

LW202 'Law of Contract II' – Marking Criteria for Contract Law Assessment 1 Semester 2 2014

RSD Facets	Elements	Distinction (A, A+) 78 - 100%	Credit (B, B+) 64 - 77%	Pass (C, C+) 50 - 63%	Fail (below standard) 40 - 49%	Fail (weak performance) Less than 40%
Embark and Clarify	Introduction	Establishes context to subject and presents legal issues. Line of argument is clear and effective.	Establishes context to subject and presents legal issues. Line of argument is clear.	Establishes context to subject and presents legal issues. Line of argument taken but vague.	Attempt to link context to subject and present legal issues, but link is weak. No clear line of argument.	Introduction incomplete, flawed or missing.
Find and Generate	Relevance and credibility of information sources	Wide range of appropriate and relevant primary/ secondary references fully integrated into text with sound mix of direct/indirect quotations. Quotations support arguments.	A range of appropriate and relevant primary/ secondary references generally integrated into text with mix of direct/indirect quotations. Most quotations support arguments.	Attempt made to apply research to essay, some integration of primary/ secondary references to text. Balance of direct/indirect quotations is uneven. Quotations occasionally replace student input.	Application or research to essay uncertain. Heavy reliance on very few primary/secondary references. Balance of direct/indirect quotations is questionable. Quotations often replace student input.	No evidence of research.
	Referencing	Citations totally accurate and referenced according to <i>SOL Referencing Guide</i> and <i>AGLC</i> . Bibliography complete and accurate.	Most citations are correct and referenced according to <i>SOL Referencing Guide</i> and <i>AGLC</i> . Bibliography good but has minor errors.	Citations show several errors and difficulty with <i>SOL Referencing Guide</i> and <i>AGLC</i> . Bibliography is satisfactory but has some errors.	Citations show many errors and inability to use <i>SOL Referencing Guide</i> and <i>AGLC</i> . Bibliography has many errors.	Lack of appropriate citation and bibliography.
Evaluate and Reflect	Quality of analysis	Presents strong, focused argument, well supported by impressive legal analysis and evidence. Points made are clear and convincing.	Presents argument with relevant legal analysis and supporting evidence. Points made are clear.	Presents argument with some legal analysis but also some description/ summary. Points made can be followed but require some effort.	Argument is not clear with more summary than evidence of legal analysis. Point of essay is lost in some places.	No argument or evidence provided. Point of essay is unclear.
	Conclusion	Thoughtful final perspective and persuasive conclusion.	Has clear conclusion which brings together main points and answers question.	Has a conclusion which simply repeats main points.	Has a conclusion with little detail or unclear.	No apparent conclusion.
Organise and Manage	Plan	Clear identification and separation of relevant ideas with details.	Clearly showing relevant ideas with details.	Some distinction of ideas but not consistent.	Ideas do not reflect the legal issues. Major elements missing.	No apparent plan.
	Paragraphs	Has well-structured paragraphs, that have one main idea and strong supporting primary/ secondary resources. Has very good links between paragraphs that result in an essay that flows well.	Has well-structured paragraphs that have one main idea and supporting primary/secondary resources. Links between paragraphs are there but could be stronger.	Has separate paragraphs that have one main idea and some supporting primary/secondary resources but not consistent. Some links between paragraphs.	Has poor paragraph development – main ideas left undeveloped or more than one main idea in a paragraph. Links between paragraphs are absent or not clearly stated. Little use of primary/secondary resources.	Has little sense of paragraphing – paragraphs are too long or too short. Main ideas and supporting primary/secondary resources are poor and confusing.
Analyse and Synthesise	Development of analysis	Answers question set fully and thoughtfully linking answers to broader discussions in the discipline and/or developing new perspectives on the question.	Answers question set clearly and in sufficient detail.	Answers the question set mostly – some irrelevance.	Addresses the question but in a roundabout way, irrelevant discussion on question set.	Fails to answer question set.
Communicate and Apply	Language and grammar	Mostly free of errors in punctuation, word choice, spelling and format. Grammar wholly accurate.	Some errors in punctuation, word choice, spelling and format. Grammar mostly accurate.	Careless errors in punctuation, word choice, spelling and format. Minor grammatical errors but somewhat accurate.	Errors impede comprehensibility.	Errors seriously compromise comprehensibility.

Prepared by Natasha Khan, Jessie Chella, Anuleshni Neelta, Anthony Austin, and Heena Lal.

Copyright © The University of the South Pacific, 2014. Rubric designed by Natasha Khan, Jessie Chella, Anuleshni Neelta, Anthony Austin and Heena Lal. Available under Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License. Reference: Willison, J. and O'Regan, K., 2006 and 2013. *The Research Skills Development Framework*.