

Assessment 3 Marking Rubric (40%)

	Excellent (80-100%)	Very Good (70-79%)	Good (60-69%)	Fair (50-59%)	Poor (<50%)
Test Results (30%)	<p>Accuracy in all the below criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description and interpretation of results. • Analysis of score discrepancies, providing both normative and idiographic comparisons. • Discussion of relevant components of all six tests. 	<p>Minor errors in one of the below, with no errors in the other two criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description and interpretation of results. • Analysis of score discrepancies, providing both normative and idiographic comparisons. • Discussion of relevant components of all six tests. 	<p>Minor errors in two of the below, or significant errors in one:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description and interpretation of results. • Analysis of score discrepancies, providing both normative and idiographic comparisons. • Discussion of relevant components of all six tests. 	<p>Minor errors in all three of the below, or significant errors in two:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description and interpretation of results. • Analysis of score discrepancies, providing both normative and idiographic comparisons. • Discussion of relevant components of all six tests. 	<p>Significant errors (including missing information) in all three:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description and interpretation of results. • Analysis of score discrepancies, providing both normative and idiographic comparisons. • Discussion of relevant components of all six tests.
Summary (20%)	<p>Includes a succinct summary of all relevant information (inc. referral questions, relevant background, test performance). All relevant results are summarised, with clear emphasis on most important results, including the client's strengths and weaknesses.</p>	<p>Relevant information (inc. referral questions, relevant background, test performance) is summarised well, but a little information is missing. Results are summarised, with some discussion of strengths and weaknesses. However, emphasis may not be placed on the most relevant findings.</p>	<p>While information is summarised, some of the relevant information (inc. referral questions, relevant background, test performance) may be missing. Most results are summarised, but a discussion of strengths and weaknesses is not wholly accurate. Emphasis may not be placed on the most relevant findings.</p>	<p>While information is summarised, much of the relevant information (inc. referral questions, relevant background, test performance) may be missing. Most results may not be summarised and/or, a discussion of strengths and weaknesses is missing. Emphasis is not placed on the most relevant findings.</p>	<p>Most of the relevant information (inc. referral questions, relevant background, test performance) is missing or incorrect. Strengths and weaknesses are not discussed or are wholly incorrect, and emphasis is not placed on most relevant findings.</p>
Opinion (20%)	<p>Opinion cohesively integrates all relevant information (background history, referral questions, presentation, and test results) to explicitly answer all referral questions. Strong response to the referral questions with evidence to justify the decision, along with discussion of any factors that may have contributed to the findings (e.g., mood, effort).</p>	<p>Opinion integrates all relevant information (background history, referral questions, presentation, and test results) to explicitly answer all referral questions. Good response to the referral questions with evidence to justify the decision, along with discussion of any factors that may have contributed to the findings (e.g., mood, effort).</p>	<p>Opinion integrates some relevant information (background history, referral questions, presentation, and test results) and may answer some or all referral questions, but some aspects are missing. A response to the referral questions is included but evidence to justify the decision could be lacking and/or a discussion of any factors that may have contributed to the findings (e.g., mood, effort) could be missing.</p>	<p>Opinion integrates some relevant information (background history, referral questions, presentation, and test results) but does not answer some or all referral questions. A response to the referral questions is included but evidence to justify the decision is lacking and a discussion of any factors that may have contributed to the findings (e.g., mood, effort) is missing.</p>	<p>Insufficient consideration of relevant information (background history, referral questions, presentation, and test results) and does not answer some or all referral questions. Evidence to justify the decision is lacking and a discussion of any factors that may have contributed to the findings (e.g., mood, effort) is missing.</p>

Continued....

	Excellent (80-100%)	Very Good (70–79%)	Good (60–69%)	Fair (50-59%)	Poor (<50%)
Recommendations (20%)	Recommendations are evidence-based, specific and tailored to the client, include a consideration of recommendations for all relevant parties (e.g., client, referrer), and succinctly and accurately address management of the difficulties described in the referral questions.	Recommendations are evidence-based and accurately address the management of difficulties described in the referral questions. Recommendations are tailored to the client, but do not include a consideration of other relevant parties or sufficiently address all difficulties described in the referral questions.	Recommendations are generally evidence-based and somewhat address the management of difficulties described in the referral questions. Recommendations are tailored to the client, but do not include a consideration of other relevant parties or sufficiently address all difficulties described in the referral questions.	Recommendations address the management of difficulties described in the referral questions but may not be completely accurate or evidence-based or appropriate and/or be tailored to client, and/or address difficulties described in the referral questions.	Recommendations poorly address the management of difficulties described in the referral questions, and are not appropriate, or tailored to client. They do not adequately address difficulties described in the referral questions.
Overall Structure & Writing Style (10%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report includes all sections in a logical order. Information flows logically and cohesively within and between paragraphs/sections. Writing is clear, concise, and cohesive, with correct spelling, grammar, etc. Style is appropriate for the audience. Explains psychological concepts well and without jargon. Any citations/references are genuine/authentic and legitimate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report includes all sections in a logical order. Information generally flows logically within and between paragraphs/sections. Writing is generally clear, concise, and cohesive, with minor errors in spelling, grammar, etc. Style is appropriate for audience. Most psychological concepts are explained with minimal jargon used. Any citations/references are genuine/authentic and legitimate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report includes all sections. Minor issues with the logical flow of information within and/or between paragraphs/sections. Minor errors in clarity, conciseness, cohesion, or spelling, grammar, etc. Style is mostly appropriate for the audience. Psychological terms are not always explained. Jargon often used. Any citations/references are genuine/authentic and legitimate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report may include all sections, but order is not logical. Several issues with the logical flow of information within and/or between paragraphs/sections. Several errors in clarity, conciseness, cohesion, or spelling, grammar, etc. Style may not be appropriate for the audience. Psychological terms are not explained, and/or extensive use of jargon. Any citations/references are genuine/authentic and legitimate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report may include all sections, but order is not logical. Many issues with the logical flow of information within and/or between paragraphs/sections. Many errors in clarity, conciseness, cohesion, or spelling, grammar, etc. Style may not be appropriate for the audience. Psychological terms are not explained, and/or extensive use of jargon. Any citations/references are not genuine/authentic and/or not legitimate.