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**CRITERIA SHEET | ASSIGNMENT 1: LEARNING JOURNAL**

**Part A: learning activitIES: CHECK POINT 1**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NAME: |  | GRADE: |  |
| SUBMISSION POINT: | CHECK POINT 1 (Weeks 3 to 7) | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **QUIZZES** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WEEK 4 | /5 |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WEEK 6 | /5 |
| **CRITICAL REFLECTION COMPONENT (WEEKS 3, 5, 7)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SUMBISSION DATE |  | 2 | | | 1 | | | 0 | | |  | | | | | |
| WEEK 3 | /2 | Submitted in the relevant week | | | Submitted the week following | | | Submitted any other time before check point | | |
| WEEK 5 | /2 | Submitted in the relevant week | | | Submitted the week following | | | Submitted any other time before check point | | |
| WEEK 7 | /2 | Submitted in the relevant week | | | Submitted the week following | | | Submitted any other time before check point | | |
| CRITERION |  | 7  85%-100% | | | 6  75%-84% | | | 5  65%-74% | | | 4  50%-64% | | | Refer / Fail  0%-49% | | |
| ANALYSIS AND CRITICAL DISCUSSION  The ability to:   * apply and integrate critical analysis; * investigate multiple perspectives, contradictions or inconsistencies * present a valid argument * form, present and support own opinions   and original ideas   * stimulate discussion | /24 | 24 |  | 20.4 | 20.2 |  | 18 | 17.8 |  | 15.6 | 15.4 |  | 12 | 11.8 |  | 0 |
| Posts show strong awareness of key issues discussed in weekly learning materials.  Presents a strong, coherent and valid argument (where appropriate).  Strong evidence of independent investigation, questioning and analysis.  Ability to effectively synthesise information from a variety of sources. Independently takes and understands multiple perspectives and through these can provide an insightful and/or exhaustive critical discussion of the issues at hand.  Incorporates own opinion and original ideas into discussion, with strong foundation in theory and examples.  Presents thought provoking questions or statements to further the discussion. | | | Posts show a good awareness of key issues discussed in weekly learning materials.  Presents a coherent and valid argument (where appropriate).  Evidence of independent investigation, questioning and analysis.  Ability to synthesise information from a variety of sources.  Independently takes and understands multiple perspectives and through these can provide an insightful critical discussion of the issues at hand.  Incorporates own opinion or original ideas into discussion, with foundation in theory and examples.  Presents questions or statements to further the discussion. | | | Posts show awareness of key issues discussed in weekly learning materials, however emphasis may be disproportionate.  Presents an argument (where appropriate).  Some evidence of independent investigation, questioning and analysis.  Attempts to synthesise information from a variety of sources.  Takes and understands multiple perspectives and through these can provide a critical discussion of the issues at hand.  Incorporates own opinion or original ideas into discussion, with reference to theory or examples.  May present questions or statements to further the discussion. | | | Posts show awareness of some of the key issues discussed in weekly learning materials, however emphasis is disproportionate.  Presents an argument, however, emphasis is disproportionate and/or argument is not well developed (where appropriate).  Little evidence of independent investigation, questioning and analysis.  Some attempt to synthesise information from a variety of sources.  Attempts to take and understand multiple perspectives.  Some attempt to incorporate own opinion or original ideas into discussion, however opinion may not be grounded in theory or examples.  Attempts to present questions or statements to further the discussion. | | | Posts show little or no awareness of key issues discussed in weekly learning materials.  Argument is not provided, or is disproportionate or irrelevant (where appropriate).  No evidence of independent investigation, questioning and analysis.  No attempt to synthesise information from a variety of sources.  No attempt to take and understand multiple perspectives.  No attempt to incorporate own opinion or original ideas into discussion, or opinion is not grounded in theory or examples.  Does not present questions or statements to further the discussion. | | |
| MEDIA MECHANICS AND COMMUNICATION  The ability to:   * make effective use of social technologies * apply the conventions of the medium * accurate referencing and citation in correct format * use appropriate language for the audience and context * use appropriate style and tone of writing * adhere to word / time limit * use correct grammar, spelling and punctuation * use correct pronunciation with effective pitch, pace and emphasis * use appropriate article, paragraph, sentence structure | /6 | 6 |  | 5.1 | 5 |  | 4.5 | 4.4 |  | 3.9 | 3.8 |  | 3 | 2.9 |  | 0 |
| **All posts**  Post is extremely well structured and flows logically and convincingly to conclusions.  Entry makes significant use of the affordances of social technology, which may include highly appropriate contextual linking, use of highly relevant images to enhance the post or convey meaning, very effective incorporation of other media.  Sources (including for images and other media) are always attributed correctly and appropriately for the medium (no reference lists!).  Tagging and categorising of post is excellent and effectively describes the content of the post.  Length or duration of entry highly appropriate to context (minimum requirement specified in description of learning activity).  **Written posts**  Language used is highly appropriate to the audience and context.  Fluent, professional style and tone. May be informal, but still appropriate in a professional context.  