

LEGENDARY TALES OF THE AUSTRALIAN ABORIGINES

RICH ASSESSMENT TASK: REVIEW RUBRIC

Standard	Indicators
Produces a comprehensive review that deals with all aspects in detail and is written with sophistication.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a detailed and accurate summary of the text types. Shows strong awareness of context of production and production history. Sophisticated evaluation of the text's literary value with strong examples. Sophisticated evaluation of presentation of Aboriginal cultures. Sophisticated comparison with W. J. Thomas' text. Strong argument as to the text's suitability to study. Writes fluently, using accurate expression and terminology. Few or no errors in spelling, punctuation, grammar.
Produces a well-written review that covers all aspects of the task. Some sophistication of ideas is present.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a succinct and accurate summary of the text types. Makes relevant points about the context of production and production history. Makes a well-argued evaluation of literary value with some relevant examples. Makes a number of relevant points about the presentation of Aboriginal cultures. Makes an accurate comparison with W. J. Thomas' text. Makes a well-reasoned argument with some relevant examples as to text's suitability to study. Writing is mostly fluent, may tend to describe rather than analyse. Occasional errors in spelling, punctuation, grammar.
Produces a review that covers all aspects of the task, but some sections may not be well covered. Limited support for ideas is given.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a limited summary of the text types. Publication history is limited, important facts omitted. Argument of literary value is not well-supported with examples; argument lacks sophistication. Makes a limited comparison with W. J. Thomas' text. Writing comprehensible but explanations limited; generalisations and some inaccuracies with expression may be present. Some errors in spelling, punctuation, grammar.

Produces a review that does not cover all aspects of the task. Response is superficial.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Produces a review but little evidence of reference to context of production or appeal to target audience.• Review poorly presented.• Statement of intent brief and shows very limited understanding about deliberate shaping of techniques to create appeal.• Writing hampered by poor expression, limited points.• Frequent errors in spelling, punctuation, grammar.
Partial or inadequate work presented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Shows a limited knowledge of the text.• Only provides a few points with no logical connection.• Poor control over language conventions.

Teacher comment