations as to what data will answer.	Good description of how data can be used once collected but some misconceptions about realistic achievements.	Very good description of how data can be handled and interpreted, minor gaps. Minor unrealistic expectations of use of data.	Excellent description of how data will be handled and interpreted. Realistic expectations of how data can be used.
Formatting	10	None to speak of	Very minor attempt to present the information in a logical order. Very hard to follow and critical information omitted.	Limited use of a logical structure making it difficult to follow. Several gaps in required information.	Satisfactory presentation. All information provided but sometimes difficult to follow. Logical structure not really considered.	Good presentation. Some information presented in an illogical order. Some changes required.	Very good presentation. Logical structure with minor repetition / omission.	Excellent presentation. Easy to follow, logical structure.
Referencing, Spelling & Grammar	5	Token or no submission	Referencing poor. Many errors in spelling and/or grammar. Exceeded/well below word limit.	Referencing could be improved. Some errors in spelling and/or grammar. Did not keep to word limit.	Referencing satisfactory. Few errors in spelling and/or grammar. Largely kept to word limit.	Referencing good. Minor errors in spelling and/or grammar. Kept to word limit.	Referencing very good. Occasional errors in spelling and/or grammar. Kept to word limit.	Referenced to a professional standard. No errors in spelling and/or grammar. Kept to word limit.

Supervisors Report Rubric

Assessment Criteria	%	Very Poor (G3-G1)	Poor (F3-F1)	Weak (E3-E1)	Pass (D3-D1)	Good (C3-C1)	Very Good (B3-B1)	Excellent (A5-A1)
Specific project skills	25	Token or no submission	Minimal effort applied. Poor practical/technical abilities.	Minor effort applied. Limited practical / technical abilities.	Satisfactory effort applied. Acceptable practical / technical abilities.	Good amount of effort applied. Good practical / technical abilities.	Very good level of effort applied. Very good practical / technical abilities.	Excellent amount of effort. Excellent practical / technical abilities.
Project management and organisation	25	Token or no submission	Did not seek guidance or benefit from guidance given. Managed time completely ineffectively. Poor team working abilities.	Required considerable guidance or did not benefit from guidance. Time available was not used effectively. Limited team working abilities.	Required guidance showing some initiative. Time management could be improved. Satisfactory team working abilities.	Required some guidance but followed instructions satisfactorily. Time management acceptable. Good team working abilities.	Worked with some guidance but showing independence. Managed available time productively. Very good team working abilities.	Worked principally independently, showing initiative and creativity. Excellent team working abilities.
Analysis and interpretation	25	Token or no submission	Little analytical ability with no contextual awareness. Unable to apply critical thought in interpreting and discussing data and its meaning.	Minimal analytical ability with little contextual awareness. Little evidence of critical thought in interpreting and discussing data and its meaning.	Limited analytical ability with limited contextual awareness. Limited critical thought in interpreting and discussing data and its meaning.	Good analytical ability with some contextual awareness. Good critical thought in interpreting and discussing data and its meaning.	Very good analytical ability with strong contextual awareness. Very good critical thought in interpreting and discussing data and its meaning.	Excellent analytical ability with excellent contextual awareness. Outstanding critical thought in interpreting and discussing data and its meaning.
Communication and innovation	25	Token or no submission	Poor communication skills evident throughout project. Played no role in progression of project.	Intermittent and ineffective communication skills. No involvement in progression of project	Good communication skills when applied. Minimal involvement in progression of project.	Good communication skills throughout project. Minor contribution to progression of project.	Very good communication skills throughout project. Contributed to progression of project.	Excellent communication skills throughout project. Played a major role in progression of project.

