

Expanded AB Assessment criteria AND conversion to numerical marks

	Excellent (5)	Very good (4)	Good (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Inadequate (1)
Coverage, organisation, and prioritisation: (Excellent) Sources are clearly organised in relation to the emerging research question. Key areas of literature (central to the argument) are distinguished from contextual or background works, and sources are thoughtfully prioritised rather than listed indiscriminately. (Very good) Sources are well organised around the research topic. Most key areas of literature are identified and prioritised, though distinctions between central and contextual works may not always be clear. (Good) Relevant sources are included and generally organised around the research topic, though prioritisation between key and supporting works is limited or uneven. (Satisfactory) Sources are loosely related to the research topic but organisation is limited. Key works may be missing; sources are listed rather than prioritised. (Inadequate) Sources are poorly selected, weakly related to the research topic, or largely indiscriminate in coverage.					
Critical engagement:					

(Excellent) Each entry demonstrates a clear understanding of the text's main argument, methods, and contribution. The annotation explains why the source is relevant, including how it supports or complicates the research focus. (Very Good) Annotations accurately summarise the argument and contribution of each text, with some explanation of relevance to the research focus. (Good) Annotations summarise the text but engagement remains mostly descriptive, with limited explanation of relevance to the research focus. (Satisfactory) Annotations provide minimal description of the text with little evidence of understanding of its argument or contribution. (Inadequate) Annotations misrepresent the source or fail to demonstrate understanding of the text.					
Analytical awareness: (Excellent) Clear connections and contrasts between sources are identified (including cross-referencing where relevant). Gaps, silences, or contested areas in the literature are acknowledged. (Very Good) Some connections or contrasts between sources are identified, though analysis may be uneven or limited. (Good) Sources are treated individually with limited comparison or synthesis.					

(Satisfactory) Little awareness of relationships between sources. (Insufficient) No analytical engagement with the literature.					
Integrity and accuracy: (Excellent) Sources are legitimate, verifiable, and correctly cited. Annotations accurately represent each source's argument (we may check a random sample). No fabricated or misrepresented sources are included. (Very Good) Sources are appropriate and correctly cited with only minor inaccuracies. (Good) Sources are mostly appropriate but citations contain some inconsistencies. (Satisfactory) Citation problems or questionable sources appear. (Insufficient) Serious citation issues, fabricated sources, or misrepresentation of texts.					

Descriptor	Points
Excellent	5
Very good	4
Good	3
Satisfactory	2
Inadequate	1

Maximum score = 20 points

Total Points	% Mark	Grade
19–20	80–100	High Distinction
17–18	70–79	Distinction
14–16	65–69	High Merit
12–13	60–64	Merit
10–11	55–59	Pass
7–9	50–54	Low Pass
< 6	< 50	Fail

Note to students: Because the final mark reflects performance across all criteria, achieving an “Excellent” rating in one category does not automatically result in a Distinction overall. Final marks are determined by the overall pattern of strengths and weaknesses across the rubric.