Class of 2018 - New and updated Extended Essay timeline/deadline(s):
*No abstract is required

- **May 22** Annotated Bibliography and working outline (20 Ex-cred pts)
- **May 22-31** Supervisor Meeting and Initial Formal Reflection on RPPF (see below explanation of the RPPF) [mandatory and 50 pts]
- **Sept 5** Completed FIRST DRAFT DUE – title page, Table of Contents, the body of the paper, work cited, and appendix. Hard copy must be turned into Ms. Close by 7:25am (140 possible pts)
- **Sept 5-Oct 13** Make an appointment to meet with your supervisor. This is not a formal meeting. Your Supervisor will NOT read the FIRST ROUGH DRAFT. You may ask about portions of the paper. You may ask if your EE is correctly formatted and ask about the research question, and works cited page. (25 pts)
- **Nov 10** Completed 2nd DRAFT DUE – hard copy goes to Ms. Close and a digital version is uploaded to ManageBac by 7:25am. The 2nd DRAFT should be as close to the completed product as possible. Your EE Supervisor WILL read this 2nd DRAFT and will be the topic of discussion in your Interim Reflection Meeting. (50 pts)
- **Nov 10-Dec 13** Schedule an official meeting with your supervisor. This will be your official INTERIM REFLECTION MEETING for the RPPF (see below explanation of the RPPF). You will meet with your supervisor and go over suggested revisions. Remember that the supervisor is not allowed to edit your paper; they are there to guide you and discuss areas you need to look at. It is highly suggested that you take your own printed copy of your EE and mark it up as you go over your EE with your supervisor. Pay close attention to issues related to citation and subject as they can both cause failing conditions for your paper and/or risk your diploma. You will write the official reflection for your Interim Reflection Meeting on your RPPF [mandatory and 50 pts]
- **Jan 15** Final EE Deadline!! Students must turn in one final printed copy and one electronic copy of the paper before 1st period! The printed copy is turned in to Ms. Close in the IB office Room 261. The electronic copy must be submitted on ManageBac (there will be directions for uploading on the website). You must have done both to the deadline. Some EE supervisors may ask you to give them a second printed copy of your paper with the changes you have made HIGHLIGHTED, since the 2nd Draft and this final draft. This can be turned in the next day without impacting whether you have met the deadline. If a final version of the essay has not been turned in to Ms. Close and uploaded by this Jan 15 deadline, the student will have after school detention and Saturday School until the paper is completed and turned in.
- **Jan 15-30** Final Supervisor Meeting – Viva Voce – Contact your EE supervisor to set up an appointment for your last official reflection meeting. This will be our official FINAL REFLECTION MEETING for the RPPF (see below explanation of the RPPF). It is your last conversation with your supervisor before they validate your work for IB World. If you do not meet with them for your Viva Voce, your paper cannot be validated and will not be sent for grading. You must write your official final reflection on your RPPF. [mandatory 50 pts]
- **Jan 31** Submit your completed, mandatory RPPF - Following the viva voce, complete your final reflection for this meeting. Your RPPF should now be completed and upload it to ManageBac. Your EE Supervisor will then add their final comments on your Final RPPF. The supervisor adds the final comment to authenticate the process by signing and dating. A blank or un-submitted RPPF will score a 0 for criterion E. (150 pts)
**RPPF and the 3 mandatory Reflection Session**

There are three mandatory reflection sessions that are a formal part of the extended essay and should be recorded on the *Reflections on planning and progress form* (RPPF). Following each of these 3 reflection meeting session, students are required to complete the relevant comment section on the RPPF and submit it to their supervisor (upload it to ManageBac). The supervisor must then sign and date the form and after the final reflection session, the *viva voce*, add their own comment. For more information on the protocols for completing and submitting the *Reflections on planning and progress form* please see below.

Following the completion of all three sessions, the form will be submitted to the International Baccalaureate along with the completed extended essay. An incomplete form will impact the examiner’s ability to apply assessment criterion E (engagement)[SEE criteria information BELOW] and will result in the student receiving a lower mark for this criterion. In fact, a blank or un-submitted RPPF will score a 0 for criterion E.

**First Formal Initial Reflection Session**

This initial reflection session should be a dialogue between the student and the supervisor based on the student’s initial explorations. It is recommended that the student sends their supervisor an outline of their research proposal ahead of the meeting in order to give the supervisor the opportunity to review their work. This will ensure that the reflection session is focused and productive.

Topics of discussion that should arise during this session include:

- a review of the requirements and assessment criteria for the subject
- a review of ethical and legal implications, if applicable
- a dialogue about possible approaches and any potential problems that might arise
- a discussion of strategies for developing the student’s ideas for the essay and expanding the research so that the essay starts to take form
- probing and challenging questions that will help the student focus their thinking; this should lead to the development of the student’s working research question
- an outline of the next steps that the student should undertake in order to refine their question; this should take the form of a research and writing timeline.

