

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. Substantial inaccuracies.	Gaps in knowledge and only superficial understanding of models of disability. Some significant inaccuracies.	Understanding of principles of disability representation and experiences; beginning interdisciplinary knowledge in part informed by research	Systematic understanding of principles of disability representation and experiences; coherent interdisciplinary knowledge in part informed by research	Good understanding of principles of disability representation and experiences; coherent interdisciplinary knowledge informed by range of research	Excellent interdisciplinary knowledge and understanding of principles of disability representation and experiences. Awareness of the limitations of the knowledge base	Highly detailed interdisciplinary knowledge and understanding of principles of disability representation and experiences. Awareness of the ambiguities and limitations of knowledge
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. Unsupportable or missing conclusions. Lack of any attempt to analyse, synthesise or evaluate.	Some evidence of analytical, intellectual skills, but for the most part descriptive. Ideas sometimes illogical and contradictory. Generalised statements made with scant evidence. Conclusions lack relevance.	Evidence of some logical, analytical thinking and some attempts to synthesise, with some weaknesses. Some evidence to support findings and views, but not consistently interpreted. Some relevant conclusions.	Evidence of some logical, analytical thinking and synthesis. Can analyse and/or abstract information without guidance. An emerging awareness of different stances and ability to use evidence to support the argument. Valid conclusions.	Sound logical, analytical thinking, synthesis and evaluation. Ability to devise and sustain persuasive arguments and to review the significance of evidence. Ability to communicate ideas and evidence accurately and convincingly. Sound, convincing conclusions.	Thoroughly logical work supported by judiciously selected and evaluated evidence. High quality analysis. Ability to investigate contradictory information and identify reasons for contradictions. Strong conclusions.	Exceptional work- Judiciously selected and evaluated evidence. Very high quality analysis. Ability to investigate contradictory information and identify reasons for contradictions. Highly persuasive conclusions.
Scholarly practices <i>e.g. use of relevant literature; academic writing; academic honesty, referencing and citation</i>	Little evidence of reading. Views are unsupported and non-authoritative. Academic conventions largely ignored.	Evidence of little reading and/or of reliance on inappropriate sources and/or indiscriminate use of sources. Academic conventions used inconsistently.	References to a range of relevant sources. Some omissions and minor errors. Academic conventions evident and largely consistent with minor lapses.	Knowledge, analysis and evaluation of a range of research-informed literature including sources retrieved, analysed independently. Academic skills consistently applied.	Knowledge, analysis and evaluation of a range of research-informed literature including sources retrieved, analysed independently with accuracy and assurance. Good academic skills consistently applied.	Excellent knowledge of research-informed literature embedded in the work. Consistent analysis and evaluation of sources. High-level academic skills consistently applied.	Outstanding knowledge of research-informed literature embedded in the work. Consistent analysis and evaluation of sources. High-level academic skills consistently and professionally applied.

<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: Can competently create an artefact (with commentary) with minimum guidance with minor weaknesses. Can communicate findings in different formats as appropriate to the task, with limited weaknesses.</p>	<p>Research skills: Can competently create an artefact (with commentary) with minimum guidance. Can communicate effectively in different formats as appropriate to the task. Adopts style and register appropriate for audience.</p>	<p>Research skills: Can successfully create an artefact (with commentary) including evaluation with very limited external guidance. Can communicate well, confidently and consistently in different formats as appropriate to the task. Adopts style and register to engage audience.</p>	<p>Research skills: Can very successfully create an artefact (with commentary) including evaluation with a significant degree of autonomy. Can communicate professionally and confidently in different formats as appropriate to the task. Adopts style and register to engage audiences.</p>	<p>Impressive ability to draw on own research and that of others to formulate meaningful argument for artefact and commentary. Exceptionally successful in a wide range of tasks including evaluation with a high degree of autonomy. Can communicate with real professionalism, adapting style easily for given audiences.</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.</p>	<p>Limited evidence of ability in the range of skills identified for assessment at this level. Significant weaknesses evident.</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>