Sentences skilfully constructed: unified, coherent, forceful, varied and well-structured.  Excellent use of standard grammar, spelling and punctuation.  No proof reading errors.  **Video posts**  Overall quality of video recording and editing is excellent.  Audio is of an excellent quality: consistent volume, clean and without distraction or extraneous noise.  All shots are clearly focused and well framed and the camera is held steady.  Video flows extremely smoothly.  Video is well lit so that the speaker and their expressions are clearly visible.  Where applicable, visual aids are professionally prepared and have strong visual appeal. They are used effectively to significantly enhance the presentation.  Highly engaging delivery, words are pronounced correctly and confidently with highly effective pace, pitch, pause and emphasis. | | | **All posts**  Post is well structured and flows logically and convincingly to conclusions.  Entry makes effective use of the affordances of social technology, which may include appropriate contextual linking, use of relevant images to enhance the post or convey meaning, effective incorporation of other media.  Sources (including for images and other media) are always attributed correctly and appropriately for the medium (no reference lists!), with one or two errors or areas for improvement.  Tagging and categorising of post is of a high quality and effectively describes the content of the post, with minor room for improvement.  Length or duration of entry appropriate to context (minimum requirement specified in description of learning activity).  **Written posts**  Language used is appropriate to the audience and context.  Professional style and tone. May be informal, but still appropriate in a professional context.  Language is fluent, confident, well-structured and engaging.  High level of accuracy in spelling and grammar. 1-3 proof reading errors.  **Video posts**  Overall quality of video recording and editing is very good.  Audio is of a high quality: consistent volume, clean and without distraction or extraneous noise.  Majority of shots are clearly focused and well framed and the camera is held steady.  Video flows smoothly.  Video is well lit so that the speaker and their expressions are for the most part clearly visible.  Where applicable, visual aids are well prepared and have visual appeal. They are used appropriately to enhance your presentation.  Engaging delivery, words are pronounced correctly with effective pace, pitch, pause and emphasis. | | | **All posts**  Post is generally well structured and flows logically to conclusions.  Entry makes some use of the affordances of social technology, which may include contextual linking, use of images to enhance the post or convey meaning, incorporation of other media.  Sources (including for images and other media) are generally attributed correctly and appropriately for the medium (no reference lists!), with two or three errors or areas for improvement.  Tagging and categorising of post is generally well executed and effectively describes some of the content of the post, with room for improvement.  Minimum length or time requirement met (specified in description of learning activity).  **Written posts**  Language used is, for the most part, appropriate to the audience and context.  Professional style and tone. Language mainly fluent with good overall structure.  Grammar and spelling accurate.  4-6 proof reading errors.  **Video posts**  Overall quality of video recording and editing is good.  Audio is of a reasonable quality: mostly consistent volume, clean and without obvious distraction or significant amounts of extraneous noise.  Shots are clearly focused and well framed and the camera is held steady, with some exceptions.  Video generally flows smoothly.  Video is lit so that the speaker is clearly visible but with room for improvement.  Where applicable, visual aids have some appeal and are generally used effectively.  Good delivery, words are mostly pronounced correctly. Some or all of pace, pitch, pause and emphasis are used to good effect. | | | **All posts**  An attempt is made to provide an effective structure to the post, however, this may not be entirely successful.  Some attempt to make us of the affordances of social technology, however, not all attempts are successful or appropriate.  Sources (including for images and other media) are sometimes attributed correctly and may not always be attributed appropriately for the medium.  Sources (including for images and other media) are attributed, however, there may be some issues with accuracy of attributions.  Post has been tagged and categorised, however, there may be obvious omissions or inappropriate tags or categories may be included.  Minimum length or time requirement met (specified in description of learning activity).  **Written posts**  Language used is not always appropriate for the context and audience.  Style and tone is professional with some structure.  Meaning apparent, but language not always fluent.  Grammar and spelling mainly accurate.  7-10 proof reading errors.  **Video posts**  Overall quality of video recording and editing is satisfactory.  Audio is of average quality: there are some distractions and extraneous noise that impact on overall quality.  Shots are generally focused but one or both of framing or camera stability need improvement.  An attempt has been made to create a smooth flow, but this may not be successful.  Where applicable, visual aids are used, but they have little appeal. They are sometimes distracting and/or do not enhance the oral presentation.  Satisfactory delivery. Frequent issues with pronunciation/enunciation.  Some or all of pace, pitch, pause and emphasis are not well used. | | | **All posts**  Little or no attempt to provide an effective structure to the post.  Entry makes little or no use of the affordances of social technology and/or inclusions may lack relevance.  Where applicable, visual aids are not used where needed and/or significantly detract from the oral presentation.  