

Using the Research Skill Development Framework to Construct Marking Rubrics for Law Assessments*

Thaatchayini Kananatu¹

¹Business Law and Taxation Department, Monash University, Malaysia.

Corresponding author email address: thaatchayini.kananatu@monash.edu

A peer reviewed short paper for a presentation at the International conference on Models of Engaged Learning and Teaching (I-MELT), 11-13 December 2017. Available from www.imelt.edu.au

Abstract

This practice paper aims to document the utility of the Research Skill Development (RSD) framework in constructing (a) assignment marking rubrics for the in-semester assessment of International Trade Law, a core unit under the Master of International Business programme in Monash University Malaysia; and (b) paper marking rubrics for an undergraduate conference titled Genderworks: Dialogue and Action across Our Differences, organised by Monash University Malaysia. This paper is a story of “why” and “how” the RSD was aligned to the learning outcomes as well as the key assessment criteria for law assignments, particularly for units taken by non-law students. In using the RSD for either undergraduate or postgraduate law assignments for non-law students, this practice paper proposes that there is a need to obtain student feedback and reflection on the effectiveness of the RSD for research-based law assignments.

** Support for this project/activity has been provided by the Monash Education Academy.*

Why the RSD?

My first introduction to the Research(er) Skills Development framework or RSD (Willison & O’Regan, 2007; Willison, 2012) was at an introductory workshop on ‘Working with the Research Skill Development framework’ conducted by Monash learning advisors Lyn Torres and Sarah Jansen from Monash University Library Australia on 28th September 2016. The workshop introduced the RSD as a non-prescriptive framework that provided a structure through which educators can teach research skills to university students. Since Semester 2, 2016, I have been the Chief Examiner of the unit BTM 5919 International Trade Law, a core unit under the Masters of International Business (MIB) Programme at the School of Business, Monash University Malaysia. As a Chief Examiner as well as lecturer for the unit, I found the RSD framework to be malleable

enough to incorporate into the assessment design and key marking criteria of the Masters-level law assignment. However, as the students were not law students, but business students, there was a need to align the law-based assessments and legal research to relevant learning outcomes that take into consideration business students' future professional undertakings in the corporate world.

One of the key aims in a Masters-level or postgraduate level unit, is to enhance research skills – in particular to enhance research-based “thinking” and to teach and/or guide students the processes involved in research. There was a critical need to focus on the priority of the MIB Programme as a whole – and to facilitate students undertaking the Research Pathway option and for potential or future Higher Degree Research or HDR students. Following the line of literature that points to inculcating a research culture in undergraduate curriculum (Willison & Buisman-Pijlman, 2016; Paterson, *et al.*, 2013) and master's curriculum (Venning and Buisman-Pijlman, 2013), the objective in using the RSD framework was to promote a research culture among the postgraduates who undertook the MIB programme. However, there was a practice gap incorporating research skills in the unit International Trade Law, as the previous focus of the unit was on law assessment styles that were “problem-based” rather than “research-based”.

The problem-based teaching approach required the use of a legal reasoning method commonly known as the “Issue Rule Application Conclusion” or IRAC method of analysis (Burton, 2017; Turner (2012). The IRAC method was designed for law students in order to inculcate legal reasoning skills and train the students to ‘think like a lawyer’ (Burton, 2017). This paper postulates that the IRAC method is not suitable for non-law students, who are not aiming to be legally trained. There is a tension between problem-based learning and research-based learning.

The current literature on legal education for non-law students, in particular business students, is focused on studies that advocate using the ‘problem-based learning’ approach (Batty, 2013; Douglas, 2012); the ‘environmentalist’ or contextual approach (i.e., “how is law relevant to business?”) (Dove, 2016; Endeshaw, 2002); and using inter-disciplinary theoretical frameworks to make sense of the “law” in social sciences and economics (Arup, 2013; Jones, 1989). The current literature shows gaps in terms of incorporating a research framework in the teaching and assessment of law subjects for non-law students. Braye (2006) advocates a research-informed organisation of the teaching and learning of law for non-law students through the curriculum and assessment tasks which involve student-led research, but does not indicate the methodology or framework to be used. The literature is focused on teaching law to non-law undergraduate students, which points to a significant gap in studies done on teaching law to non-law *postgraduate* students, which requires a higher standard of research-informed curriculum and assessment. Although this paper proposes to fill the gap in practice, it is a stepping stone to conducting an empirical study for a future theoretical paper on the use of the RSD for legal education for non-law students.

