

**CRITERIA & STANDARDS DHS 1: Learning Issue Summary – 2007**

The following standards provide descriptions of the middle of the grade range.

<b>Excellent (Mark = &gt;8.5)</b>		<b>Satisfactory (Mark = 5 – 6.4)</b>	
<b>K</b>	<p>Fulfills and exceeds all the criteria listed above with an excellent level of overall performance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key and other relevant concepts or information are noted using accurate terminology, gained from a wide range of sources; No errors of fact, uses only relevant information.</li> <li>• Information/concepts are synthesised and summarised, using questions/tables/diagrams so information is clearly and logically organised to develop coherent explanations and sustained arguments and builds on previous knowledge/experience.</li> <li>• Concepts are related such that the information or concepts are integrated and applied to the relevant system, tissue or situation, consistently and comprehensively relating knowledge to the DLP to explain findings or manage patient.</li> <li>• Concepts are linked to key principles and concepts are applied, generalised and/or hypothesised to relevant different situations, clearly demonstrating when, why and under what conditions knowledge/ skills/behaviours can be used.</li> <li>• Critically analyses recommended relevant literature and other sources.</li> </ul>	<b>K</b>	<p>Fulfills most of the criteria with a satisfactory level of overall performance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key or important information or concepts are noted and accurate terminology is used.</li> <li>• Lists or describes poorly integrated explanations of a general understanding of knowledge, restates information read, with little transformation or application; Minor errors of fact.</li> <li>• Some level of logical organisation evident, but does not consider all relevant data or does not discriminate relevant from irrelevant data, eg looks like a shopping list of major items.</li> <li>• Uses recommended relevant literature, but limited evidence of synthesis and application of understanding.</li> <li>• Limited evidence of application of information /relating to DLP to explain or manage patient ie information is of basic use only eg identifies key teeth/oral surface features or key steps in the appropriate sequence for a preventive plan.</li> </ul>
<b>C</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic style is consistently used and expression is clear and error free.</li> <li>• Uses a range of appropriate presentation formats, eg tables, text, flow charts, diagrams.</li> <li>• Information sources are acknowledged, referencing is consistent and accurate.</li> <li>• Requested format is followed.</li> <li>• Shows evidence of consistent incorporation of feedback.</li> </ul>	<b>C</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic style is used mostly, expression is clear, with some minor deficiencies but these do not impede understanding.</li> <li>• Makes use of common presentation formats, eg tables, text; Minor deviation from requested format, eg names of group members missing, font size &lt;11 pt, 0.5 page over limit.</li> <li>• Information sources are accurately acknowledged, referencing is consistent, enabling easy location of sources.</li> <li>• Shows evidence of incorporating only key areas addressed in feedback.</li> </ul>
<b>Very Good (Mark= 7.5-8.4)</b>		<b>Borderline (Mark = 4-4.9)</b>	
<b>K</b>	<p>Fulfills all the criteria with a very good level of overall performance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key and other relevant concepts or information are noted using accurate terminology, No errors of fact and uses only relevant information.</li> <li>• Information/concepts are synthesised and summarised using questions/tables/diagrams so information is clearly and logically organised.</li> <li>• Concepts are related such that the information or concepts are integrated and applied to the relevant system, tissue or situation; relevant examples are used, with consistent relating of knowledge to the DLP to explain findings or manage patient.</li> <li>• Where relevant, concepts are applied to similar situations demonstrating when and why knowledge/skills/behaviours can be used.</li> <li>• Critically analyses recommended relevant literature and other sources.</li> </ul>	<b>K</b>	<p>Does not fulfil most of the criteria to a satisfactory standard – does not achieve a satisfactory level of overall performance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only a few key concepts or points are noted; other information noted is inaccurate and/or irrelevant</li> <li>• Limited listing and simple brief descriptions of knowledge resulting in only partial explanation, with restating of information read, with little transformation or application.</li> <li>• Some major errors of fact, does not discriminate relevant from irrelevant data.</li> <li>• Organisation is limited and not logical.</li> <li>• Limited use of recommended relevant literature.</li> </ul>
<b>C</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic style is consistently used, expression is clear and error free.</li> <li>• Uses a range of appropriate presentation formats, eg tables, text, flow charts, diagrams.</li> <li>• Information sources are acknowledged, referencing is consistent and accurate.</li> <li>• Requested format is followed.</li> <li>• Shows evidence of incorporating majority of feedback.</li> </ul>	<b>C</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic style not used and expression has some errors, eg grammar, making communication difficult.</li> <li>• Deviated from requested format, eg learning issue question not included, 1 page over limit, font size &lt;11 pt.</li> <li>• List of references (in text and in a reference list) is incomplete and source(s) cannot be easily identified.</li> <li>• No evidence of using feedback.</li> </ul>
<b>Good (Mark = 6.5 – 7.4)</b>		<b>Unsatisfactory (Mark = 3 – 3.9)</b>	
<b>K</b>	<p>Fulfills most of the criteria with a good level of overall performance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All key concepts/information/facts and minor concepts ie encyclopaedic information or concepts are noted and accurate terminology is used, No errors of fact.</li> <li>• Some level of organisation but not logical or incomplete, eg looks like a detailed and partly organised shopping list, derived from recommended sources.</li> <li>• Limited application of information to situation or indication of relationships between concepts ie information is of basic or general use, eg identifies teeth/oral surface features or steps in the appropriate sequence for a preventive plan.</li> <li>• Critically analyses recommended relevant literature.</li> </ul>	<b>K</b>	<p>Fails to meet more than half of the criteria – unsatisfactory in most aspects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Misses point of LI questions; doesn't answer LI questions; repeats words in question but says nothing/adds nothing; incorrect information/terminology.</li> <li>• Explains issues/knowledge incompletely or minimally, with little or no application of knowledge.</li> <li>• Major errors of fact, does not discriminate relevant from irrelevant data.</li> <li>• Organisation of knowledge is not evident.</li> </ul>
<b>C</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic style is used mostly, expression is clear and error free.</li> <li>• Uses common presentation formats eg tables and text.</li> <li>• Information sources are acknowledged, referencing is consistent and accurate.</li> <li>• Minor deviation from requested format is followed, eg, &lt;11pt font.</li> <li>• Shows evidence of incorporating majority of feedback.</li> </ul>	<b>C</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic style not used, expression has major errors, information cannot be understood, requiring extensive clarification.</li> <li>• Deviated from requested format, eg &gt; 1 page over or under limit, font size &lt;11 pt.</li> <li>• Referencing is incomplete, sources are not acknowledged; referencing is inconsistent and/or inaccurate; format not followed (in text and in a reference list) and source(s) cannot be identified.</li> <li>• No evidence of using feedback.</li> </ul>
		<b>Very Unsatisfactory (Mark = &lt; 2)</b>	
		<p>Achieves few or none of the criteria.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fails to submit work.</li> </ul>	

**Key: K Content knowledge acquisition, integration, organisation, relevance and application**

**C Communication: Academic Writing and Formatting**