

Assessment Guidelines & Marking Criteria of your Research Article Summary

Your written submissions will be broadly assessed on four criteria:

- Engagement with the assignment
- Understanding of content in assigned article
- Quality of summary of research undertaken in assigned article
- Organization and presentation

We are looking at the level and quality of your engagement with the assigned article, not “ticking boxes” in each of the above 4 categories. To earn a particular mark, your essay does not have to fulfil that mark individually for each category; evidence of strength in some areas may compensate for weaknesses in others. This guideline is to help show you we are looking at the predominant character of your submission

There is a 750-word limit on this essay which includes your title, but does not include your bibliography.

Checklist of essential elements required for all essays:

- ✓ Name, Student ID, Course Number, Date
- ✓ Title of Essay (can be “Extended Abstract of Article X” or “A Summary of Article X” etc.)
- ✓ Coherent organisation of material: introduction, argument and evidence, conclusion
- ✓ Clear style, accurate spelling, clear sentence construction and punctuation*

- ✓ Relevance: essay summarizes clearly the main points of the assigned article
- ✓ Understanding of the research topic/question(s) being investigated in the assigned article
- ✓ Your essay must incorporate Coe et. al. or other resources (videos, articles, etc.), appropriately referenced
- ✓ Use of own words, except where quoting a source directly
- ✓ 3-5 Bibliography entries (Harvard style preferred)

*with due allowance made for students registered as dyslexic

Assessment Breakdown for Research Article Summary:

5 Points	Structure and Readability Grammar, Spelling, Formatting Outlines approach taken to topic Quotations and references accurately cited Overall quality of writing
5 Points	Engagement with Research Article Demonstrates understanding of research undertaken Sets the topic against a wider background/Provides context Defines key or problematic terms Appropriate use of Coe et. al., secondary resources Key Points presented clearly
+/-2 Points	Discretionary marks, Overall quality of summary