EVALUATION/ FEEDBACK FORM
(to be read in conjunction with the more specific comments offered in the submission)

Student:
Title of submission:

1. ORGANISATION, SUPPORT AND PRESENTATION (25%)	
1.1 MARKS	**ORGANISATION AND SUPPORT**
1,0 - 1,3	Main section and sub-section headings are clearly inter-related, and are arranged logically. All necessary support sections are provided and are used according to academic expectations. Arrangement and content of list of references follows the APA/MLA style consistently.
1,7 – 2,0	Section and sub-section headings are arranged logically. All necessary support sections are provided and mostly fulfil academic expectations. Arrangement and content of list of references follow the APA/MLA style consistently, but occasional errors are noticeable (e.g. mismatch of spelling of name with one in citation) and more complex entries (e.g. edited publications/ multiple authors) may need slight attention.
2,3 – 2,7	There is a link between section and sub-section headings, though some aspects may need attention. There is evidence of a general understanding of the academic function of various support sections. Arrangement and content of list of references mostly follow the APA/ MLA style, but some errors are noticeable (e.g. a source missing, occasional error in spellings, dates) and more complex entries (e.g. edited publications/ multiple authors) need some attention.
3,0 – 3,3	Headings are not always clearly relevant, or there is a lack of unity/link between all sections. The academic functions of various support sections are not always fulfilled (e.g. the conclusion may include new information/not summarise main areas considered and conclusions reached). The organisation is not helpful to the reader. The list of references is incomplete and can cause some confusion due to limited understanding of the conventions/ awareness of the APA/ MLA style.
3,7 – 5,0	Poor organisation and a disregard for academic expectations are evident. Necessary support sections may be missing, incomplete or inappropriately used. The reader finds great difficulty in understanding the organisation and using the list of references which is muddled, incomplete and shows little understanding of the conventions.
1.2 MARKS	**PRESENTATION**
1,0 - 1,3	Length corresponds to limit given. Readers can 'navigate' the text easily, using cover page, numbering system, lists, etc. The product uses appropriate features throughout (font size/ style, spacing, 'bold' headings, error-free cover page etc.).
1,7 – 2,0	Length corresponds to limit given. Text navigation is usually easy and cover page, numbering system, lists, etc are generally good. The product uses some appropriate features (font size/ style, spacing, 'bold' headings, error-free cover page etc.).
2,3 – 2,7	The length may be a little outside given parameters. Basic navigational features are present, though some more complex features may be incomplete/missing. Overall, essential features used.
3,0 – 3,3	The project is likely to be too short/long. The reader finds difficulty in navigating the text due to errors in basic features, such as (non)reference to visuals in-text. The cover page may contain errors/omissions.
3,7 – 5,0	The project is likely to be too short/long. Navigating the text is difficult and frustrating for the reader due to errors in basic text presentation. The numbering system, cover page and word-processing features are inadequate for an academic assignment.

2. CONTENT: INTERCULTURAL REFLECTION AND EVALUATION (50%)	
MARKS	
1,0 - 1,3	The reflection shows complex interpretations and thoughtful insights about self and culture and discusses how to apply learning. The reflection shows a strong desire to learn more and may offer ideas for gaining more knowledge. The reflection describes other perspectives in depth and recognizes and respects the complexity of culture. It explains differences in depth and/or describes incidents through the other's point of view.
1,7 – 2,0	The reflection attempts to articulate more in-depth interpretations although it may reveal inconsistency. The reflection demonstrates an increasing desire to learn and may list ways knowledge is incomplete. The reflection describes and respects other perspectives. It attempts to explain differences in more depth, or draw connections and conclusions with a degree of exploration.
2,3 – 2,7	The reflection begins to make simple interpretations. The reflection may list simple new understandings or simplistic personal growth and change. The reflection demonstrates an emerging desire to learn or a sense of wonder to find answers to questions. The reflection shows increasing recognition of other points of view and shows growing respect for differences. It begins to validate differences or attempts simple explanations of differences.
3,0 – 3,3	The reflection is mostly descriptive but may show basic attempts to understand or learn more about observations. The reflection begins to recognize other points of view yet in simplistic and superficial ways; it prefers own perspective or does not know how else to interpret or act.
3,7 – 5,0	The reflection is purely descriptive. It does not attempt to understand, explore, or make meaning of experiences or observations. The reflection does not recognize other points of view, is unable to suspend judgment of others, or may be critical or negative toward the other.
3. LANGUAGE: ACCURACY, RANGE AND STYLE (25%)	
MARKS	
1,0 - 1,3	Wide range of grammatical structures and vocabulary used, with very few mistakes. Linguistic unity at discourse level and very good cohesion through accurate use of adverbials and conjunctions/pronouns/use of synonyms etc. The writer does not plagiarise and expresses/summarises his/her and other writers' ideas in his/her own words. A sophisticated piece of writing.
1,7 – 2,0	Meaning is clear and expressed in mainly accurate language, using some complex sentences and demonstrating a good range of appropriate vocabulary. A degree of fluency and cohesion is generally maintained. The writer does not plagiarise, relying mainly on summarising, though a limited amount of paraphrasing may be too close to original texts.
2,3 – 2,7	The writer is able to use appropriate vocabulary and usually conveys meaning unambiguously. Sentence structure and grammatical control are adequate, though further editing and correction may be required in complex sentences. There is evidence and control of basic cohesive devices in the text. The writer clearly attempts to avoid plagiarism, though there may be over-use of close paraphrasing at times.
3,0 – 3,3	Some appropriate vocabulary is used, but needs to be developed. Meaning is sometimes obscure, either due to lexical or grammatical limitations. Errors are noticeable throughout even in simple sentences, and there is a need to improve text cohesion and fluency. OR Over-use of close paraphrasing.
3,7 – 5,0	Language is limited in all respects. The student is unable to write at length on an academic subject due to lexical and grammatical restrictions. Errors dominate throughout, making the text difficult to read and the meaning obscure. OR Plagiarised text.
	FINAL GRADE: