**AMB303 Criteria Sheet – Assessment 1 Semester 1 2020**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GRADE** | **FAIL** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **MARK** |
| **MARK RANGE** | **0-49%** | **50-64%** | **65-74%** | **75-84%** | **85-100%** |  |
| **Knowledge of issues and topics**  **KS 1.1** | Does not show any understanding of importance of the topic; e.g. textbook repetition. Majority of the operative components was not aligned. Majority of the assignment was incomplete, or incorrectly addressed. Time limit exceeded. | Shows a general awareness of importance of topic; lacks explanation of topic importance and/ or reading. Weak alignment of operative components. The assignment was attempted with one or more aspect incomplete or incorrectly addressed. | Shows a reasonably sound awareness of importance of the topic and its operations. Partially aligned operative components. Each aspect of the assignment was covered to a level of completeness that significantly supports the assignment. | Uses information well to illustrate knowledge of importance of the topic. **Strong theoretical (reading)** knowledge demonstrated. Supportive argument. Fully aligned operative components. Each aspect of the assignment was complete and correctly addressed. | Gives a clear and concise explanation of the topic in detail as well as showing **additional related insight/reading**. Completely aligned operative components. Each aspect of the assignment was complete, comprehensive and correctly addressed. | **/30** |
| **Understanding and depth of issues**  **HO 2.1** | Lacks detail and operational explanations; no examples; or poor explanation. You showed some analytical efforts, but the logical inferences are not strong. Body of literature does not suffice to support your position. Scant use of high-level literature. Your presentation does not state the direction of your argument clearly. Work is mostly descriptive and with very little synthesis of literature into your argument. Time limit exceeded. | A basic use and **synthesis** of issues of detail and operational functions. You presented a logical analysis based on an introduction and small body of literature to support your position. You do not refer to sufficient high-level literature sources. You state the direction of your arguments and recommendations but lack justification. Your work is mostly descriptive. | Some evidence of good use and **synthesis** of major issues. You presented a logical and sequenced analysis based on a well explained presentation. You presented a body of literature to support your position. You refer to a few high-level literature sources. You state the direction of argument and recommendations. You attempt to synthesise the literature into your argument(s). Lack detailed coverage. | There is significant use and **synthesis** of most suggested operational details. You presented a logical and sequenced analysis based on an introduction and detailed body (literature review). You refer to several high-level literature sources and offer a balanced view. You state the direction of your argument. You synthesise your research and the literature into your argument(s). | Outstanding range and depth of multiple links and **operational detail** demonstrated in the answer given. You presented a logical and sequenced analysis based on a detailed introduction and strong and comprehensive body (literature review). You refer to multiple high-level high-quality literature sources and offer a balanced view. You very clearly and concisely state the direction of your argument. You seamlessly synthesise the literature into your argument(s). | **/50** |
| **Professional communication oral (video)**  **PC 3.2** | You presented the content in an incoherent way and make frequent technical errors throughout the presentation. You lack appropriate academic and/or industry referencing. No clear spoken message conveyed. Video display face reading a paper, no/weak professionalism as ‘reporter’. Time limit exceeded. | Conveys some issues but with low level of meaning and engagement with the audience. Overreliance on notes. You organise content in a manner that be difficult for the reader to follow at times. Several technical, grammatical and referencing errors throughout. Video display almost only the face of the student, weak ‘reporter’ professionalism. | You organise content clearly but make some technical, referencing, format, grammatical and/or spelling errors. You’re able to convey meaning and engage the audience at low satisfactory level. Video strongly display a ‘business like reporter scenario’. | Organise content clearly. Generally, appropriate referencing. Mostly follow the suggested format. Mostly free of grammar and spelling errors. Mostly convey insights and meaning, engages the audience at a very high level. Lacks cohesion. Video display a ‘business like reporter scenario’ at the expert level. | Excellent spoken communication and audience engagement. Cohesive. You organise content clearly, with no technical errors. Extensive referencing using correct APA format. Follows the suggested format and academic conventions precisely. Free of grammar and spelling errors. Video display a truly professional ‘business like reporter’ experience. | **/20** |
|  | | | | | | **/100** |