Sources (including for images and other media) are not attributed, or attribution is consistently incorrect.  Post has not been tagged or categorised, or tags and categories are largely inappropriate and/or insufficient.  Minimum length or time requirement has not been met (specified in description of learning activity).  **Written posts**  Language is not appropriate for the context and audience.  Style and tone of writing is not appropriate.  Disorganised or incoherent writing. Meaning unclear as grammar and/or spelling contain frequent errors (Written).  More than 10 proof reading errors.  **Video posts**  Overall quality of video recording and editing is satisfactory.  Audio is of poor quality: distractions and extraneous noise make it difficult to hear the narrator.  There may be visual distortions that impact on quality.  Shots may not be focused, well framed or steady.  Minimal attempt to create a smooth flow.  Visual aids are not appropriate or not used.  Clarity is adversely impacted upon by unprofessional delivery and/or use of inappropriate language.  Significant issues with pronunciation/enunciation. | | |
| TOTAL  Includes marks for submission dates, quizzes | /46 |  | | |  | | |  | | |  | | |  | | |

COMMENTS:

**Part A: learning activitIES: CHECK POINT 2**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NAME: |  | GRADE: |  |
| SUBMISSION POINT: | CHECK POINT 2 (Weeks 8 to 13) | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **QUIZES** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WEEK 4 | /5 |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WEEK 6 | /5 |
| **CRITICAL REFLECTION COMPONENT (WEEKS 3, 5, 7)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SUMBISSION DATE |  | 2 | | | 1 | | | 0 | | |  | | | | | |
| WEEK 3 | /2 | Submitted in the relevant week | | | Submitted the week following | | | Submitted any other time before check point | | |
| WEEK 5 | /2 | Submitted in the relevant week | | | Submitted the week following | | | Submitted any other time before check point | | |
| WEEK 7 | /2 | Submitted in the relevant week | | | Submitted the week following | | | Submitted any other time before check point | | |
| CRITERION |  | 7  85%-100% | | | 6  75%-84% | | | 5  65%-74% | | | 4  50%-64% | | | Refer / Fail  0%-49% | | |
| ANALYSIS AND CRITICAL DISCUSSION  The ability to:   * apply and integrate critical analysis; * investigate multiple perspectives, contradictions or inconsistencies * present a valid argument * form, present and support own opinions   and original ideas   * stimulate discussion | /24 | 24 |  | 20.4 | 20.2 |  | 18 | 17.8 |  | 15.6 | 15.4 |  | 12 | 11.8 |  | 0 |
| Posts show strong awareness of key issues discussed in weekly learning materials.  Presents a strong, coherent and valid argument (where appropriate).  Strong evidence of independent investigation, questioning and analysis.  Ability to effectively synthesise information from a variety of sources. Independently takes and understands multiple perspectives and through these can provide an insightful and/or exhaustive critical discussion of the issues at hand.  Incorporates own opinion and original ideas into discussion, with strong foundation in theory and examples.  Presents thought provoking questions or statements to further the discussion. | | | Posts show a good awareness of key issues discussed in weekly learning materials.  Presents a coherent and valid argument (where appropriate).  Evidence of independent investigation, questioning and analysis.  Ability to synthesise information from a variety of sources.  Independently takes and understands multiple perspectives and through these can provide an insightful critical discussion of the issues at hand.  Incorporates own opinion or original ideas into discussion, with foundation in theory and examples.  Presents questions or statements to further the discussion. | | | Posts show awareness of key issues discussed in weekly learning materials, however emphasis may be disproportionate.  Presents an argument (where appropriate).  Some evidence of independent investigation, questioning and analysis.  Attempts to synthesise information from a variety of sources.  Takes and understands multiple perspectives and through these can provide a critical discussion of the issues at hand.  Incorporates own opinion or original ideas into discussion, with reference to theory or examples.  May present questions or statements to further the discussion. | | | Posts show awareness of some of the key issues discussed in weekly learning materials, however emphasis is disproportionate.  Presents an argument, however, emphasis is disproportionate and/or argument is not well developed (where appropriate).  Little evidence of independent investigation, questioning and analysis.  Some attempt to synthesise information from a variety of sources.  Attempts to take and understand multiple perspectives.  Some attempt to incorporate own opinion or original ideas into discussion, however opinion may not be grounded in theory or examples.  Attempts to present questions or statements to further the discussion. | | | Posts show little or no awareness of key issues discussed in weekly learning materials.  Argument is not provided, or is disproportionate or irrelevant (where appropriate).  No evidence of independent investigation, questioning and analysis.  No attempt to synthesise information from a variety of sources.  No attempt to take and understand multiple perspectives.  No attempt to incorporate own opinion or original ideas into discussion, or opinion is not grounded in theory or examples.  Does not present questions or statements to further the discussion. | | |
| MEDIA MECHANICS AND COMMUNICATION  The ability to:   * make effective use of social technologies * apply the conventions of the medium * accurate referencing and citation in correct format * use appropriate language for the audience and context * use appropriate style and tone of writing * adhere to word / time limit * use correct grammar, spelling and punctuation * use correct pronunciation with effective pitch, pace and emphasis * use appropriate article, paragraph, sentence structure | /6 | 6 |  | 5.1 | 5 |  | 4.5 | 4.4 |  | 3.9 | 3.8 |  | 3 | 2.9 |  | 0 |
| **All posts**  Post is extremely well structured and flows logically and convincingly to conclusions.  Entry makes significant use of the affordances of social technology, which may include highly appropriate contextual linking, use of highly relevant images to enhance the post or convey meaning, very effective incorporation of other media.  Sources (including for images and other media) are always attributed correctly and appropriately for the medium (no reference lists!).  Tagging and categorising of post is excellent and effectively describes the content of the post.  Length or duration of entry highly appropriate to context (minimum requirement specified in description of learning activity).  **Written posts**  Language used is highly appropriate to the audience and context.  Fluent, professional style and tone. May be informal, but still appropriate in a professional context.  Sentences skilfully constructed: unified, coherent, forceful, varied and well-structured.  Excellent use of standard grammar, spelling and punctuation.  No proof reading errors.  **Video posts**  Overall quality of video recording and editing is excellent.  Audio is of an excellent quality: consistent volume, clean and without distraction or extraneous noise.  All shots are clearly focused and well framed and the camera is held steady.  Video flows extremely smoothly.  Video is well lit so that the speaker and their expressions are clearly visible.  Where applicable, visual aids are professionally prepared and have strong visual appeal. They are used effectively to significantly enhance the presentation.  Highly engaging delivery, words are pronounced correctly and confidently with highly effective pace, pitch, pause and emphasis. | | | **All posts**  Post is well structured and flows logically and convincingly to conclusions.  Entry makes effective use of the affordances of social technology, which may include appropriate contextual linking, use of relevant images to enhance the post or convey meaning, effective incorporation of other media.  Sources (including for images and other media) are always attributed correctly and appropriately for the medium (no reference lists!), with one or two errors or areas for improvement.  Tagging and categorising of post is of a high quality and effectively describes the content of the post, with minor room for improvement.  Length or duration of entry appropriate to context (minimum requirement specified in description of learning activity).  **Written posts**  Language used is appropriate to the audience and context.  Professional style and tone. May be informal, but still appropriate in a professional context.  Language is fluent, confident, well-structured and engaging.  High level of accuracy in spelling and grammar. 1-3 proof reading errors.  **Video posts**  Overall quality of video recording and editing is very good.  Audio is of a high quality: consistent volume, clean and without distraction or extraneous noise.  Majority of shots are clearly focused and well framed and the camera is held steady.  Video flows smoothly.  Video is well lit so that the speaker and their expressions are for the most part clearly visible.  Where applicable, visual aids are well prepared and have visual appeal. They are used appropriately to enhance your presentation.  Engaging delivery, words are pronounced correctly with effective pace, pitch, pause and emphasis. | | | **All posts**  Post is generally well structured and flows logically to conclusions.  Entry makes some use of the affordances of social technology, which may include contextual linking, use of images to enhance the post or convey meaning, incorporation of other media.  Sources (including for images and other media) are generally attributed correctly and appropriately for the medium (no reference lists!), with two or three errors or areas for improvement.  Tagging and categorising of post is generally well executed and effectively describes some of the content of the post, with room for improvement.  Minimum length or time requirement met (specified in description of learning activity).  **Written posts**  Language used is, for the most part, appropriate to the audience and context.  Professional style and tone. Language mainly fluent with good overall structure.  Grammar and spelling accurate.  4-6 proof reading errors.  **Video posts**  Overall quality of video recording and editing is good.  Audio is of a reasonable quality: mostly consistent volume, clean and without obvious distraction or significant amounts of extraneous noise.  Shots are clearly focused and well framed and the camera is held steady, with some exceptions.  Video generally flows smoothly.  Video is lit so that the speaker is clearly visible but with room for improvement.  Where applicable, visual aids have some appeal and are generally used effectively.  Good delivery, words are mostly pronounced correctly. Some or all of pace, pitch, pause and emphasis are used to good effect. | | | **All posts**  An attempt is made to provide an effective structure to the post, however, this may not be entirely successful.  Some attempt to make us of the affordances of social technology, however, not all attempts are successful or appropriate.  Sources (including for images and other media) are sometimes attributed correctly and may not always be attributed appropriately for the medium.  Sources (including for images and other media) are attributed, however, there may be some issues with accuracy of attributions.  Post has been tagged and categorised, however, there may be obvious omissions or inappropriate tags or categories may be included.  Minimum length or time requirement met (specified in description of learning activity).  **Written posts**  Language used is not always appropriate for the context and audience.  Style and tone is professional with some structure.  Meaning apparent, but language not always fluent.  Grammar and spelling mainly accurate.  7-10 proof reading errors.  **Video posts**  Overall quality of video recording and editing is satisfactory.  Audio is of average quality: there are some distractions and extraneous noise that impact on overall quality.  Shots are generally focused but one or both of framing or camera stability need improvement.  An attempt has been made to create a smooth flow, but this may not be successful.  Where applicable, visual aids are used, but they have little appeal. They are sometimes distracting and/or do not enhance the oral presentation.  Satisfactory delivery. Frequent issues with pronunciation/enunciation.  Some or all of pace, pitch, pause and emphasis are not well used. | | | **All posts**  Little or no attempt to provide an effective structure to the post.  Entry makes little or no use of the affordances of social technology and/or inclusions may lack relevance.  Where applicable, visual aids are not used where needed and/or significantly detract from the oral presentation.  Sources (including for images and other media) are not attributed, or attribution is consistently incorrect.  Post has not been tagged or categorised, or tags and categories are largely inappropriate and/or insufficient.  Minimum length or time requirement has not been met (specified in description of learning activity).  **Written posts**  Language is not appropriate for the context and audience.  Style and tone of writing is not appropriate.  Disorganised or incoherent writing. Meaning unclear as grammar and/or spelling contain frequent errors (Written).  More than 10 proof reading errors.  **Video posts**  Overall quality of video recording and editing is satisfactory.  Audio is of poor quality: distractions and extraneous noise make it difficult to hear the narrator.  There may be visual distortions that impact on quality.  Shots may not be focused, well framed or steady.  Minimal attempt to create a smooth flow.  Visual aids are not appropriate or not used.  Clarity is adversely impacted upon by unprofessional delivery and/or use of inappropriate language.  Significant issues with pronunciation/enunciation. | | |
| TOTAL  Includes marks for submission dates | /36 |  | | |  | | |  | | |  | | |  | | |

COMMENTS:**PART B: PARTICIPATION IN THE LEARNING COMMUNITY**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NAME: |  | GRADE: |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CRITERION | MARKS | 7  85%-100% | 6  75%-84% | 5  65%-74% | 4  50%-64% | Refer / Fail  0%-49% |
| ANALYSIS AND CRITICAL DISCUSSION  The ability to:   * apply and integrate critical analysis; * investigate multiple perspectives, contradictions or inconsistencies * present a valid argument * form, present and support own opinions * develop original ideas * stimulate discussion | /5 | Replies to posts/participation in threads consistently demonstrate strong insight, depth, and a high level of understanding. They connect with the original post and add to that post by including references to supporting material (for example, through links).  Contributions to PLN demonstrate strong evidence of independent and original questioning and analysis, as well as independent investigation.  Independently takes and understands multiple perspectives and through these can consistently provide relevant and insightful comments on the issues at hand.  Personal opinion is appropriately expressed and underpinned by theory and examples.  Provides, in an appropriate manner, constructive criticism of other posts/replies and/or support for ideas that should be of considerable help to the original author and/or the community.  Poses/replies to especially focused or challenging questions in a manner that demonstrates significant understanding of the topic and a good ability to defend one's position. | Replies to posts/participation in threads consistently demonstrate insight, depth, and understanding. They connect with the original post and add to that post by including references to supporting material (for example, through links).  Contributions to PLN demonstrate evidence of independent and original questioning and analysis, as well as independent investigation.  Independently takes and understands multiple perspectives and through these can provide relevant comments on the issues at hand.  Personal opinion is appropriately expressed and underpinned by theory or examples.  Provides, in an appropriate manner, constructive criticism of other posts/replies and/or support for ideas that should be of help to the original author and/or the community.  Poses/replies to especially focused or challenging questions in a manner that demonstrates strong understanding of the topic and an ability to defend one's position. | Replies to posts/participation in threads usually demonstrate insight, depth, and understanding. They connect with the original post and may add to that post.  Contributions to PLN demonstrate some evidence of independent and original questioning and analysis, as well as independent investigation.  Takes and understands multiple perspectives and through these can provide comments on the issues at hand.  Personal opinion is appropriately expressed and includes some reference to theory or examples.  Attempts to provide appropriately phrased constructive criticism and support that may be of help to the original author and/or the community.  May pose or reply to focused or challenging questions from time-to-time. Manner demonstrates understanding of the topic and may also evidence ability to defend one’s position. | Replies to posts/participation in threads sometimes demonstrate understanding. Sometimes connects with the original post and, in some cases, may add to that post.  Contributions to PLN demonstrate minimal attempt at independent and original questioning and analysis, and/or independent investigation.  