

RUBRIC/FEEDBACK SHEET  
 EDST5451 EDUCATIONAL POLICY: THEORY AND PR  
 UNSW SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Assessment Task 1: Policy Analysis

Specific Criteria	(-)			>(+)	
<p>Understanding of the question or issue and the key concepts involved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriateness of policy document selected for analysis</li> <li>• Explicit engagement with Bacchi s (2009) approach to policy analysis</li> <li>• Clear understanding of the concept of policy problems</li> </ul>					
<p>Depth of analysis and critique in response to the task</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and reasoned identification of the problem represented within the selected policy document</li> <li>• Clear and reasoned identification of assumptions within the selected policy document</li> <li>• Detailed analysis of relevant historical context/s</li> <li>• Clear and reasoned identification of silences within the selected</li> </ul> <p>Thoughtful suggestions for how the problem could be questioned, disrupted, or replaced</p>					
<p>Familiarity with and relevance of professional and/or research literature used to support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses policy documents and related sources effectively to support response</li> </ul>					


RUBRIC/FEEDBACK SHEET  
 EDST5451 EDUCATIONAL POLICY: THEORY AND PR  
 UNSW SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Assessment Task 2: Policy Briefing

Specific Criteria	(-)			>(+)	
<p>Understanding of the question or issue and the key concepts involved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A relevant issue in education policy at state or federal level is clearly identified and explained, and a position relevant to the issue is taken</li> <li>• Clear understanding of the relationship between policy problems and solutions</li> </ul>					
<p>Depth of analysis and critique in response to the task</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issue is explored in depth, demonstrating a thorough grasp of the content</li> <li>• Considered, reflexive analysis of position is articulated</li> <li>• Overall evaluation of position is thoughtful and well-reasoned</li> </ul>					
<p>Familiarity with and relevance of professional and/or research literature used to support response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a wide range of academic literature to effectively support response</li> <li>• Uses unit readings as relevant to effectively support response</li> <li>• Uses policy documents and/or related sources as relevant to effectively support response</li> </ul>					
<p>Structure and organisation of response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Logical sequencing of ideas in response to task requirements</li> <li>• Effective use of paragraphing</li> <li>• Clarity and coherence of organisation, including use of sub-</li> </ul>					

Specific Criteria	(-)		>(+)		
headings where appropriate					
Presentation of response according to appropriate academic and linguistic conventions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Writing adheres to academic standards of grammar, punctuation and spelling</li> <li>• Accuracy and consistency in use of APA conventions, including both in-text citations and the reference list</li> <li>• Within +/-10% of the word limit</li> </ul>					
General comments/recommendations for next time:					

Recommended: /20 (FL PS CR DN HD) Weighting: 60%

NB: The ticks in the various boxes are designed to provide feedback to students. Each tick has equal weight in determining the recommended grade. D P • à • à @ • à • à p ( equal weight in determining the recommended grade. D P • et @ 0 0 0 0