

JSB172 Professional Academic Skills
Assessment 2: Literature Review
(50% of overall grade)



School of Justice
Faculty of Law

This assessment relates to Learning Outcomes:

- 1) apply reflective practice principles to identify current and future skills to engage in the profession
- 2) demonstrate proficiency in academic literacies, including applying appropriate referencing conventions
- 3) practice and develop professional writing conventions for a range of audiences and formulate persuasive arguments in written text

Criteria	7	6	5	4	3	2-1
Application of academic literacies						
60%						
<p>Evidence of the use of search strategies to locate scholarly sources and define the relevant themes and issues</p> <p>Clear and identifiable argument as informed and substantiated by sources. Evidence of understanding and critical thinking; evidence of synthesis of ideas that apply to and are developed from the literature</p>	<p>Extensive use of a range of suitable scholarly sources. Sources are very effectively used for demonstrating relevance of all issues for expert to consider in scenario/role</p> <p>Selection, reading and annotation demonstrate high level skills in searching strategies and analysis. Clearly and concisely synthesises and expands on the main theme and core points of the source/s. Ideas are integrated into the discussion. Through sophisticated analysis and synthesis the purpose of the literature review work is achieved</p>	<p>A range of suitable scholarly sources selected, demonstrating skills in searching strategies. Sources are mostly effectively used and related to the expert and scenario / role is mostly evident / maintained with a minor lack of focus; most points of relevance noted</p> <p>Shows a deep level of thinking to synthesise major points and issues and how they contribute to the critical discussion of the literature themes or issues</p>	<p>Some scholarly sources have been selected, demonstrating some skills in searching strategies. Suitability of the sources is less defined and less maintained throughout discussion due to lack of focus; descriptive at times and only some points of relevance noted</p> <p>There are examples of synthesising ideas and themes relevant to the expert and scenario/role through well-articulated discussion which is sometimes supported through relevant sources - scholarly and non-scholarly</p>	<p>Limited skills in search strategies; large reliance on non-scholarly sources. The relevance of sources to the expert to consider in scenario/role is generally not communicated</p> <p>Some synthesis of ideas present</p>	<p>Very limited evidence of searching for scholarly sources; sources cited are not scholarly. Sources are irrelevant and of low quality and are not used to show relevance of issues for expert to consider in scenario/role</p> <p>Response does not address the set task requirements in regards to content and/or format. Lack of evidence of critical thinking. No synthesis of ideas presented</p>	<p>No evidence</p> <p>No evidence</p>

Criteria	7	6	5	4	3	2-1
Academic and professional writing conventions and presentation 40%						
Evidence of understanding of written communication suitable for the task and Harvard referencing	Writing is clear, concise and free of typographical errors. Conforms to the guidelines in all respects	Writing is clear and concise with minimal typographical errors. It conforms to the guidelines with fluency, no repetition, although may not always use full sentences. Few errors with use of Harvard style	Writing is competent, clear and concise with limited typographical errors. Some errors with use of Harvard style	Writing is sound. It adequately communicates some of the features of a literature review with typographical errors. Many errors with use of Harvard style	Writing is poor and unclear with frequent errors of grammar. Limited use of Harvard referencing	No evidence