Some attempt to take and understand multiple perspectives, however emphasis may be disproportionate or key aspects may be missed.  Some attempt to provide personal opinion may be provided, but not often underpinned by theory or examples.  Some attempt to provide appropriately phrased constructive criticism and support that may or may not be of help to the original author and/or the community.  May reply to focused or challenging questions from time-to-time. | Replies to posts/participation in threads do not demonstrate an appropriate level of understanding. Fails to connect with or add to the original post.  Contributions to PLN do not evidence independent and original questioning and analysis, or independent investigation.  Little or no attempt to take and understand multiple perspectives.  No attempt to provide personal opinion, or attempts do not reference theory or examples.  Constructive criticism is not provided or is not appropriately phrased.  No attempt to pose or reply to focussed or challenging questions. |
| LEADERSHIP | /2.5 | Consistently provides leadership by engaging and motivating the learning community. May be evidenced by   * mentorship, helpfulness, encouragement of others * demonstration of positive influence on group dynamic * creativity, experimentation, risk taking, entrepreneurship, inquisitiveness, questioning, establishing different ways to do things * being an exemplar to others, fostering a keen interest in tools and technologies. | Frequently provides leadership by engaging and motivating the learning community. May be evidenced by   * mentorship, helpfulness, encouragement of others * demonstration of positive influence on group dynamic * creativity, experimentation, risk taking, entrepreneurship, inquisitiveness, questioning, establishing different ways to do things * being an exemplar to others, fostering a keen interest in tools and technologies. | Attempts to provide leadership by engaging and motivating the learning community. | Sometimes attempts to provide leadership by engaging and motivating the learning community. | Does not attempt to provide leadership. |
| EXTENT OF CONTRIBUTION  Includes:   * frequency of contribution to the discussion (on others’ Writtens, in group discussions) * ability to engage readers/foster discussion * development of relationships and networks | /2.5 | Participates actively in broader class discussions, including through the unit blog, the Google+ community, and Twitter (using the hash tag #ifn614).  May also engage in discussions outside of the class environment through contributions to broader professional discussions.  Fosters engagement through comments on learning activities in a way that promotes further discussion.  Conversations with the PLN evidence the development of a strong, active and valuable virtual professional network. | Participates regularly in broader class discussions, including through the unit blog, the Google+ community, and Twitter (using the hash tag #ifn614).  Frequently attracts comments from classmates.  Conversations with the PLN evidence the development of an active virtual professional network. | Participates in broader class discussions, including through the unit blog, the Google+ community and Twitter (using the hash tag #ifn614).  Attracts comments from classmates.  Conversations with the PLN evidence the development of a virtual professional network. | Occasionally/rarely participates in broader class discussions, including through the unit blog, the Google+ community, and Twitter (using the hash tag #ifn614).  Sometimes attracts comments from classmates.  Conversations with the PLN may not indicate that an active professional network is developing. | Does not interact or the broader class group.  Does not attract comments from classmates.  Conversations with the PLN are do not evidence the development of a professional network. |
| TOTAL | /10 |  |  |  |  |  |

COMMENTS

**CRITERIA SHEET | ASSIGNMENT 2: GRANT EOI**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NAME: |  | GRADE: | /10 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CRITERION |  | 7  85%-100% | 6  75%-84% | 5  65%-74% | 4  50%-64% | Refer / Fail  0%-49% |
| UNDERSTANDING OF THE TOPIC/TASK  The ability to:   * design an appropriate program, product or service | /2.5 | The proposed product, service or program is highly appropriate to the information service context and relevant to user needs. | The proposed product, service or program is appropriate to the information service context and relevant to user needs. | The proposed product, service or program is appropriate to the information service context and relevant to user needs. | A product, service or program is proposed that may not be entirely appropriate for the information service context. | Inability to identify a product, program or service. |
| ANALYSIS AND CRITICAL DISCUSSION  The ability to:   * effectively communicate required information * apply and integrate critical analysis * identify and analyse user needs * investigate multiple perspectives, contradictions or inconsistencies * develop original ideas | /7.5 | Proposed program, product or service is very well conceptualised and a clear and detailed overview is provided.  Purpose, aims, objectives and anticipated benefits are identified, are highly appropriate, and grounded in user needs. | Proposed program, product or service is well conceptualised and a clear overview is provided.  Purpose, aims, objectives and anticipated benefits are identified, are appropriate, and are grounded in user needs. | A clear overview of the program, product or service is provided, however, may require further development.  Purpose, aims, objectives and anticipated benefits are identified, however, they may not be focussed on user needs. | An overview of the program, product or service is provided but may lack detail or needs further development.  Purpose, aims, objectives and anticipated benefits are identified, however, they may not be focussed on user needs and/or may not be relevant. | An overview of the program, product or service is provided but is not appropriate, insufficient or does not adequately explain the proposed initiative.  Purpose, aims, objectives and anticipated benefits are not identified or are inappropriate. |