**The Interim Reflection Session**

This session is a continuation of the dialogue between supervisor and student in which the student must demonstrate the progress they have made in their research. They must also be able to discuss any challenges they have encountered, offer their own potential solutions and seek advice as necessary.

During this session the supervisor might discuss:

- a completed piece of sustained writing from the student in order to ensure that they understand the academic writing requirements, including referencing formats
- whether an appropriate range of sources has been accessed and how the student is critically evaluating the origin of those sources
- what the student now has to do in order to produce the full draft of their essay, and ways and means of breaking down the task into manageable steps.

By the end of the interim reflection session both student and supervisor should feel satisfied that there is:

- a clear and refined research question
- a viable argument on which to base the essay
- a sufficient range of appropriate sources
- a clear vision for the final steps in the writing process.
Between the interim session and the completion of the extended essay, students should continue to see their supervisor as appropriate to their needs, although the third and final reflection session should not take place until after the extended essay has been completed and uploaded for submission.

Commenting on a draft version of the extended essay
Commenting on one completed draft of the essay is a very important aspect of the latter stages in the process, and the last point at which the supervisor sees the essay before it is finally uploaded for submission. It is therefore vital that the level of support given is appropriate—too little support and the ability of the student to meet their potential is compromised; too much help and it will not be the work of an independent learner. THIS WILL HAPPEN AFTER THE 2ND DRAFT IS SUBMITTED AND DURING YOUR INTERIM REFELCTION MEETING.

The best way of conducting this last stage is for the student to submit the essay prior to a supervision session to allow the supervisor to add their comments. This should be followed by a one-to-one discussion between the supervisor and the student in which they go through the comments together as these become a starting point for a dialogue about the essay. This advice should be in terms of the way the work could be improved, but this first draft must not be heavily annotated or edited by the supervisor.

What supervisors can do
Comments can be added that indicate that the essay could be improved. These comments should be open-ended and not involve editing the text, for example:

- **Issue:** the research question is expressed differently in three places (the title page, the introduction and the conclusion).
  
  **Comment:** is your research question consistent through the essay, including on the title page?

- **Issue:** the essay rambles and the argument is not clear.
  
  **Comment:** your essay lacks clarity here. How might you make it clearer?

- **Issue:** the student has made a mistake in their calculations.
  
  **Comment:** check this page carefully.

- **Issue:** the student has left out a section of the essay.
  
  **Comment:** you are missing something here. What is it? Check the essay against the requirements.

- **Issue:** the essay places something in the appendix that should be in the body of the essay.
  
  **Comment:** are you sure this belongs here?

- **Issue:** the conclusion is weak.
  
  **Comment:** what is it that you are trying to say here? Have you included all your relevant findings? Have you looked at unanswered questions?

- **Issue:** the essay has an incomplete citation.
  
  **Comment:** you need to check this page for accuracy of referencing.

What supervisors cannot do:

- Correct spelling and punctuation.
- Correct experimental work or mathematics.
- Re-write any of the essay.
- Indicate where whole sections of the essay would be better placed.
- Proofread the essay for errors.
- Correct bibliographies or citations.

Preparation for the Final Reflection Session (*viva voce*)
Supervisors must have already read the final version of the essay, sent to them by the candidate, before this session takes place.

Students should bring the following to this session:

- extracts from their RRS that illustrate how they have grown as learners through the process of reflection
- a willingness to share their personal experience and to discuss the skills and development of conceptual understandings that they have acquired through the completion of the extended essay.
Final Reflection Session (viva voce)
The viva voce is a short interview between the student and the supervisor, and is the mandatory conclusion to the extended essay process. Students who do not attend the viva voce will be disadvantaged under criterion E (engagement) as the Reflections on planning and progress form will be incomplete.

The viva voce is conducted once the student has uploaded the final version of their extended essay to the IB for assessment. At this point in the process no further changes can be made to the essay. The viva voce is a celebration of the completion of the essay and a reflection on what the student has learned from the process.

The viva voce is:
- an opportunity to ask the student a variety of open-ended questions to elicit holistic evidence
- an opportunity for the supervisor to confirm the authenticity of the student’s ideas and sources
- an opportunity to reflect on successes and difficulties encountered in the research process
- an aid to the supervisor’s comments on the Reflections on planning and progress form.

The viva voce should last 20–30 minutes. This is included in the recommended amount of time a supervisor should spend with the student.

