**Assessment task 2 marking rubric**

| Assessment task 2 marking rubric | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Ratings** | **Pts** |
| This criterion is linked to a Learning OutcomeConceptual understanding of task  What is written: theory, ideas, content of response | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **20 to >16.0 pts**  **Outstanding (H1)**  Presents an in depth and strong understanding of, and engagement with, theoretical perspectives and their application to pharmacology. Offers a concise and highly systematic synthesis, interpretation and analysis of research evidence. Demonstrates a very high level of critical engagement consistently and appropriately; may demonstrate extended thinking on the topic. Identifies patterns or trends in the literature and analyses the information retrieved. Writer’s voice and high level of independent thinking are clearly evident. | **16 to >15.0 pts**  **Very high standard (H2A)**  Presents detailed and strong understanding of theoretical perspectives and their application to pharmacology. Offers a detailed synthesis, interpretation and analysis of research evidence. Demonstrates a consistent level of critical engagement; may have attempted extended thinking, but not always successfully. Displays writer’s voice and independent thinking within the assignment. | **15 to >14.0 pts**  **High standard (H2B)**  Presents a mostly strong understanding of theoretical perspectives and their application to pharmacology; minor gaps may be evident. Offers a mostly detailed synthesis, interpretation and analysis of research evidence. Demonstrates a consistent level of critical engagement, though may have offered more. Displays writer’s voice and some independent thinking, though this could have been more evident. | **14 to >13.0 pts**  **Sound work (H3)**  Presents understanding of theoretical perspectives and their application to pharmacology, though needs more development. Offers some synthesis, interpretation and analysis of research evidence, though this may have been more evident. Demonstrates some critical engagement. Writer’s voice present, but not overly strong; limited independent thinking evident. | **13 to >10.0 pts**  **Satisfactory work (PASS)**  Presents some degree of understanding of theoretical perspectives and their application to pharmacology though there are clear gaps in understanding. Offers limited synthesis, interpretation and analysis of research evidence. Demonstrates limited critical engagement. Writer’s voice not at all strong, and independent thinking not evident enough. | **10 to >0 pts**  **Unsatisfactory**  Attempts at presenting theoretical perspectives and their application to pharmacology not successful; or links between two areas not clear or not made at all. Synthesis, interpretation and analysis of research not evident. Demonstrates limited or no critical engagement. Writer’s voice and independent thinking not evident. | | 20 pts |
| This criterion is linked to a Learning OutcomeStructure/organisation  How task is presented & completed; genre or task type; logic, flow, intra-text links | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **12 to >10.0 pts**  **Outstanding (H1)**  Ideas presented in coherent, logical and cohesive (linked) manner. Completes all required aspects of task to an exemplary standard. Text response organised and sequenced appropriate to genre (eg clear paragraphing; use of headings or sections where appropriate; and formatted appropriately and correctly referenced). Concise presentation of ideas; response falls within designated word count range. The message is very clear, the reader finds the writing easy to follow; errors in expression rare and nondistracting; content highly relevant. | **10 to >9.0 pts**  **Very high standard (H2A)**  Ideas presented in coherent and cohesive manner with minor inconsistencies or gaps. Completes required aspects of task, though some parts may have been more detailed or more balance could have been evident. Text response organised appropriate to genre; minor errors may be evident or could have been completed more thoroughly. Mostly concise presentation of ideas. The message is mostly clear, the reader can follow the message; errors in expression minimal and almost always non-distracting; content relevant. | **9 to >8.5 pts**  **High standard (H2B)**  Ideas presented in generally coherent and cohesive manner, though inconsistencies evident. Completes required aspects of task though some parts need to have been more detailed or clearly more balanced. Text response organised appropriate to genre; though some minor gaps may be evident or elements missing. Mostly concise presentation of ideas, though sometimes verbose. The message is clear for the most part, the reader can follow the message though there is sometimes strain; errors are evident and at times distracting; some minor elements of content may not be relevant. | **8.5 to >8.0 pts**  **Sound work (H3)**  Ideas mostly presented in coherent and cohesive manner, though inconsistencies clearly evident in logic and links between sections. Completes required aspects of task, though some parts are missing or not well developed. Text response organised mostly