| TOTAL | /10 |  |  |  |  |  |

COMMENTS

**CRITERIA SHEET | ASSIGNMENT 3: GRANT APPLICATION**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NAME: |  | GRADE: |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CRITERION |  | 7  85%-100% | 6  75%-84% | 5  65%-74% | 4  50%-64% | Refer / Fail  0%-49% |
| UNDERSTANDING OF THE TOPIC/TASK  The ability to:   * identify and meet the needs of the audience * identify and discuss the central issues | /5 | The proposed product, service or program is highly appropriate to the information service context and relevant to user needs.  Ideas are clearly presented and defined.  Effectively summarises the key issues.  Ideas are developed in clear, concise and ordered stages.  Well focused with the appropriate audience in mind; needs of the audience are fully met. | The proposed product, service or program is appropriate to the information service context and relevant to user needs.  Discussion focuses on the topic.  Summarises the key issues.  Effective development of ideas.  Acknowledges and meets the needs of the audience. | The proposed product, service or program is appropriate to the information service context and relevant to user needs.  Discussion aimed at the topic.  A summary of some of the key issues is provided; or presents a generalised discussion of a majority of the key issues.  Acknowledges the audience and generally meets their needs. | A product, service or program is proposed that may not be entirely appropriate for the information service context.  Discussion generally aimed at the topic.  Central ideas are present but very generalised, without any clear focus.  Audience acknowledged but unsatisfactory analysis results in only partial meeting the audience’s needs. | Inability to identify a product, program or service.  Inadequate grasp of the topic.  Central ideas lacking, confused, and unsupported.  Lacks evidence of knowledge or understanding relevant to the topic.  No consideration of the audience. |
| ANALYSIS AND CRITICAL DISCUSSION  The ability to:   * effectively communicate required information * apply and integrate critical analysis * identify and analyse user needs * investigate multiple perspectives, contradictions or inconsistencies * develop original ideas | /25 | Proposed program, product or service is very well conceptualised and a clear and detailed overview is provided.  There is a clear and detailed discussion of user needs and the link between the proposed product, service or program and the user needs of the target group.  Purpose, aims, objectives and anticipated benefits are identified, are highly appropriate, and grounded in user needs.  Project structure is appropriate, detailed and practical.  A highly appropriate budget has been provided, with excellent justifications made.  A highly appropriate risk management strategy has been developed. It recognises all relevant risks and provides appropriate strategies for mitigation.  A highly effective evaluation strategy and appropriate timeline have been defined. Consideration has been given to incorporating a variety of metrics.  A clear and highly appropriate link is made to the organisation’s mission, vision and/or strategy.  A clear and highly appropriate link is made to the funding organisation’s mission, vision and/or strategy.  Proposed program, product or service is very innovative in its concept or idea, design, delivery or content.  **General criteria**  Strong evidence of independent and original questioning, analysis.  Independently takes and understands multiple perspectives and through these can provide a thorough and complete proposal.  Effective ability to synthesise the information. | Proposed program, product or service is well conceptualised and a clear overview is provided.  There is a clear discussion of user needs and the link between the proposed product, service or program and the user needs of the target group.  Purpose, aims, objectives and anticipated benefits are identified, are appropriate, and are grounded in user needs.  Project structure is appropriate and practical.  An appropriate budget has been provided, with appropriate justifications made.  An appropriate risk management strategy has been developed. It recognises relevant risks and provides appropriate strategies for mitigation.  An effective evaluation strategy and appropriate timeline have been defined. Consideration has been given to incorporating a variety of metrics.  A clear and appropriate link is made to the organisation’s mission, vision and/or strategy.  A clear and appropriate link is made to the funding organisation’s mission, vision and/or strategy.  Proposed program, product or service is innovative in its concept or idea, design, delivery or content.  **General criteria**  Evidence of independent and original questioning, analysis.  Independently takes and understands multiple perspectives and through these can provide a thorough proposal.  Ability to synthesise the information. | A clear overview of the program, product or service is provided, however, may require further development.  There is discussion of user needs of the target audience, however, the link between the proposed service and user needs may be underdeveloped or the discussion may be insufficient.  Purpose, aims, objectives and anticipated benefits are identified, however, they may not be focussed on user needs.  Project structure is appropriate.  A budget has been provided, with appropriate justifications made.  A risk management strategy has been developed, includes a majority of the relevant risks, and provides mitigation strategies.  An evaluation strategy and appropriate timeline have been defined. Consideration has been given to incorporating a variety of metrics.  