

Courtesy of Catherine Snelling, School of Dentistry, University of Adelaide
Assessment Criteria – Radiation Biology Assignment

Name: _____

| Criteria | High Distinction | Distinction | Credit | Pass | Fail |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>Knowledge acquisition, integration and application.</p> <p>Comparative analysis. Controversies or alternatives elaborated on.</p> <p>40%</p> | <p>Fulfils and exceeds all the criteria with an excellent level of overall performance</p> <p>Comprehensive discussion (analysing, synthesising and evaluating) with additional related content areas addressed from a wide range of sources.</p> <p>Displays excellent understanding of all main relevant areas of knowledge.</p> <p>Controversies elaborated on.</p> <p>Coherent explanation and sustained argument.</p> <p>No errors of fact.</p> | <p>Fulfils all the criteria with a very good level of overall performance.</p> <p>Analyses, synthesises and evaluates knowledge from different sources to develop coherent argument.</p> <p>Relating all content to specific situation/topic.</p> <p>Displays very good understanding of all main relevant areas of knowledge.</p> <p>Comparing and contrasting different patients/situation.</p> <p>Controversies highlighted.</p> | <p>Fulfils most of the criteria with a good level of overall performance.</p> <p>Analyses and synthesises knowledge from recommended sources to develop coherent explanation and argument.</p> <p>Displays good understanding of all main relevant areas of knowledge.</p> <p>Demonstrated knowledge and understanding of topic.</p> <p>No errors of fact.</p> | <p>Fulfils most of the criteria with a satisfactory level of overall performance.</p> <p>Major content areas addressed.</p> <p>Displays sound understanding of all main relevant areas of knowledge.</p> <p>Retelling of information with limited relating to specific patients/situation and/or content areas.</p> <p>Minor errors of fact.</p> | <p>Fails to meet many criteria – unsatisfactory in most aspects.</p> <p>Some areas addressed (incomplete).</p> <p>Does not display evidence of sound understanding of main relevant knowledge.</p> <p>Very limited relationships drawn between patients and/or content areas.</p> <p>Failed to meet minimum requirements.</p> <p>Errors of fact.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| | | No errors of fact. | | | |
| <p>Construction & validation of argument including use of knowledge to compare and contrast between different situations. Develop from general to specific. Include appropriate introduction and conclusion.</p> <p>40%</p> | <p>Highly reflective argument, identifying, relating, comparing and contrasting issues raised.</p> <p>Thoroughly organises and formulates an approach to the scenario. Interprets clearly and accurately in relation to the context.</p> <p>Responded in both lay and technical approach.</p> | <p>Organises and formulates an approach to the scenario. Interprets clearly and accurately the majority of issues raised.</p> <p>Understanding transferred into response to patient/situation/topic or presented technical discussion.</p> <p>Demonstrated selectivity & judgement.</p> | <p>Approaches the scenario logically.</p> <p>Recognises and identifies issues.</p> <p>Lack of integration of knowledge.</p> <p>Some evidence-based examples used to support argument.</p> <p>Limited examples supporting information</p> | <p>Approaches the scenario logically.</p> <p>Does not consider all relevant data or discriminate relevant from irrelevant data</p> <p>Paraphrasing and lists.</p> | <p>Does not work through the scenario logically</p> <p>Argument lacking or lacks conviction</p> |
| <p>Communication, including structure of response, writing, spelling, grammar. Referencing should include using a variety of references, from texts, journals & electronic, which are both relevant & current, & should be acknowledged.</p> <p>20%</p> | <p>A well structured response.</p> <p>A wide range of relevant sources referenced.</p> <p>All sources of information appropriately referenced/acknowledged.</p> <p>Expression is clear.</p> | <p>No grammatical /spelling errors.</p> <p>Uses predominantly texts and references with some additional sources used.</p> <p>Adequate referencing.</p> <p>Expression is clear.</p> | <p>Minor grammatical/spelling errors.</p> <p>Mostly uses texts/recommended references.</p> <p>Adequate referencing/sourcing.</p> <p>Expression is clear.</p> | <p>Some grammatical/spelling errors.</p> <p>Uses few text/references</p> <p>Inadequate sourcing.</p> <p>Expression is generally clear.</p> | <p>Major grammatical/spelling errors, poorly structured response.</p> <p>Lack of or inappropriate referencing (plagiarism).</p> <p>Expression is unclear</p> |

Comment:

Final Grade: / 100