In order to fill the gap in practice, I have attempted to focus on infusing research skills in assessment questions and criteria as well as marking rubrics. The approach I took was to attempt in constructing the assignment questions, criteria and marking rubrics in alignment to the RSD for the last three semesters (See Annex 1). The librarians and learning advisors from Monash University Malaysia (MUM), in particular, Annette Wilson, Sara Kuhn, and Namita Santra were assisting me throughout that process with suggestions and feedback. The ongoing process and dialogue with the librarians has kept the assessment rubric fluid and flexible. To further enhance my knowledge in RSD, on 31st May 2017, I attended the Masterclass workshop conducted by John Willison from the University of Adelaide, and Lyn Torres and Sebastian Borutta from Monash University Australia. The masterclass explored an adapted version of the RSD – the MELT – Models of Engaged Teaching and Learning. This further piqued my interest in using the RSD, not only for assessment marking rubrics but also for curriculum design.

Thus, this practice paper traces the development of “how” the Research Skill Development Framework (RSD) was used. In particular, it addresses the construction of two types of marking rubrics: (a) in-semester assignments in the MIB’s unit International Trade Law and (b) research papers for a multidisciplinary undergraduate conference titled *Genderworks: Dialogue and Action across Our Differences*, organised by the School of Arts and Social Sciences, and the School of Business, Monash University Malaysia.

How the RSD was Used

International Trade Law

The MIB unit International Trade Law for postgraduate students, has three significant learning outcomes that are potentially aligned to the RSD facets: first, to be able to identify legal issues and laws in an international trade context; second, to be able to apply the laws relating to international trade in a variety of practical situations; and third, to be able to write a coherent piece of advice discussing the legal implications of the issues arising in an international trade dispute (Unit Guide, Semester 2, 2017). The unit comprises two in-semester formative assessments: individual presentations and an assignment. The assignment (which accounts for 25% of the total grade) tests the students on their ability to identify the legal issues that arise in an international trade context, to determine the relevant laws and scholarly work relating to those legal issues, and to be able to give coherent advice on the legal implications. The assignment requires the students to embark on a research process which involves conducting legal research (i.e., finding the law, legal materials and legal resources); analysing the legal data obtained and putting the analysis into context (i.e., how it solves the legal problem at hand).

Attempts were made to incorporate the RSD facets into this process, and what was developed used the RSD facets as well as a combination of the IRAC Method and social science-type essay writing criteria (See Annex

1). For instance, Facet 1 (Embark and Clarify) was used to measure the student's ability to identify the issue or legal issues; Facet 2 (Find and Generate) was used to ascertain the student's research in finding the relevant rule; Facet 3 (Evaluate and Reflect) was used to determine the student's ability to apply the rules or laws found to the legal issues identified; and Facet 5 (Analyse and Synthesise) provided a means to ascertain the student's conclusion or final answer to the question. As the assignment also requires good structure and writing skills, Facet 4 (Organise and Manage) and Facet 6 (Communicate and Apply) was used to measure students' ability to structure their answers linking their arguments, show clarity of thought and use the correct citation and referencing.

By employing both the RSD and the IRAC Method, I was not only able to teach the postgraduate business students how to conduct legal research, but also encouraged them to use the skills learnt in their law assignment for other subjects that required research. Comparison of the results from two law assignments (Semester 2, 2016 and Semester 1, 2017) showed that students who undertook the Semester 1 unit scored higher, and there were more students who obtained a Distinction and Credit. Using the RSD to create a criterion-referenced assessment rubric also enabled me to align the assessment question to the rubric. Students in Semesters 1 and 2, 2017 were able to answer the assessment question more effectively.

Genderworks Conference

In July 2017, I was made a convener for an undergraduate conference titled *Genderworks: Dialogue and Action across Our Differences*, organised by the School of Arts and Social Sciences and the School of Business, Monash University Malaysia. As a convener, and also one of the judges for the research papers, I recommended that the committee use the RSD. The conference papers accepted were based on gender themes including law/human rights, media and politics, which attracted papers from undergraduate law students (non-Monash institutions), as well as students from gender studies, medicine and engineering. With a diverse set of conference papers came the need to develop a more "neutral" rubric which will take student diversity into account (See Annex 2).

