

## Assessment task 2: Contemporary Issues Marking Rubric

Criterion	Fail	Pass	Credit	Distinction	High Distinction
<b>Background</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides the reader with a clear understanding of VAD legislation, and why it provides an important option for people with terminal conditions.</li> <li>Discusses the circumstances in which VAD may be appropriate and the legislative requirements that now govern the practice.</li> <li>Describes consent arrangements for individuals wanting to utilise VAD.</li> <li>Outlines potential supportive and palliative approaches to care for people with terminal conditions.</li> <li>Builds a case for the importance of research enquiry, which is important to Nursing or midwifery practice.</li> </ul>	<p>Limited or absent background section that does not address the assessment criteria.</p> <p>Does not build a case for the importance of research enquiry, which is important to Nursing or midwifery practice.</p> <p>Largely unsupported with high quality literary evidence.</p> <p>Sequencing of ideas do not flow logically and does not create a cohesive narrative.</p>	<p>Background demonstrates a limited understanding of the role of VAD, legislative requirements, consent, or palliative approaches as per the assessment criteria.</p> <p>Builds an insubstantial case for the importance of research enquiry, which is important to nursing or midwifery practice.</p> <p>Limited use of high-quality literary evidence.</p> <p>Sequencing of ideas sometimes flow logically, but overall do not create a cohesive narrative.</p>	<p>Background demonstrates a basic understanding of role of VAD, legislative requirements, consent, or palliative approaches as per the assessment criteria.</p> <p>Builds a satisfactory case for the importance of research enquiry, which is important to nursing or midwifery practice.</p> <p>Limited use of high-quality literary evidence.</p> <p>Sequencing of ideas do not always flow logically but overall creates a cohesive narrative.</p>	<p>Demonstrates a substantial understanding of role of VAD, legislative requirements, consent, or palliative approaches as per the assessment criteria.</p> <p>Builds a clear case for the importance of research enquiry, which is important to nursing or midwifery practice.</p> <p>Supported mostly with high quality literary evidence.</p> <p>Sequencing of ideas mostly flow in a logical way and overall create a cohesive narrative.</p>	<p>Demonstrates a clear, accurate and comprehensive understanding of role of VAD, legislative requirements, consent, or palliative approaches as per the assessment criteria.</p> <p>Builds a plausible and compelling case for the importance of research enquiry, which is important to nursing or midwifery practice.</p> <p>Consistently supported with high quality literary evidence.</p> <p>Sequencing of ideas are extremely well organised and flow consistently in an eloquent and logical way. Overall creates a cohesive and persuasive narrative.</p>
<b>13 marks</b>	<b>0 - 6.4</b>	<b>6.5 - 7.7</b>	<b>7.8 - 9</b>	<b>9.1 – 10.3</b>	<b>10.4 -13</b>

