

GRADING CRITERIA FOR EVIDENCE-BASED STUDENT PROJECTS

Grade	A (70-100%)	B (60-69%)	C (50-59%)	D (40-49%)	E (or lower) (0-39%)
Rationale for grade	Exceptional work	Highly acceptable work	Acceptable work	Barely acceptable	Unacceptable
Implications for work submitted.	<i>Very little room for improvement.</i>	<i>Key project criteria have been met in a very satisfactory way.</i>	<i>The work submitted has demonstrated that the project criteria has been understood and met.</i>	<i>Key assessment criteria have been met in a superficial or substandard way.</i>	<i>There is no (or very little evidence) that the assessment criteria for this project have been understood or met.</i>

GRADING CRITERIA FOR EVIDENCE-BASED STUDENT PROJECTS

Submission and Presentation Criteria					
	A	B	C	D	E (or lower)
Submission	Project has been submitted according to all submission guidelines and on time.	-	-	-	Project has not been submitted according to all submission guidelines and /or on time.
Presentation	Project has been submitted according to all presentation guidelines.	-	-	-	Project has not been submitted according to all presentation guidelines.
Academic writing	High standards of professional, academic writing and care are clearly evident.	High standards of professional, academic writing and care are evident, but some minor errors are present. Grades for future submissions should improve if these errors are addressed and/or eliminated.	There has been an attempt to meet academic writing standards in this project, but errors and lack of care is evident in places. Grades for future submissions should improve if these errors are addressed and/or eliminated	The writing of this project falls well short of what is expected. Review the work submitted and identify poor grammar, informal or ‘anecdotal’ writing, spelling errors, incorrect capitalisation, etc. If you are unsure of where your work has fallen short, please use additional university supports to address these shortfalls, or ask your lecturer in an appropriate forum if you are unsure what these issues are.	The writing of this project is not of the standard required at university undergraduate level. Significant improvement is required to pass future assignments / submissions. Please avail of additional university supports or ask your lecturer in an appropriate forum of how you might address these problems.

GRADING CRITERIA FOR EVIDENCE-BASED STUDENT PROJECTS

	A	B	C	D	E (or lower)
Citing	All sources have been cited correctly and consistently according to the Harvard Style Guide.	Most sources have been cited correctly and consistently according to the Harvard Style Guide, but one minor error was found. Please be conscious of this to improve grades in future submissions.	There was a solid attempt to cite consistently and correctly according to the Harvard Style Guide, but at least one significant, or a small number of minor errors, were detected. If these are not addressed in future submissions, the grade for this element will be lower than a 'C'.	Significant problems were noted (which may include incorrect use of author family names, key information not included in citations, non-use of page numbers for quotes or use of page numbers for non-quotes). If these issues are not addressed in future submissions, the grade for these elements will be lower than a 'D'. Please revisit the materials provided to assist students to cite using the Harvard Style to improve future grades.	Too many citation errors existed to pass this element. These may include: non-use of the Harvard Citation system; incorrectly spelled citations; citations of unpublished sources (such as personal interviews, lecture slides, etc.); citing URLs instead of appropriate publication details, inconsistencies etc. Please revisit the materials provided to assist students to cite using the Harvard Style to improve future grades.

GRADING CRITERIA FOR EVIDENCE-BASED STUDENT PROJECTS

	A	B	C	D	E (or lower)
Referencing	The references section has been comprehensively and correctly completed using the Harvard Style.	The references section has been comprehensively and correctly completed using the Harvard Style, but one error was found. Please be conscious of this to improve grades in future submissions.	There was a solid attempt to create a referencing system according to the Harvard Style Guide, but at least one significant error or a small number of minor errors were detected. If these are not addressed in future submissions, the grade for these elements will be lower than a 'C'.	Significant problems were noted (which may include incorrect use of author family names, the reference list not being arranged alphabetically by author family names, inconsistencies amongst various entries on the reference list, non-published material being listed, etc). If these issues are not addressed in future submissions, the grade for these assignments will be lower than a 'D'. Please revisit the materials provided to assist students to cite using the Harvard Style to improve future grades.	Too many referencing errors existed to pass this element. These may include: non-use of the Harvard Citation system; incorrectly spelled references; inconsistencies, blatant copying and pasting, citing unpublished sources (such as personal interviews, lecture slides, etc.); referencing URLs of material accessed electronically instead of appropriate publication details, inconsistencies etc. Please revisit the materials provided to assist students to cite using the Harvard Style to improve future grades.