An appropriate link is made to the organisation’s mission, vision and/or strategy, but may lack specificity.  An appropriate link is made to the funding organisation’s mission, vision and/or strategy, but may lack specificity.  Proposed program, product or service is somewhat innovative in its concept or idea, design, delivery or content.  **General criteria**  Some evidence of independent and original questioning, analysis.  Recognises alternative perspectives  Some evidence of ability to synthesise the information. | An overview of the program, product or service is provided but may lack detail or needs further development.  There is limited discussion of user needs of the target audience. In addition, the link between the proposed service and user needs may be underdeveloped or not present.  Purpose, aims, objectives and anticipated benefits are identified, however, they may not be focussed on user needs and/or may not be relevant.  Project structure has been defined but is not appropriate or excludes key consideration.  A budget has been provided, however justifications are not appropriate or not provided.  A risk management strategy has been developed, however, there are significant omissions. In addition, mitigation strategies have not been provided or may not be appropriate.  An evaluation strategy and timeline have been defined, however, the strategy may not be appropriate. In addition, the strategy may not incorporate a variety of metrics.  Attempt made to link to the organisation’s mission, vision and/or strategy, but may lack specificity or may not be appropriate.  Attempt made to link to the funding organisation’s mission, vision and/or strategy, but may lack specificity or may not be appropriate.  Attempt made to propose an innovative program, product or service, but it may not be entirely novel or may not be well conceptualised.  **General criteria**  Little or no evidence of independent and original questioning, analysis.  Limited ability to recognise alternative perspectives.  Limited ability to synthesise the information. | An overview of the program, product or service is provided but is not appropriate, insufficient or does not adequately explain the proposed initiative.  No or insufficient discussion of user needs.  Purpose, aims, objectives and anticipated benefits are not identified or are inappropriate.  Project structure has not been defined or is inappropriate.  A budget has not been provided or is inappropriate.  A risk management strategy has not been provided or is inappropriate.  An evaluation strategy has not been provided or is inappropriate.  No or inappropriate link to organisation and funding organisation’s mission, vision and/or strategy.  No attempt to develop an innovative program, product or service.  **General criteria**  Lacks critical thought or analysis. |
| USE OF LITERATURE/ EVIDENCE OF READING  The ability to:   * research the topic * draw on a wide range of authoritative sources | /5 | The topic has been well researched. Evidence of wide reading, drawing on an impressive range of sources.  Sources are consistently relevant, current and authoritative.  Highly appropriate references are used to support decisions.  Literature is used throughout with the effect that the work appears highly authoritative. | Evidence of independent research.  Critical appraisal of the literature gained from a variety of authoritative and relevant sources.  Appropriate references are used to support decisions.  Literature is used throughout with the effect that the work appears authoritative. | Draws primarily on recommended readings, with limited independent research.  Provides evidence and critical application of these readings relevant to the subject.  References are used to support decisions.  Literature is used throughout. As a result, the work may appear authoritative. | No independent research, relying on recommended readings.  Literature is presented uncritically, in a purely descriptive way. | No evidence of literature being consulted, or irrelevant to the topic. |
| PRESENTATION  The ability to:   * use fluent language with correct grammar, spelling and punctuation * use appropriate paragraph, sentence structure * use appropriate style and tone of writing * accurate referencing | /2.5 | Clarity promoted by consistent use of standard grammar, spelling and punctuation.  Sentences skilfully constructed: unified, coherent, forceful, varied.  Paragraph structure effectively developed.  Fluent, professional style and tone of writing.  No proof reading errors. | Language fluent.  Grammar and spelling accurate.  A few proof reading errors. | Language mainly fluent, but some minor areas that may lead to confusion.  Grammar and spelling mainly accurate. The tone and style of writing are informal or conversational. | Meaning apparent, but language not always fluent.  Grammar and/or spelling contain errors.  Inappropriate vocabulary, style or tone for professional writing. | Meaning unclear as grammar and/or spelling contain frequent errors.  Disorganised or incoherent writing. |
| SELF ASSESSMENT  The ability to:   * discuss the personal learning outcomes from the assignment * critically review the quality of academic work | /2.5 | A clear understanding of the learning outcomes achieved from the assignment.  Confidently evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of own work.  Identifies specific areas of knowledge and skills to be developed further. | Understands the learning outcomes achieved.  Provides a succinct evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of own work.  Identifies areas for further development of knowledge and skills. | Recognises the overall learning outcomes, but is not clear about further development.  Comments generally on the quality of own work. | Begins to recognise own strengths and weaknesses, but lacks confidence in reflecting on own learning and quality of work submitted. | Inability to meaningfully undertake the process of self evaluation. |
| TOTAL | /40 |  |  |  |  |  |

COMMENTS