

## Review Rubric

Criterion	Exemplary	Developing	Needs Revision
<b>1. Focus &amp; Scope</b>	Clear, single issue or argument; strong purpose.	Topic relevant but broad or drifting.	Lacks focus or have multiple unlinked ideas.
<b>2. Scholarly Grounding</b>	Draws on key literature/data; integrated naturally.	Some references, limited engagement.	Little/no evidence; unsupported claims.
<b>3. Accessibility &amp; Clarity</b>	Engaging, jargon-free, logical flow.	Generally clear, some complexity.	Overly academic, unclear, disjointed.
<b>4. Critical Reflection</b>	Insightful, reflexive, and analytical.	Some reflection, limited depth.	Descriptive or promotional.
<b>5. Tone &amp; Voice</b>	Professional, balanced, invitational.	Appropriate, but slips occasionally.	Informal, directive, or polemical.
<b>6. Structure &amp; Coherence</b>	Logical flow, strong open/close.	Coherent but uneven.	Disorganised or unclear.
<b>7. Originality &amp; Contribution</b>	Fresh insight, clear contribution.	Relevant but less original.	Repeats well-known ideas.
<b>8. Visuals / Data (if used)</b>	Support argument, labelled, cited.	Present but under-explained.	Unclear, missing, or decorative.
<b>9. Ethical Writing</b>	Sources cited, avoids overlap.	Minor citation issues.	Risk of self-plagiarism, unclear sources.
<b>10. Relevance to RSA</b>	Clear link to regional studies.	Implicit link.	Unclear or off-topic.