

WORK6001 Essay Report 40% (20 marks for each review article)

	HIGH DISTINCTION	DISTINCTION	CREDIT	PASS	FAIL
(1) Understanding of core issues					
Addresses the core issues	Exceptionally clear and concise identification of the article and core issues relevant to the misconception demonstrating great depth in understanding	Identifies the article and relevant issues in a clear and concise way; demonstrated good depth in understanding.	Identifies the relevant issues in a clear way and with sufficient depth in understanding	General identification of the article and issues relevant to the misconception	Does not identify or inaccurately identifies the relevant issues in the misconception.
(2) Evidence of extensive research					
Use of literature - depth and breadth of reading	Comprehensive and detailed review of the relevant literature; Used own ideas supported by a wide range of sources which have been thoroughly and analysed, applied and discussed.	Good knowledge and able to draw knowledge from the literature based on a variety of sources. Developing own ideas in the process and supported by sources that are well analysed, applied and discussed.	Reasonable knowledge; Has given a factual and/or reasonable conceptual knowledge; depth and breadth of research sufficient and reasonable application of readings.	Evidence of limited knowledge and only some use of the appropriate research; Lacks research depth and the use of a limited range of sources.	Lacks evidence of knowledge; Little to no evidence of using relevant research and misuse and/or inaccurate description of key concepts and research findings.
(3) Evidence of critical thinking and analysis					
Critical evaluation and analysis	Comprehensive critical review of the article and relevant issues; provided in-depth analysis of relevant theory and evidence with supporting and insightful conclusions. Contradictory/conflicting evidence identified and insightful ideas are presented. Evaluation well justified based on excellent analysis of theory and evidence.	Good review of the article and relevant issues; analysed evidence with supporting conclusions. Contradictory/conflicting evidence identified and relevant ideas presented. Evaluation justified based on theory and evidence.	Adequate evaluation of article and analysed evidence but limited range in terms of the ideas presented and conclusions made. Evaluation mostly based on theory and evidence.	Some evidence of critical thought but limited in providing only partial accurate evaluation and conclusion based on limited theory and evidence.	Lacks critical evaluation and analysis of the article and lack reference to relevant theory and evidence. Analysis and evaluation underdeveloped and not based relevant theory and evidence.
(4) Application of evidence to practice					
Integration and application of theory and evidence to discuss implications for evidence-based management	Excellent integration and application of theory and evidence. Ideas about application and implications for evidence-based management based on in-depth analysis and integration of theory and evidence. Applied ideas in a well integrated and insightful way.	Good integration and application of theory and evidence. Ideas about application and implications for evidence-based management based on good analysis of theory and evidence. Ideas applied coherently.	Adequate integration and application of theory and evidence. Ideas about application and implications for evidence-based management made in a style which is mostly logical and coherent.	Some evidence of integration of theory and evidence, but ideas about application and implications for evidence-based management limited and not always logical and coherent.	Inappropriate application / interpretation of article, description without application, limited discussion of implications for evidence-based management and/or no theories / frameworks.
(5) Overall structure, flow, connection between sections and referencing					
Structure, coherence, and clarity of expression and referencing	Shows a polished and well structured approach to the report with compelling clarity of arguments, expression and accurate referencing.	Carefully and logically organised and written clearly with referencing.	Good organisation and coherence and mostly written clearly with referencing.	Little attempt to organise in a logical manner, or lacking clarity of expression and referencing.	Disorganised / incoherent and/or fail to meet academic references requirements.