GRADING CRITERIA FOR EVIDENCE-BASED STUDENT PROJECTS

Research, evidence collection, synthesis & reporting.					
	A	B	C	D	E (or lower)
Data / evidence collection strategy	A solid strategy to collect evidence which was relevant to the project objectives was tested and clearly presented.	An acceptable strategy to collect evidence was presented, but a more rigorous test of the strategy is required.	A reasonable strategy was presented, but it is clear that it will not collect the most comprehensive range of data expected if deployed as is. All possible outcomes and shortcoming have not been anticipated.	A weak strategy to collect evidence or data was presented. The attempt to connect the strategy to the aims of the project appeared superficial and requires greater development.	A haphazard strategy to collect evidence or data was presented, with little attention given to how it would help meet the projects objectives.
Data / evidence sources	High quality, credible authoritative, sources of evidence relevant to the project have been identified, tested and verified as appropriate to the project. All possible sources of evidence have been assessed.	Some high quality, credible authoritative, sources of evidence relevant to the project have been identified, tested and verified as appropriate to the project. It is unclear if additional sources could also have been assessed.	Most of the sources of evidence relevant to the project have been identified. Additional sources which could also have been assessed have not been identified.	The attempt to identify sources relevant to the project is superficial and requires much deeper engagement. In some cases, projects which receive a D for this element report on published overviews of evidence are reviewed, rather than conducting original research.	Poor quality, non-credible sources of subjective, open-source or biased evidence have been used or identified. No objective, clear system has been applied to the sources of evidence or data identified as sources for the project.

GRADING CRITERIA FOR EVIDENCE-BASED STUDENT PROJECTS

	A	B	C	D	E (or lower)
Rigour of evidence search	The search for relevant evidence is clearly systematic, iterative and rigorous.	The search for relevant evidence appears systematic and rigorous. More detail is required on how the search criteria evolved.	The outline of the approach taken to the evidence search did not include details of alternative searches or the other approaches taken. At least one important search string was not evident.	The outline of the approach taken to the evidence search did not include details of alternative searches. More than one search string or approach that was obviously relevant to the project was missing.	The search for evidence was based on poor sources or rudimentary or basic searches.
Analysis of evidence / data	The data was analysed in a systematic, robust fashion which is easily replicable. The analytical strategy and its results were clearly communicated in the project report.	The data was largely analysed in a systematic and robust fashion, which may be easily replicable. Some greater clarity in the description of this work could have been provided.	The data was analysed in a reasonable fashion. More description of the analytical strategy should be provided in future submissions.	The analytical strategy was not well described or appears to have been undertaken in a very superficial way. It is difficult to replicate this analysis. Because of this, the results presented may be open to question.	No real analytical strategy was used. Results are presented in a way which leads to significant questions about the rigour, and results of the project. It is impossible to replicate this analysis as presented.
Discussion / Conclusions	Results are presented and discussed in a highly convincing manner. The implications of the findings (including implications for managers, employees, and researchers) are clearly outlined.	Results are presented and discussed in a manner which is generally convincing. More depth is required on the implications of findings for research or work/management practice.	Results are reasonably well-presented and discussed. Future submissions should strive for a better discussion of implications for future research and/or management/work contexts.	Results are described in generic terms with only a tenuous relationship to the research question.	Results are discussed in an anecdotal and subjective manner. Implications are not clearly based on findings and are generic and/or un-implementable.