

**Example 1: AIS Tourism Visitor Care 4N0628, Supervisor's/Assessor's Marking Rubric: Portfolio**

Score		Criteria
10 Marks	5 Marks	
9-10	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive response</li> <li>• Deep understanding of the topic demonstrated</li> <li>• Fully accurate or relevant information provided</li> <li>• Clear and cohesive writing/presentation of information</li> </ul>
7-8	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minor detail missing from response</li> <li>• Good understanding of the topic demonstrated</li> <li>• Mostly accurate or relevant information provided</li> <li>• Mostly clear and cohesive writing/presentation of information</li> </ul>
5-6	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some details missing from response</li> <li>• Reasonable understanding of the topic demonstrated</li> <li>• Generally accurate or relevant information provided, with some errors or omissions</li> <li>• Organised, cohesive and easy to read writing/presentation of information</li> </ul>
3-4	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only part of the topic/question responded to</li> <li>• Basic understanding of the topic demonstrated</li> <li>• Some accurate but limited information provided</li> <li>• Organised, cohesive and easy to read writing/presentation of information</li> </ul>
1-2	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only part of the topic/question responded to</li> <li>• Minimal understanding of the topic demonstrated</li> <li>• Large volume of inaccuracy or omissions</li> <li>• Unorganised and unclear writing/presentation of information</li> </ul>
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fully inaccurate response, or no response provided</li> <li>• Little of no understanding of the topic demonstrated</li> </ul>

## Example 2: Sample Rubric for Communications 5N0690, Writing Skills: Structured

Category	Distinction (15-13 marks)	Merit (12-10 marks)	Pass (9-7.5 marks)	Unsuccessful (<7.5 marks)
<b>Structure</b>	Report well-structured with well-constructed headings and paragraphs. Detailed. Balanced. Used impersonal language throughout. Good interpretation of terms of reference	Report well-structured with headings and paragraphs. Good detail provided. Balanced. Used impersonal language. Good interpretation of terms of reference	Basic report structure. Minimum detail provided. Some balance evident. Used some impersonal language. Basic interpretation of terms of reference	Report poorly structured. Lack of detail and balance. Little or no impersonal language used. Poor interpretation of terms of reference
<b>Sources</b>	Information clearly relates to the report topic with several supporting details and/or examples. Range of sources cited through references and bibliography. Comprehensive and relevant research evident	Information clearly relates to the report topic with 1-2 supporting details and/or examples. Sources cited through references and bibliography. Thorough and relevant research evident	Information relates to the report topic but with no supporting details and/or examples. Few sources cited through references and bibliography. Some relevant research evident	Information does not relate to the report topic. Little or no sources cited. Little or no evidence of research evident
<b>Quality of Information</b>	Information and ideas communicated with a high degree of clarity, confidence and objectivity. Range of visual aids used. Evidence of original thinking	Information and ideas communicated with considerable clarity and objectivity. Visual aid used. Some evidence of original thinking	Information and ideas communicated with some clarity and objectivity. Visual aid used. Little evidence of original thinking	Information and ideas communicated with limited or no clarity and objectivity. Little or no visual aids used. Little or no evidence of original thinking
<b>Recommendations and Conclusions</b>	Findings presented clearly. Recommendations and/or conclusions show evidence of critical thinking and in-depth analysis	Findings presented clearly. Recommendations and/or conclusions show evidence of careful analysis	Findings presented clearly. Recommendations and/or conclusions show evidence of limited analysis	Findings presented. Recommendations and/or conclusions show no evidence of critical thinking or analysis
<b>Mechanics of Writing</b>	No grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. Used extensive vocabulary. Ideas well expressed	Almost no grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. Use of appropriate vocabulary with a degree of fluency. Ideas well expressed	A few grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. Use of appropriate vocabulary. Ideas appropriately expressed	Many grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. Lack of use of appropriate vocabulary. Ideas poorly expressed