

Criteria	Poor/Fail	Needs improvement/ Marginal fail	Acceptable/ Pass	Good/ Credit	Very Good/ Distinction	Excellent/ High Distinction
Application of critical thinking – background research on selected topic, logical argumentation, explanation, inferences and assumptions used in firstly constructing; and then critically analysing the discourse. (10 marks)	2 points Almost no evidence of any background research, poor knowledge of elements of argumentation. Poor or incorrect proficiency shown in understanding topic, creating a meaningful discourse and then critically analysing the created discourse. (0 - 2.9 marks)	4 points Very little evidence of background research, insufficient knowledge of elements of argumentation. Some inaccuracies or inadequate proficiency shown in understanding topic and creating & then critically analysing the discourse. (3 - 4.9 marks)	5 points Some evidence of background research, adequate but superficial knowledge of elements of argumentation. Mostly accurate proficiency shown in understanding topic and creating & then critically analysing the discourse. (5 - 5.9 marks)	6 points Satisfactory background research, competent knowledge of elements of argumentation. Accurate proficiency shown in understanding topic and creating & then critically analysing the discourse. (6 - 6.9 marks)	7 points Good background research, in depth knowledge of elements of argumentation. Accurate and broad proficiency shown in understanding topic and creating & then critically analysing the discourse. (7 - 7.9 marks)	10 points Excellent background research, in depth, extensive knowledge of elements of argumentation. Superior proficiency shown in understanding topic and constructing & then critically analysing the discourse. (8 - 10 marks)
Problem solving – identification of key issues in the selected topic and logically defensible resolutions suggested. (10 marks)	2 points Inaccurate or missing justification of solutions and recommendations. Argument is missing, poor, or inaccurate with no supporting evidence. (0 - 2.9 marks)	4 points Insufficient or inadequate justification of solutions and recommendations or use of inaccurate sources. Argument either inadequate or inaccurate or evidence does not support argument. (3 - 4.9 marks)	5 points Some justification of solutions and recommendations using limited sources. Argument either not well developed or not well supported by evidence (5 - 5.9 marks)	6 points General justification of solutions and recommendations using different sources. Logical argument developed with some supporting evidence. (6 - 6.9 marks)	7 points Accurate justification of solutions and recommendations using a broad variety of sources. Logical argument developed, supported by clear evidence. (7 - 7.9 marks)	10 points Superior justification of solutions and recommendations using a wide variety of sources. Logical argument developed in rigorous fashion, supported by clear evidence. (8 - 10 marks)
Reflection and communication – question answered effectively in terms of overall presentation of the speech and also subsequent critical reflection on the speech demonstrating appropriate use of one or more CT tools. (10 marks)	2 points Question not answered correctly. Poor presentation. Poor use of language. Structure inadequate or incorrect. Missing or inaccurate critical reflection and analysis of own argument using CT tools. Missing or very poor referencing. (0 - 2.9 marks)	4 points Question not answered well. Presentation awkward or not fluent. Use of language needs improvement. Not structured well or little logic in layout. Some flaws in critical reflection and analysis of own argument using CT tools. Poor referencing. (3 - 4.9 marks)	5 points Question partly answered. Presentation adequate, but inconsistent fluency. Language usage readable but errors detract from presentation. Some logic in flow and structure. Some accurate points in critical reflection and analysis of own argument using CT tools. Satisfactory referencing with minor inconsistencies. (5 - 5.9 marks)	6 points Question adequately answered. Reasonably concise and fluent presentation. Mostly correct use of language. Some logic in flow and structure. Good critical reflection and analysis of own argument using CT tools. Satisfactory referencing. (6 - 6.9 marks)	7 points Question fully answered. Clear, concise and fluent presentation. Correct use of language. Logical flow and structure within word limits. Strong critical reflection and analysis of own argument using CT tools. Good referencing evidencing considerable external research (7 - 7.9 marks)	10 points Question fully answered. Expert clear, concise and fluent presentation, accurately set out. Excellent use of language. Logical flow and structure within word limits. Excellent critical reflection and analysis of own argument using CT tools. Good referencing evidencing extensive external research. (8 - 10 marks)
Overall Score	Fail (N) 0 or more	Fail (N) 9 or more	Pass (P) 15 or more	Credit (C) 18 or more	Distinction (D) 21 or more	High Distinction (HD) 24 or more