Hence the conference paper judging rubric incorporated the RSD facets in accordance with the social science criteria required in research assignments. This did not differ greatly from the MIB assignment rubric, except in focusing on the conference theme and sub-themes rather than the law. Two other judges used the conference paper judging rubric, in order to be fair and to attempt to standardize the marking process. Although the judges were able to give comments and constructive criticism of the papers outside the RSD facets/rubric criteria, what was appreciated was the more objective criteria set by the RSD. This more objective criteria also assisted in answering any queries from paper presenters, in justifying the results.

Where to From Here?

This practice paper is a story of my experience experimenting with the RSD for two sets of marking rubrics: one for postgraduate assignments and the other for undergraduate conference/research papers. What I have discovered is that the RSD can be used for law-based assignments, in particular incorporating legal methods of analysis and criteria for legal essay writing. Although it is crucial to ensure that the RSD-based rubric be aligned to the learning outcomes of the subject taught, what is missing in this story is student feedback. There is a need to measure the outcomes through students' comments and reflection on the rubric, which I plan to obtain in the coming semester.

My personal experience using the RSD from September 2016 to date has been positive; since introducing RSD-based rubrics, my own teaching evaluation scores have improved. This has encouraged me to further incorporate the RSD, not just for assignment marking, but also for the whole curriculum. The RSD could prove to be a transferrable skill, which could be potentially used for other both academic and professional/non-academic research endeavours.

References

- Arup, C. (2013). Business law: The sometime subject of socio-legal studies. *Law in Context*, 29(2), 10-23.
- Batty, R. (2013). Well there's your problem – the case for using PBL to teach law to business students. *The Law Teacher*, 47(2), 243-260.
- Braye, S., Preston-Shoot, M., & Johns, R. (2006). Lost in translation? Teaching law to non-lawyers: Reviewing the evidence from social work. *The Law Teacher*, 40(2), 131-150.
- Burton, K. (2017). "Think Like a Lawyer" Using a Legal Reasoning Grid and Criterion-Referenced Assessment Rubric on IRAC (Issue, Rule, Application, Conclusion). *Journal of Learning Design*, 10(2), 57-68.
- Douglas, S. (2012). Student engagement, problem based learning and teaching law to Business students. (Report). *E-Journal of Business Education and Scholarship Teaching*, 6(1), 33-43.
- Dove, L., & Bryant, N. (2016). Law in Translation: Challenges and Opportunities in Teaching International Students in Business Law and Legal Environment Courses. *Journal of Legal Studies Education*, 33(2), 263-291.
- Endeshaw, A. (2002). Teaching law to business students: An inquiry into curriculum and methodology. *The Law Teacher*, 36(1), 24-43.
- Jones, M. (1989). A Primer on Teaching International Business Law to Undergraduate Students. *Journal of Legal Studies Education*, 8(1-2), 37-51.
- Paterson, G., Rachfall, T., & Reid, C. (2013). Building a Culture of Research: Using Undergraduate Research to Advance the TR Profession, Build Research Capacity, and Foster Collaborative Relationships. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 47(4), 259-275.
- Turner, T. (2012). Finding consensus in legal writing discourse regarding organizational structure: A review and analysis of the use of IRAC and its progenies. *Legal Communication & Rhetoric: JALWD*, 9, 351-364.
- Venning, J., & Buisman-Pijlman, F. (2013). Integrating assessment matrices in feedback loops to promote research skill development in postgraduate research projects. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(5), 567-579.
- Willison, J., & Buisman-Pijlman, F. (2016). PhD prepared: Research skill development across the undergraduate years. *International Journal for Researcher Development*, 7(1), 63-83.
- Willison, J. W. (2012). When Academics Integrate Research Skill Development in the Curriculum. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 31(6), 905-919.
- Willison, J., & O'Regan, K. (2007). Commonly known, commonly not known, totally unknown: A framework for students becoming researchers. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 26(4), 393-409.