appropriate to genre, though some inconsistencies, errors or gaps may be evident (eg missing elements; irrelevant inclusions; formatting issues). Concise at times, other times verbose, and imbalance between sections evident (some may be short while others are long). Overall, the message is clear, though errors evident and distracting in parts; some clear areas of content may not be relevant. | **8 to >6.0 pts**  **Satisfactory work (PASS)**  Clear issues with coherence and cohesion; at times logic not evident or links between sections not well-established. Completes some required aspects of task adequately, though some parts are unsatisfactory. Text response organised approximate to genre; though inconsistencies, errors or gaps are clearly evident (eg missing or incorrect elements or sections) and affect overall quality of response. Overall, the message is evident, however reader finds it hard to follow in parts; errors evident and distracting; sections of content may not be relevant to task or inappropriately chosen. | **6 to >0 pts**  **Unsatisfactory**  Major issues with coherence and cohesion; logic not evident or hard to follow; links between sections not clear – writing lacks flow. Task not completed or displays major gaps in required elements. Organised somewhat according to genre; though major errors or gaps are clearly evident (eg missing sections, lack of expected elements) and affect quality of writing. Conciseness of ideas not evident; contains clearly irrelevant material. Overall, message is not evident; very hard to follow message; errors distract reader significantly; whole sections of content are not relevant or inappropriate. | | 12 pts |
| This criterion is linked to a Learning OutcomeEvidence of research and citation  Referencing; conventions in use of external sources and citation | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **8 to >7.0 pts**  **Outstanding (H1)**  Uses diverse sources of information highly appropriate to the task. Provides relevant and contemporary evidence from appropriate sources. Systematically applies appropriate and accurate academic referencing conventions in text and post text; in text citations match Reference List. Required number of references is evidenced (may go beyond required reference minimum). Systematically integrates source information; evaluates and synthesises information retrieved with own thoughts and voice. | **7 to >6.0 pts**  **Very high standard (H2A)**  Uses a range of information appropriate to the task. Provides relevant evidence from appropriate sources. Applies academic referencing conventions mostly appropriately and accurately both in text and post text; minor inaccuracies may be evident. Required number of references is evidenced. Integrates source information throughout the assignment mostly successfully; evaluation and synthesis with own voice mostly successful. | **6 to >5.75 pts**  **High standard (H2B)**  Uses sources of information appropriate to the task. Provides evidence from mostly appropriate sources. Applies academic referencing conventions appropriately and accurately both in text and post text, though some errors are evident (eg a missing page reference for a direct quote; punctuation errors). Required number of references is evidenced. Integrates source information in the assignment with some inconsistencies; at time writer’s voice may be overshadowed by external authors’ ideas, and evaluation may not always be evident. | **5.75 to >5.5 pts**  **Sound work (H3)**  Uses readings mostly appropriate to the task. Provides some evidence collected from several sources; though may be overly reliant on one or two sources. Applies academic referencing conventions generally appropriately and consistently both in text and post text, though errors are evident. Required number of references is evidenced. Attempts to integrate some source information in the assignment but not always successfully; voice is subordinate in parts to external ideas, evaluation of information lacking. | **5.5 to >4.0 pts**  **Satisfactory work (PASS)**  Uses limited sources of information, mostly appropriate to the task, though texts lacking relevancy may have been used. Provides limited evidence collected from a narrow range of sources – gaps are clearly evident. Academic referencing conventions inconsistently applied both in text and post text; errors are frequent. Required number of references is not evidenced; may be short. Integrates limited source information in the assignment; voice is frequently subordinate to external ideas; claims made may be unsubstantiated or not evaluated. | **4 to >0 pts**  **Unsatisfactory**  Evidence of reading minimal, and not appropriate or relevant to task. Very limited evidence of research – major gaps are clearly evident. Not enough evidence collected from sources of information. Academic referencing conventions not applied both in text and post text; errors are frequent; in text citations do not match Reference List; understanding of the role and form of external citation not evident. Required number of references is not evidenced. Fails to integrate source information in the assignment; voice is not evident; claims are unsubstantiated and not evaluated. | | 8 pts |