

Assessment criteria: Artefact and critical commentary

Marks	0-19	20-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-100
	Fail (F)	Fail (E)	Pass: 3 rd (D)	Pass: 2.2 (C)	Pass: 2.1 (B)	1 st (A)	1 st (A)
Knowledge and Understanding	Major gaps in knowledge and understanding of models of disability. Significant inaccuracies.	Gaps in knowledge and only superficial understanding of models of disability. Some inaccuracies.	Some knowledge and understanding of principles of disability representation and experiences.	Broad knowledge and understanding of principles of disability representation and experiences.	Very good knowledge and understanding of principles of disability representation and experiences.	Very good, detailed understanding of principles of disability representation and experiences. Some beginning awareness of the limitation of their knowledge and how this influences on analysis and interpretations.	Exceptional understanding of principles of disability representation and experiences. Awareness of the limitation of their knowledge and how this influences on analysis and interpretations.
Intellectual skills <i>e.g. analysis and synthesis; using evidence; drawing conclusions</i>	Unsubstantiated generalizations made without use of any credible evidence. Lack of analysis and relevance.	Generalisations and statements are largely irrelevant, illogical or contradictory. Conclusions lack relevance and/or validity.	Some awareness of main issues and beginning identification of an argument. Some evidence provided but not always consistent. Some relevant conclusions.	Main issues identified and critically analysed. An awareness of different stances and ability to use evidence. Generally sound conclusions.	Good level of analysis and synthesis. An awareness of different stances and ability to use evidence convincingly. Valid conclusions.	Excellent analysis and synthesis. A range of perceptive points made. Evidence used convincingly to build logical argument. Strong conclusions.	Exceptional analysis and synthesis. Perceptive, logically connected points made throughout the proposal. Evidence selected judiciously to build eloquent, balanced argument. Persuasive conclusions.
Scholarly practices <i>e.g. use of relevant literature; academic writing; academic honesty, referencing and citation</i>	No evidence of reading. Views are unsupported and non-authoritative. Academic conventions largely ignored.	Evidence of little reading appropriate for this level and/or indiscriminate use of sources. Academic conventions used weakly.	Evidence of reading relevant sources with some appropriate linking to given texts. Academic conventions evident and largely consistent with minor weaknesses.	Knowledge and analysis of a range of literature beyond core texts. Literature used accurately and analytically. Academic skills generally sound.	Knowledge of the field of literature used consistently. Research-informed literature integrated into the work. Very good use of academic conventions.	Critical engagement with a range of reading. Knowledge of research-informed literature embedded in work. Consistently accurate use of academic conventions.	Exceptionally wide range of relevant literature evaluated and used critically to inform argument, and balance discussion. Accurate and assured use of academic conventions.

<p>Research and enquiry <i>e.g. grasping, framing and/or creating questions; methods for gathering evidence; ethics and integrity; analysis of evidence; communicating findings in a style appropriate for a given context and audience</i></p>	<p>Little or no evidence of the required skills in any of the areas identified for assessment at this level.</p>	<p>Limited evidence of skills of research and enquiry in the range identified for assessment at this level. Significant weaknesses evident.</p>	<p>Research skills: some evidence of ability to collect and interpret information and create an artefact (with commentary) with limited external guidance. Can communicate findings appropriate to the discipline, but with some weaknesses.</p>	<p>Research skills: Can and create an artefact (with commentary) drawing on a range of sources, with limited external guidance. Can communicate effectively and largely appropriate to the discipline and audience.</p>	<p>Research skills: Can successfully create an artefact (with commentary), drawing on a range of sources, with limited external guidance. Can communicate effectively and consistently, appropriate to the discipline and audience.</p>	<p>Research skills: Can successfully create an artefact (with commentary) with a significant degree of autonomy. Can communicate very effectively and confidently, appropriate to the discipline and different audiences.</p>	<p>Evidence of exceptional success in creating an artefact (with commentary) with a high degree of autonomy for the level. Can communicate highly effectively and confidently with diverse audiences, in a wide range of formats, as appropriate to the context.</p>
<p>Professional and life skills <i>e.g. creativity, digital practices,; presentation skills; ethical awareness; team working; self-management; project and time-management; leadership; recognition of own strengths and weaknesses and ability to take steps to improve.</i></p>	<p>Little no evidence of the required skills in any of the areas identified for assessment at this level.</p>	<p>Limited evidence of ability in the range identified for assessment at this level. Significant weaknesses evident in key areas, including ethics of artefact creation.</p>	<p>Some evidence of ability to recognise own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional and practical skills, but with limited insight in some areas, including ethics of artefact creation.</p>	<p>Good ability to recognise own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional and practical skills, showing good insight in some areas, including ethics of artefact creation.</p>	<p>Very good evidence of ability to take initiative in evaluating own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional and practical skills identified by others and develop and effectively apply own evaluation criteria.</p>	<p>Very good evidence of ability to take initiative in evaluating own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional and practical skills showing excellent judgement, including of the ethical responsibilities of the task.</p>	<p>Outstanding evidence of ability to show insight and autonomy in evaluating own strengths and weaknesses, showing outstanding judgement and awareness of complexity of ethical issues in task.</p>
<p>Marks</p>	<p>0-19</p>	<p>20-39</p>	<p>40-49</p>	<p>50-59</p>	<p>60-69</p>	<p>70-79</p>	<p>80-100</p>