

The undergraduate descriptors on information/data collection :

<p>Information/ data collection [From L4 taxonomy: Gather and organise information/data from recommended and appropriate sources.]</p>	<p>Evidence of widely applied critical engagement with a wide range of relevant sources. Use of research- informed literature where relevant. Consistently accurate application of specified referencing style.</p>	<p>Evidence of critical engagement with a wide range of relevant sources. Use of research- informed literature where relevant. Accurate application of specified referencing style.</p>	<p>Evidence of engagement with a wide range of relevant sources. Good use of specified referencing style, with few inaccuracies or inconsistencies.</p>	<p>Evidence of engagement with an appropriate range of sources. Cites sources beyond essential and recommended texts. Specified referencing style used with minor inaccuracies or inconsistencies.</p>	<p>Evidence of some relevant sources. Sources largely confined to essential and recommended texts. Specified referencing use contains inaccuracies and/or inconsistencies.</p>	<p>Poor evidence of engagement with essential source materials. Lacks evidence of wider information/ data collection and associated reading. Heavily reliant on taught elements. Inconsistent and weak use of specified referencing style.</p>	<p>Very limited evidence of engagement with relevant source materials. Very limited information gathering. Very poor use of specified referencing style.</p>	<p>No evidence of information/ data collection or engagement with relevant source materials. No information gathering evident. Absent or incoherent use of specified referencing style.</p>
---	--	--	--	---	---	---	---	--

My own adapted criteria for use of resources:

<p>Use of appropriate resources (20%)</p>	<p>Evidence of widely applied critical engagement with a wide range of relevant <u>sociological</u> sources. Use of <u>sociological academic journal articles to support points</u>. Consistently accurate application of <u>Harvard</u> referencing.</p>	<p>Evidence of critical engagement with a wide range of relevant <u>sociological</u> sources. Use of <u>sociological academic journal articles to support points</u>. Accurate application of <u>Harvard</u> referencing.</p>	<p>Evidence of engagement with a wide range of relevant/<u>academic sociological</u> sources. Good use of <u>Harvard</u> referencing, with few inaccuracies or inconsistencies.</p>	<p>Evidence of engagement with an appropriate range of <u>sociological academic</u> sources beyond essential and recommended texts. <u>Harvard</u> referencing used with minor inaccuracies or inconsistencies.</p>	<p>Evidence of some relevant <u>sociological</u> sources. Sources largely confined to essential and recommended texts. <u>Harvard</u> referencing use contains inaccuracies and/or inconsistencies.</p>	<p>Poor evidence of engagement with essential <u>sociological</u> source materials. Lacks evidence of wider information/ data collection and associated reading. Heavily <u>reliant on slides already used by lecturer</u>. Inconsistent and weak use of <u>Harvard</u> referencing.</p>	<p>Very limited evidence of engagement with relevant <u>sociological</u> source materials. Very limited <u>academic</u> information gathering. Very poor use of <u>Harvard</u> referencing.</p>	<p>No evidence engagement with relevant <u>sociological</u> source materials. No <u>source citations</u> evident. Absent or incoherent use of <u>Harvard</u> referencing.</p>
---	---	---	---	---	---	--	---	---