Annex 1: Rubric for International Trade Law (Semester 2 2017) In-Semester Assessment *

Criterion	High Distinction (80-100)	Distinction (70-79)	Credit (60-69)	Pass (50-59)	Fail (49-0)
Embark and Clarify <input type="checkbox"/> Aligned with the assessment task/question. *Evident from the introduction/overall arguments in the answer. Total Marks: [15]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establishes a <i>very strong</i> connection to the task/question. ▪ Identifies <i>all</i> the relevant legal issues and sets the scope of the task <i>very well</i>. [12.0 – 15.0]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establishes a <i>strong</i> connection to the task/question. ▪ Identifies <i>most</i> of the relevant legal issues and sets the scope of the task <i>well</i>. [10.5 – 11.9]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establishes an <i>adequate</i> connection to the task/question. ▪ <i>Adequately</i> identifies the relevant legal issues and <i>adequately</i> sets the scope of the task. [9.0 – 10.4]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establishes a <i>weak connection</i> to the task/question. ▪ Identifies <i>some</i> of the relevant legal issues and <i>somewhat</i> sets the scope of the task. [7.5 – 8.9]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>No or very weak connection</i> to the task/question. ▪ <i>No or very little</i> identification of the relevant legal issues; <i>fails</i> to set the scope of the task. [0 – 7.4]
Find and Generate <input type="checkbox"/> Relevance and credibility of sources. <input type="checkbox"/> Diverse source base includes scholarly books, journal articles, statutes & legal cases. *Evident from footnotes/reference list. Total Marks: [20]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sources are <i>all highly</i> relevant and credible, well-chosen, and <i>numerous</i> (eight and above). ▪ <i>Very diverse</i> source base. [16 – 20]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sources are <i>mostly</i> relevant and credible, well-chosen, and <i>sufficiently numerous</i> (six to seven). ▪ <i>Diverse</i> source base. [14 – 15.8]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sources are <i>reasonably</i> relevant, credible, well-chosen, and <i>adequate</i> in number (four to five). ▪ <i>Sufficiently diverse</i> source base. [12 – 13.8]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sources are <i>mostly irrelevant</i>, not credible nor well-chosen and <i>few</i> in number (three to four). ▪ <i>Somewhat narrow</i> or similar source base. [10 – 11.8]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sources are <i>all irrelevant</i>, not credible nor well-chosen and <i>very few</i> in number (two to none). ▪ <i>Excessively narrow</i> or similar source base. [0 – 9.8]
Evaluate and Reflect <input type="checkbox"/> Quality and strength of analysis and knowledge <input type="checkbox"/> Key arguments *Evident from the body of the answer. Total Marks: [20]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstrates <i>very high</i> degree of originality and complexity in clear and direct response to key aspects of the question. ▪ <i>Fully accurate</i> understanding of relevant knowledge. ▪ <i>Very strong analysis</i> and <i>highly analytical</i>. ▪ <i>Highly original</i> and <i>very clear</i> argumentation [16 – 20]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstrates <i>high</i> degree of originality and complexity in clear and direct response to key aspects of the question. ▪ <i>Mostly accurate</i> understanding of relevant knowledge. ▪ <i>Strong analysis</i> and <i>more analytical</i> than narrative. ▪ <i>Mostly original</i> and <i>clear</i> argumentation. [14 – 15.8]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstrates <i>adequate</i> degree of originality and complexity in clear and direct response to key aspects of the question. ▪ <i>Adequately accurate</i> understanding of relevant knowledge. ▪ <i>Sufficient analysis</i>; <i>more narrative</i> than analytical. ▪ <i>Lacks originality</i> but <i>sufficiently clear</i> argumentation. [12 – 13.8]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstrates <i>inadequate</i> degree of originality and complexity in clear and direct response to key aspects of the question. ▪ <i>Somewhat inaccurate</i> understanding of relevant knowledge. ▪ <i>Insufficient analysis</i>; <i>mostly narrative</i>. ▪ <i>Very little originality</i> and <i>unclear</i> argumentation. [10 – 11.8]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Fails</i> to directly respond to and address the key aspects of the question. ▪ <i>Fully inaccurate</i> understanding of relevant knowledge. ▪ <i>Excessively or fully narrative</i>, with <i>no analysis</i>. ▪ <i>No originality</i> and no clear argumentation. [0 – 9.8]



Criterion	High Distinction (80-100)	Distinction (70-79)	Credit (60-69)	Pass (50-59)	Fail (49-0)
Organise and Manage <input type="checkbox"/> Plan and Structure *Evident from the overall answer.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very clear/excellent identification and separation of relevant ideas and arguments with details. Very strong structure, with very clearly outlined arguments, provides very strong introduction and conclusion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear/good identification and separation of relevant ideas and arguments with details. Strong structure, with clearly outlined arguments, provides strong introduction and conclusion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficiently clear identification and separation of relevant ideas and arguments with details. Sufficient structure, with sufficiently outlined arguments, provides adequate introduction and conclusion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Somewhat unclear identification and separation of relevant ideas and arguments with details. Weak structure, that lacks a clear contention, with some outlined arguments, provides weak introduction and conclusion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very unclear identification and separation of relevant ideas and arguments with details. Very weak structure, with no outlined arguments, provides very weak or no introduction and conclusion.
Total Marks: [15]	[12.0 – 15.0]	[10.5 – 11.9]	[9.0 – 10.4]	[7.5 – 8.9]	[0 – 7.4]
Analyse and Synthesise <input type="checkbox"/> Development of analysis *Evident from the final conclusion of the answer.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final conclusion very coherently and logically links arguments from paragraph to paragraph. Provides a very strong, clear and concise final conclusion, fully synthesising and linking all the key arguments made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final conclusion coherently and logically links arguments from paragraph to paragraph. Provides a strong, clear and concise final conclusion, synthesising and linking all the key arguments made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final conclusion adequately links arguments from paragraph to paragraph, with minor shortcomings. Provides an adequate, and sufficiently clear and concise final conclusion, with minor shortcomings in synthesising and linking key arguments made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final conclusion inadequately links arguments from paragraph to paragraph, with major shortcomings. Provides an inadequate, and insufficiently clear and concise final conclusion, with major shortcomings in synthesising and linking key arguments made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No or very weak final conclusion which fails to links arguments from paragraph to paragraph. Provides no or very weak final conclusion, with no synthesis/linking of key arguments made (if any).
Total Marks: [15]	[12.0 – 15.0]	[10.5 – 11.9]	[9.0 – 10.4]	[7.5 – 8.9]	[0 – 7.4]
Communicate and Apply <input type="checkbox"/> Written expression: language and grammar <input type="checkbox"/> Use of Australian Guide to Legal Citation (AGLC) Referencing Style and List of References.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing style is very clear and concise with very few or no errors in English grammar, spelling, and punctuation; no typographical errors. Very effective/ excellent articulation of ideas. All correct and consistent citations according to AGLC referencing style. Provides a fully complete list of references. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing style clear and coherent with few minor errors in English grammar, spelling, and punctuation; few minor typographical errors. Effective/good articulation of ideas. Almost all correct and consistent citations with few minor errors in AGLC referencing style. Provides an almost complete list of references. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing style adequately clear with frequent minor errors in English grammar, spelling, and punctuation; frequent minor typographical errors. Generally effective articulation of ideas. Generally correct and consistent citations with frequent minor errors in AGLC referencing style. Provides an adequate list of references. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing style unclear or incoherent. Few major errors in English grammar, spelling, and punctuation; few major typographical errors. Poor quality of writing impedes the author's ability to articulate ideas. Incorrect and inconsistent citations with few major errors in AGLC referencing style. Provides an inadequate list of references. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing style very unclear or very incoherent. Frequent major errors in English grammar, spelling, and punctuation; frequent major typographical errors. Very poor quality of writing which seriously impedes the author's ability to articulate ideas. Fails to use AGLC referencing style. Fails to provide any list of references.
Total Marks: [15]	[12.0 – 15.0]	[10.5 – 11.9]	[9.0 – 10.4]	[7.5 – 8.9]	[0 – 7.4]



Criterion	High Distinction (80-100)	Distinction (70-79)	Credit (60-69)	Pass (50-59)	Fail (49-0)
Subtotal:	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
Adjustments/penalties:					
TOTAL MARKS: []	Comments:				



Annex 2: Rubric for Papers Submitted to the Genderworks Undergraduate Conference*

Criterion	EXCELLENT (80-100)	GOOD (60-79)	AVERAGE (40-59)	POOR (0-39)	COMMENTS/MARKS
1. Embark and Clarify <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Aligned with conference track/theme.</i> <i>*Evident from the introduction/overall arguments in the paper.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establishes a <i>very strong connection</i> to conference theme (gender) and relevant track. ▪ Identifies <i>all</i> the relevant issues/arguments and sets the scope of the paper <i>very well</i>. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establishes a <i>generally strong connection</i> to conference theme (gender) and relevant track. ▪ Identifies <i>most</i> of the relevant issues/arguments and sets the scope of the paper <i>well</i>. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establishes an <i>adequate connection</i> to conference theme (gender) and relevant track. ▪ Identifies <i>some</i> of the relevant issues/arguments and <i>adequately</i> sets the scope of the paper. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Weak/poor</i> connection to conference theme (gender) and relevant track. ▪ <i>Missing or flawed</i> identification of the relevant issues/arguments and poorly sets the scope of the paper. 	▪ []
Total Marks: [15]	[12.0 – 15.0]	[9.0 – 11.9]	[6.0 – 8.9]	[< 5.9]	
2. Find and Generate <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Relevance and credibility of sources.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Diverse source base includes: e.g. books, journal articles, statutes, legal cases and commentaries, newspaper articles.</i> <i>* Evident from footnotes/endnotes/ reference list.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sources are <i>all</i> relevant and credible, well-chosen, and <i>numerous</i> (eight and above). ▪ <i>Very diverse</i> source base. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sources are <i>mostly</i> relevant and credible, well-chosen, and <i>sufficiently numerous</i> (six to seven). ▪ <i>Sufficiently diverse</i> source base. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sources are reasonably relevant, credible, well-chosen, and <i>adequate</i> in number (four to five). ▪ <i>Somewhat narrow</i> or similar source base. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sources are mostly irrelevant, not credible nor well-chosen and <i>very few</i> in number (less than four). ▪ <i>Excessively narrow</i> or similar source base. 	▪ []
Total Marks: [20]	[16.0 – 20.0]	[12 – 15.9]	[8.0 – 11.9]	[< 7.9]	
3. Evaluate and Reflect <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Quality and strength of analysis and knowledge.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Key arguments</i> <i>*Evident from the body of the paper.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstrates <i>very high</i> degree of originality and complexity in clear and direct response to key aspects of the conference theme/ track. ▪ <i>Fully accurate</i> understanding of relevant knowledge. ▪ <i>Very strong</i> analysis. ▪ <i>Highly original</i> and clear argumentation. ▪ Uses sources <i>very effectively</i> in support of arguments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstrates <i>sufficiently high</i> degree of originality and complexity in clear and direct response to key aspects of the conference theme/ track. ▪ <i>Mostly accurate</i> understanding of relevant knowledge. ▪ <i>More analytical</i> than narrative. ▪ <i>Sufficiently original</i> and clear argumentation. ▪ Uses sources <i>effectively</i> in support of arguments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstrates <i>small</i> degree of originality and <i>adequate</i> complexity in clear and direct response to key aspects of the conference theme/ track. ▪ <i>Adequately accurate</i> understanding of relevant knowledge. ▪ <i>More narrative</i> than analytical. ▪ <i>Somewhat</i> clear argumentation. ▪ Uses sources <i>adequately</i> in support of arguments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstrates <i>inadequate</i> complexity in clear and direct response to key aspects of the conference theme/ track. ▪ <i>Inaccurate</i> understanding of relevant knowledge or source base. ▪ <i>Excessively narrative</i> with very little analysis. ▪ <i>Unclear</i> argumentation. ▪ <i>Inadequate</i> use of sources in support of arguments. 	▪ []



