|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | 10 to >8 PtsHigh Distinction | 8 to >7 PtsDistinction | 7 to >6 PtsCredit | 6 to >5 PtsPass | 5 to >0 PtsFail | Pointsxx/30 |
| Introduction and Conclusion*A clear and constructed introduction discussing the fundamental differences between direct and indirect technique, with a relevant conclusion.* | *Extremely well constructed with a comprehensive and detailed introduction and relevant conclusion.* | *Very well constructed with a detailed introduction and relevant conclusion.* | *Well constructed with a reasonable introduction and conclusion.* | *Adequately constructed with an introduction and a conclusion.* | *Poorly constructed with an unsatisfactory introduction and conclusion.* | /10 |
| Body of Assignment*The body of the assignments includes: b) critical analysis of the technique/s including assessment, application, treatment and tissue response/s c) the proposed mechanism of how Functional technique works, including whether this is viable and whether current evidence proves or disproves this d) explore the effectiveness and efficacy of indirect techniques and (i) explain how they work, (ii) describe the physiological and pathophysiological changes that occur, (i.e. what is it that I’m actually doing?) and (iii) why/how this occurs without large amounts of force* | Extremely well constructed and conceptionally strong. Demonstrates comprehensive research skills and provides a detailed critical analysis of the technique and its application. | Very well constructed and conceptionally strong. Demonstrates detailed research skills and provides a reasonable critical analysis of the technique and *its application.* | Well constructed. Demonstrates good research skills and provides a some critical analysis of the technique and its application. | Adequately constructed. Demonstrates limited research skills and provides a low level of critical analysis of the technique and its application. | Poorly constructed. Demonstrates unsatisfactory research skills and provides unsatisfactory critical analysis of the technique and its application | /10 |
| Application, English language and Academic conventions*The reflection follows a clear and methodical structure providing comprehensive information. References are consistent in style and format.* | *The reflection is clearly written to an excellent academic standard. Shows high-level capability to explain data based on comprehensive research. A correct reference list is provided referencing at least 5 works.* | The reflection is clearly written to a high academic standard. Shows reasonable capability to explain data based on comprehensive research. A reference list is provided with minor errors referencing at least 5  works. | *The reflection is written to a good academic standard. Shows mid-level capability to explain data based on comprehensive research. A correct reference list is provided referencing less than 5 works.* | The reflection is written to an adequate academic standard. Shows limited capability to explain data based on comprehensive research. A reference list is provided with minor errors referencing less than 5 works. | The reflection is poorly written and not of an academic standard. Shows low-level capability to explain data based on comprehensive research. A reference list is provided with errors referencing less than 4  works. | /10 |