Marking Criteria for Population Analysis Report

Student Name:

Student Number:

Marker:

\leftarrow Level of Student Autonomy \rightarrow	

			<u>,</u>	
Facet of Inquiry	Level 1 Students research at the level of a	Level 2 Students research at the level of a	Level 3 Students research independently at the	Level 4 Students research at the level of an open
	closed inquiry and require a high	closed inquiry and require some	level of a closed enquiry	inquiry, within structured guidelines
A. Students embark on inquiry and so determine a need	 degree of structure/guidance Report lacks an explicit statement of Aims (although these may be 	 structure/guidance A statement of Aims/hypothesis is present but is either not clearly 	 Report has a clear statement of Aims/hypothesis, that closely 	 Aims/hypothesis are clearly stated, focussed and innovative
for knowledge/ understanding	deduced from report content) and there is no hypothesis	stated or is inappropriate to the investigation conducted	reflects exemplars provided in the task guidelines	
B. Students find/generate needed information/data using appropriate methodology	Source of data is cited (cemetery name/location, ABS, etc) but no details of collection protocols provided, or protocols inadequate	 Data sampling protocols are adequate but not entirely appropriate in addressing aims/hypothesis 	 Data gathered are appropriate to aims/hypothesis 	Data from a variety of sources or rigorous data collection
	 Locates literature relevant to the general topic 	Locates more specific literature on at least one aspect of topic	 Locates specific literature supporting several aspects of topic 	 Locates specific literature supporting all aspects of topic
C. Students critically evaluate information/data and the process to find/generate it	No awareness of study limitations and biases but an attempt at critical analysis via completion of report self evaluation	 Report self evaluation + Limitations or biases of the study design or data collection methods are stated/addressed 	 Report self evaluation + Limitations and biases of the study design or data collection methods are stated/addressed 	Evaluation of the whole study design is rigorous
D. Students organise information collected/ generated	 Data are gathered but are not presented in a report writing structure Missing 	 Data are incorporated into a report writing structure but there is no clear linkage between sections Poor linkage of	Report writing conventions are generally followed with coherent flow Areas for improvement:	Report writing conventions are followed completely
E. Students synthesise, analyse and apply new knowledge	 There is limited synthesis of study data with existing literature Results are restated with minimal analysis and discussion 	 Study data are compared <u>or</u> contrasted with existing literature Analysis & discussion of data, but misinterpretations/ inappropriate conclusions 	 Study data are compared <u>and</u> contrasted with existing literature Analysis & discussion of data is appropriate but omissions evident 	 Synthesis of study data with that from other studies is rigorous Analysis & discussion of data is comprehensive
<i>F. Students</i> communicate knowledge and the processes used to generate it, with an awareness of ethical, social and cultural issues	 Title is present Sources are cited in the text and LOR, but Harvard referencing style is not applied 	 Title portrays a general sense of the study content Sources are cited in the text and LOR using Harvard referencing style but it is inconsistently applied or many minor style errors are present 	 Title succinctly portrays the full dimensions of the study Sources are cited in the text and LOR and Harvard referencing is consistently applied although a few minor style errors are present 	 Title succinctly portrays a study from an "original" perspective A range of sources is cited in the text and LOR and Harvard referencing is consistently and accurately applied