Criterion	EXCELLENT (80-100)	GOOD (60-79)	AVERAGE (40-59)	POOR (0-39)	COMMENTS/MARKS
Total Marks: [20]	[16 – 20]	[12 – 15.9]	[8.0 – 11.9]	[< 7.9]	
4. Organise and Manage <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Plan and Structure</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Very clear/excellent</i> identification and separation of relevant ideas and arguments with details. ▪ <i>Very strong</i> structure, with <i>very clearly</i> outlined arguments, provides <i>very strong</i> introduction and conclusion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Sufficiently clear</i> identification and separation of relevant ideas and arguments with details. ▪ <i>Sufficiently strong</i> structure, with <i>clearly</i> outlined arguments, provides <i>sufficiently strong</i> introduction and conclusion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Some</i> identification and separation of relevant ideas and arguments with <i>adequate</i> details. ▪ <i>Adequate</i> structure, with <i>adequately</i> outlined arguments, provides an introduction and conclusion but with <i>some</i> shortcomings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some distinction of ideas but not consistent. ▪ <i>Disorganised or weak</i> structure that <i>lacks</i> a clear contention, introduction and conclusion, or provides an introduction and conclusion with <i>many</i> shortcomings. 	▪ []
Total Marks: [15]	[12.0 – 15.0]	[9.0 – 11.9]	[6.0 – 8.9]	[< 5.9]	
5. Analyse and Synthesise <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Arguments and data are critically synthesised to produce coherent understanding.</i> <i>* Evident from the final conclusion or outcome of the paper.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Final conclusion <i>very coherently and logically</i> links arguments from paragraph to paragraph. ▪ Provides a <i>very strong</i>, clear and concise final conclusion, <i>fully</i> synthesising and linking all the key arguments made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Final conclusion <i>coherently and logically</i> links arguments from paragraph to paragraph. ▪ Provides a <i>sufficiently strong</i> clear and concise final conclusion, <i>sufficiently</i> synthesising and linking all the key arguments made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Final conclusion <i>adequately</i> links arguments from paragraph to paragraph, with <i>some</i> shortcomings. ▪ Provides an <i>adequate</i>, clear and <i>somewhat</i> concise final conclusion, <i>with shortcomings</i> in synthesising and linking all the key arguments made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Final conclusion <i>inadequately</i> links arguments from paragraph to paragraph, with <i>serious</i> shortcomings. ▪ Provides an <i>inadequate</i>, unclear or verbose conclusion, <i>with serious shortcomings</i> in synthesising and linking all the key arguments made. 	▪ []
Total Marks: [15]	[12.0 – 15.0]	[9.0 – 11.9]	[6.0 – 8.9]	[< 5.9]	



Criterion	EXCELLENT (80-100)	GOOD (60-79)	AVERAGE (40-59)	POOR (0-39)	COMMENTS/MARKS
<p>6. Communicate and Apply</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Written expression: Language and grammar.</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Referencing Style and List of References appropriate to discipline (e.g. OSCOLA, Bluebook or AGLC for law, Harvard, APA or Chicago for humanities and social sciences).</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing style is <i>very</i> clear and concise with very few or no errors in English grammar, spelling, and punctuation. <i>Very effective</i> articulation of ideas. All correct and consistent citations according to chosen referencing style. Provides a <i>fully complete</i> list of references. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing style clear and coherent with <i>minor</i> errors in English grammar, spelling, and punctuation, as well as <i>minor</i> typographical errors. <i>Effective</i> articulation of ideas. <i>Almost all</i> correct and consistent citations with some <i>minor</i> errors in referencing. Provides an <i>almost complete</i> list of references. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing style <i>adequately</i> clear with <i>frequent</i> errors in English grammar, spelling, and punctuation. <i>Frequent</i> typographical errors. <i>Generally effective</i> articulation of ideas. <i>Generally</i> correct and consistent citations with <i>frequent</i> errors in referencing. Provides an <i>adequate</i> list of references. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing style unclear or incoherent. <i>Major</i> errors in English grammar, spelling, and punctuation. <i>Major</i> typographical errors. Poor quality of writing impedes the author's ability to articulate ideas. <i>Incorrectly</i> cites sources and/or inconsistent referencing style. Provides an <i>inadequate</i> list of references. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> []
Total Marks: [15]	[12.0 – 15.0]	[9.0 – 11.9]	[6.0 – 8.9]	[< 5.9]	
Subtotal:	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
Adjustments/penalties:					
TOTAL MARKS: []	GENERAL COMMENTS:				

* Based on the Research Skill Development Framework (<http://www.adelaide.edu.au/rsd/>).