Systematic Review Rubric

Assessment Criteria	%	Very Poor (G3-G1)	Poor (F3-F1)	Weak (E3-E1)	Pass (D3-D1)	Good (C3-C1)	Very Good (B3-B1)	Excellent (A5-A1)
Background and Justification	5	Token or no submission	Very poor background with no scientific evidence. Illogical structure. No justification for review provided.	Poor background with minimal scientific evidence. Illogical structure. No justification for review provided.	Satisfactory description of the scientific background leading to the justification for the review.	Clear introduction to the topic supported by literature and justification for the review.	Clear introduction with, identification of the gap in the evidence and justification for the review.	Excellent introduction with up to date literature, identifying the gap in the evidence and justification for the review.
Literature Search skills	10	Token or no submission	No inclusion and exclusion criteria. Wrong search strategy. No insight into Boolean operators. No steps of data management provided.	Some indication of inclusion and exclusion criteria. Poor search strategy. No insight into Boolean operators. No steps of data management provided.	Indication of inclusion and exclusion criteria with no justification. Reasonable search strategy. Some insight into Boolean operators. Steps of data management provided.	Indication of inclusion and exclusion criteria (PICO) with justification. Correct search strategy. Good insight into Boolean operators. All steps of data management provided.	Clear and comprehensive inclusion and exclusion criteria (PICO) with justification. Correct search strategy combined with Boolean operators. All steps of data management provided.	Precise and comprehensive inclusion and exclusion criteria (PICO) with justification. Excellent search strategy with Boolean operators. All steps of data management provided.
Data extraction and Quality assessment	40	Token or no submission	No understanding of data extraction and quality assessment.	Has stated the data extraction and quality assessment but no further details or critical evaluation provided.	Has identified a validated quality assessment tool and its indicators. Stated the development and piloting of a data extraction form.	Good understanding of the quality assessment, critical evaluation and the risk of bias. Understands the relevant components of data extraction.	Very good quality assessment with risk of bias specific for a study design. All relevant data extracted. Some insight into dealing with missing data.	Excellent quality assessment with risk of bias specific for a study design. All relevant data extracted. Identifies and deals with missing data.
Data Analysis and Interpretation of results	40	Token or no submission	No understanding of data analysis or interpretation of the data.	Some understanding of data analysis but incorrect analysis and wrong interpretation.	Identified appropriate data analysis method and correct analysis conducted. Minor interpretation errors.	Good data synthesis using appropriate method of analysis. Correct interpretation of results.	Appropriate method of analysis with clear justification. Good data synthesis and correct interpretation of results.	Appropriate method of analysis with clear justification. Excellent data synthesis, including sub-group analysis where appropriate and interpretation of results including clinical significance.
Referencing, Spelling & Grammar	5	Token or no submission	Referencing poor. Many errors in spelling and/or grammar. Exceeded/well below word limit.	Referencing could be improved. Some errors in spelling and/or grammar. Did not keep to word limit.	Referencing satisfactory. Few errors in spelling and/or grammar. Largely kept to word limit.	Referencing good. Minor errors in spelling and/or grammar. Kept to word limit.	Referencing very good. Occasional errors in spelling and/or grammar. Kept to word limit.	Referenced to a professional standard. No errors in spelling and/or grammar. Kept to word limit.

Thesis (Any format) Rubric

Assessment Criteria	%	Very Poor (G3-G1)	Poor (F3-F1)	Weak (E3-E1)	Pass (D3-D1)	Good (C3-C1)	Very Good (B3-B1)	Excellent (A5-A1)
Justification and Context	20	Token or no submission	Introduction confused and poorly focused, incoherent in parts. Aims very unclear, missing or illogical. Lack of understanding. Very little attempt to discuss relevant literature.	Introduction confused and poorly focused, incoherent in parts. Aims included but unclear. Some attempt to discuss relevant literature.	Introduction satisfactory but focus could be improved. Aims clear. Fair attempt at discussing relevant literature.	Introduction good but focus could be improved. Aims clear. Good attempt at discussing relevant literature.	Introduction very good and focussed. Aims very clear. Very good attempt at discussing relevant literature. Evidence of wider reading.	Introduction excellent and focussed. Aims extremely clear. Excellent attempt at discussing relevant literature. Evidence of extensive reading and originality.
Methodology	20	Token or no submission	Poor study design. Key measures, variables and procedure poorly reported. Data handling and analysis plan inadequate or incorrect. Many errors in choice of appropriate statistics. Inadequate project planning.	Weak study design. Key measures, variables and procedure reported but in insufficient detail. Data handling and analysis plan inadequate or incorrect. Some errors in choice of appropriate statistics. Project planning could be improved.	Satisfactory study design. Key measures, variables and procedure reported satisfactorily. Data handling and analysis plan appropriate but gaps in places. Mostly appropriate choice of statistics. Project planning satisfactory.	Good study design. Key measures, variables and procedure reported well. Data handling and analysis plan good. Appropriate choice of statistics. Project planning good.	Very good study design. Key measures, variables and procedure reported very well. Data handling and analysis plan very good. Appropriate choice of statistics. Project planning very good.	Excellent study design. Key measures, variables and procedures reported extremely well. Data handling and analysis plan excellent. Appropriate choice of statistics. Project planning excellent.
Results and understanding	20	Token or no submission	Poor execution of analyses and reporting of results. Completely inaccurate conclusions. Very little understanding of results evidenced. Poor or inappropriate use of figures/tables.	Weak execution of analyses and reporting of results. Inaccurate conclusions. Some understanding of results evidenced. Unsatisfactory use of figures/tables.	Satisfactory execution of analyses and reporting of results. Acceptable conclusions. Satisfactory understanding of results evidenced. Mostly appropriate use of figures/tables.	Good execution of analyses and reporting of results. Conclusions largely accurate. Good understanding of results evidenced. Appropriate use of figures/ tables.	Very good execution of analyses and reporting of results. Conclusions accurate. Very good understanding of results evidenced. Very good use of figures/ tables.	Excellent execution of analyses and reporting of results. Conclusions entirely accurate. Excellent understanding of results evidenced. Excellent use of figures/ tables.
Synthesis	20	Token or no submission	Poor discussion. Very little awareness of related work. Poor synthesis. Unable to argue points. Uncritical. No awareness of study limitations.	Weak discussion. Limited awareness of related work. Weak synthesis. Unable to argue points clearly. Little evidence of critical thought. Little awareness of study limitations.	Satisfactory discussion. Some awareness of related work. Limited ability to synthesise and argue points. Limited evidence of critical thought. Limited awareness of study limitations.	Good discussion. Covers related work well. Some ability to synthesise and argue points. Some evidence of critical thought. Some awareness of study limitations.	Very good discussion. Covers related work very well. Good ability to synthesise and argue points. Clear evidence of critical thought. Clear awareness of study limitations.	Excellent discussion. Excellent coverage of related work. Excellent ability to synthesise and argue points. Clear evidence of superior critical thought. Excellent awareness of study limitations.
Organisation, Structure & Style	15	Token or no submission	Poor organisation and structure. Poor style, flow and coherence.	Unsatisfactory organisation and structure. Weak style, flow and coherence.	Satisfactory organisation and structure. Satisfactory style, flow and coherence.	Good organisation and structure. Good style, flow and coherence.	Very good organisation and structure. Very good style, flow and coherence.	Excellent organisation and structure. Excellent style, flow and coherence.
Referencing, Spelling & Grammar	5	Token or no submission	Referencing poor. Many errors in spelling and/or grammar. Exceeded/well below word limit.	Referencing could be improved. Some errors in spelling and/or grammar. Did not keep to word limit.	Referencing satisfactory. Few errors in spelling and/or grammar. Largely kept to word limit.	Referencing good. Minor errors in spelling and/or grammar. Kept to word limit.	Referencing very good. Occasional errors in spelling and/or grammar. Kept to word limit.	Referenced to a professional standard. No errors in spelling and/or grammar. Kept to word limit.