<b>Research Question</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The research question accurately reflects the work that will be undertaken, is clear and concise, and includes all elements of PICO framework.</li> <li>• There is a clear justification for the research question based on relevant points in the background section.</li> <li>• All aspects of the search strategy are clearly linked to the research question.</li> <li>• Accurate use of search terms and databases, and study inclusion and exclusion criteria demonstrated.</li> <li>• Key article/s clearly synthesised.</li> <li>• Level of evidence identified.</li> </ul>	<p>Limited or absent attempt. Fails to demonstrate adequate use of the PICO research question framework.</p> <p>The research question does not link to the relevant points in the background.</p> <p>OR, the search strategy is absent.</p> <p>Key article/s not clearly synthesised; OR Level of evidence not identified</p>	<p>The research question does not accurately reflect the work that will be undertaken. Or two or more of elements of the PICO framework are missing.</p> <p>The research question is linked to some of the relevant points in the background. OR, the links are tenuous or vague.</p> <p>OR, the search strategy is not clearly linked to the research question. OR, most aspects of the search strategy are unclear or incomplete.</p> <p>Key article/s partially synthesised; OR Level of evidence lacking accuracy</p>	<p>The research question reflects most aspects of the work that will be undertaken but it could be clearer. OR, most elements of the PICO framework are present.</p> <p>The research question is linked to most of the relevant points in the background.</p> <p>The search strategy is mostly linked to the research question but several aspects of it are unclear or incomplete.</p> <p>Key article/s clearly synthesised; OR Level of evidence vague or insufficient explanation</p>	<p>The research question reflects most aspects of the work that will be undertaken but it could be clearer. All elements of the PICO framework are present.</p> <p>The research question is linked to most of the relevant points in the background.</p> <p>Most aspects of the search strategy are linked to the research question and accurate use of search terms and databases, and study inclusion and exclusion criteria is mostly demonstrated.</p> <p>Key article/s clearly synthesised. Level of evidence identified, explanation incomplete.</p>	<p>The research question accurately reflects the work that will be undertaken, is clear and concise, and includes all elements PICO framework.</p> <p>The question is clearly linked to the background of the paper and reflects the relevant, persuasive and insightful rationale for the research.</p> <p>All aspects of the search strategy are clearly linked to the research question, and accurate use of search terms and databases, and study inclusion and exclusion criteria demonstrated.</p> <p>Key article/s clearly synthesised. Level of evidence clearly identified and explained.</p>
<b>10 marks</b>	<b>0 - 4.9</b>	<b>5 -5.9</b>	<b>6 – 6.9</b>	<b>7 - 7.9</b>	<b>8 - 10</b>
<b>Clarity of Expression</b> <p>Demonstrates use of academic writing principles, discipline-specific language and formal tone.</p>	<p>The writing is disjointed and difficult to follow.</p> <p>Many errors in grammar, syntax or spelling that makes the work difficult to comprehend. Informal tone.</p> <p>No clear structure is evident.</p>	<p>The writing can be followed but meaning is often unclear. Some errors in grammar, syntax or spelling. Appropriate language, academic tone not always presented.</p> <p>Structure is attempted but not clear.</p>	<p>The writing can generally be understood, although one or more sections are difficult to follow. Meaning is sometimes unclear. Appropriate language, academic tone generally presented.</p> <p>Several errors in grammar, syntax or spelling. Structure is generally clear.</p>	<p>The writing is mostly easy to follow. Meaning is mostly clear. Appropriate language, academic tone mostly presented.</p> <p>Minor, or occasional, errors in grammar, syntax or spelling.</p> <p>Structure is mostly clear and organised.</p>	<p>The writing is easy to follow. Meaning is consistently clear. Appropriate language and academic tone consistently presented.</p> <p>Few or no errors in grammar, syntax or spelling.</p> <p>Structure is consistently clear and organised throughout.</p>
<b>5 marks</b>	<b>0 – 2.49</b>	<b>2.5 – 2.9</b>	<b>3 – 3.49</b>	<b>3.5 – 3.9</b>	<b>4 - 5</b>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Use of Literature</b> Information is informed by scholarly peer- reviewed articles or relevant documents, references are skillfully placed/integrated into the narrative, demonstrates critical appraisal of sources and conforms to APA 7th ed. referencing style.</li> <li>• Minimum 5 references for background material.</li> <li>• Minimum 5 references for search strategy.</li> </ul>	<p>No evidence of literature being consulted, OR heavy use of <u>irrelevant</u> material.</p> <p>No attempt to use references. to inform statements made. No critical appraisal evident. Does not adhere to APA 7th ed. referencing style. Major errors in in- text citations and/or reference formatting. Citations are mostly absent. May be evidence of plagiarism.</p>	<p>Limited selection of <u>relevant</u> references. Limited integration of references. Limited critical appraisal, poor paraphrasing or have too much emphasis on direct quotations. Attempts APA 7th ed. referencing style/ frequent errors in in-text citations and/or reference list. Citations are mostly placed at the end of paragraphs, rather than next to the specific information to which they relate.</p>	<p>Adequate selection of <u>relevant</u> references. Mainly peer-reviewed articles and other credible sources that are relevant to the topic. References are mostly well integrated. Demonstrates some attempt at critical appraisal of sources. Generally, adheres to APA 7th ed. referencing style but has several in- text errors and/or reference list citations. A proportion of the citations are well placed, but others are separated from the information to which they refer.</p>	<p>Appropriate selection of <u>relevant</u> references. Mainly peer-reviewed articles and other credible sources that are relevant to the topic. References are mostly well integrated. Critical appraisal of sources, effective paraphrasing is evident. Mostly adheres to APA 7th ed. referencing style with only a few minor in-text errors and/or reference list citations. Citations are mostly placed near the information being referenced, but the placement leads to ambiguity in a few places.</p>	<p>Evidence of wide reading. Appropriate selection of <u>relevant</u> references. All peer reviewed articles and other credible sources are highly relevant to the topic. Most references are used critically to inform ideas, and placed effectively to allow the reader to learn more. Effective paraphrasing is evident. Adheres to APA 7th ed. referencing style with no in-text errors or reference list citations. Citations are appropriately placed to help the reader learn more about key ideas.</p>
<b>7 marks</b>	<b>0 – 3.49</b>	<b>3.5 – 4.1</b>	<b>4.2 – 4.8</b>	<b>4.9 – 5.5</b>	<b>5.6 - 7</b>
<b>Total = 35 marks</b>					