In conducting the viva voce and writing their comments on the Reflections on planning and progress form, supervisors should bear in mind the following.
- The form is an assessed part of the extended essay. The form must include: comments made by the supervisor that are reflective of the discussions undertaken with the student during their supervision/reflection sessions; the student’s comments; and the supervisor’s overall impression of the student’s engagement with the research process.
- An incomplete form resulting from supervisors not holding reflection sessions, or students not attending them, could lead to criterion E (engagement) being compromised.
- In assessing criterion E (engagement), examiners will take into account any information given on the form about unusual intellectual inventiveness. This is especially the case if the student is able to demonstrate what has been learned as a result of this process or the skills developed.
- Examiners want to know that students understand any material (which must be properly referenced) that they have included in their essays. If the way the material is used in context in the essay does not clearly establish this, the supervisor can check the student’s understanding in the viva voce and comment on this on the Reflections on planning and progress form.
- The comment made by the supervisor should not attempt to do the examiner’s job. It should refer to things, largely process-related, that may not be obvious in the essay itself.
- Unless there are particular problems, the viva voce should begin and end positively. Completion of a major piece of work such as the extended essay is a great achievement for students.

The Extended Essay Assessment Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion A: focus and method</th>
<th>Criterion B: knowledge and understanding</th>
<th>Criterion C: critical thinking</th>
<th>Criterion D: presentation</th>
<th>Criterion E: engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research question</td>
<td>Subject-specific terminology and concepts</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Layout</td>
<td>Research focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total marks available: 34
**Criterion A: Focus and method**

This criterion focuses on the topic, the research question and the methodology. It assesses the explanation of the focus of the research (this includes the topic and the research question), how the research will be undertaken, and how the focus is maintained throughout the essay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Descriptor of strands and indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The work does not reach a standard outlined by the descriptors below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1–2   | **The topic is communicated unclearly and incompletely.**  
- Identification and explanation of the topic is limited; the purpose and focus of the research is unclear, or does not lend itself to a systematic investigation in the subject for which it is registered.  
**The research question is stated but not clearly expressed or too broad.**  
- The research question is too broad in scope to be treated effectively within the word limit and requirements of the task, or does not lend itself to a systematic investigation in the subject for which it is registered.  
- The intent of the research question is understood but has not been clearly expressed and/or the discussion of the essay is not focused on the research question.  
**Methodology of the research is limited.**  
- The source(s) and/or method(s) to be used are limited in range given the topic and research question.  
- There is limited evidence that their selection was informed. |
| 3–4   | **The topic is communicated.**  
- Identification and explanation of the research topic is communicated; the purpose and focus of the research is adequately clear, but only partially appropriate.  
**The research question is clearly stated but only partially focused.**  
- The research question is clear but the discussion in the essay is only partially focused and connected to the research question.  
**Methodology of the research is mostly complete.**  
- Source(s) and/or method(s) to be used are generally relevant and appropriate given the topic and research question.  
- There is some evidence that their selection(s) was informed.  
If the topic or research question is deemed inappropriate for the subject in which the essay is registered no more than four marks can be awarded for this criterion. |
| 5–6   | **The topic is communicated accurately and effectively.**  
- Identification and explanation of the research topic is effectively communicated; the purpose and focus of the research is clear and appropriate.  
**The research question is clearly stated and focused.**  
- The research question is clear and addresses an issue of research that is appropriately connected to the discussion in the essay.  
**Methodology of the research is complete.**  
- An appropriate range of relevant source(s) and/or method(s) have been applied in relation to the topic and research question.  
- There is evidence of effective and informed selection of sources and/or methods. |

**Criterion B: Knowledge and understanding**

This criterion assesses the extent to which the research relates to the subject area/discipline used to explore the research question, or in the case of the world studies extended essay, the issue addressed and the two disciplinary perspectives applied, and additionally the way in which this knowledge and understanding is demonstrated through the use of appropriate terminology and concepts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Descriptor of strands and indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The work does not reach a standard outlined by the descriptors below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Knowledge and understanding is limited.
- The selection of source material has limited relevance and is only partially appropriate to the research question.
- Knowledge of the topic/discipline(s)/issue is anecdotal, unstructured and mostly descriptive with sources not effectively being used.

Use of terminology and concepts is unclear and limited.
- Subject-specific terminology and/or concepts are either missing or inaccurate, demonstrating limited knowledge and understanding.

Knowledge and understanding is good.
- The selection of source material is mostly relevant and appropriate to the research question.
- Knowledge of the topic/discipline(s)/issue is clear; there is an understanding of the sources used but their application is only partially effective.

Use of terminology and concepts is adequate.
- The use of subject-specific terminology and concepts is mostly accurate, demonstrating an appropriate level of knowledge and understanding.

Knowledge and understanding is excellent.
- The selection of source materials is clearly relevant and appropriate to the research question.
- Knowledge of the topic/discipline(s)/issue is clear and coherent and sources are used effectively and with understanding.

Use of terminology and concepts is good.
- The use of subject-specific terminology and concepts is accurate and consistent, demonstrating effective knowledge and understanding.

Criterion C: Critical thinking
This criterion assesses the extent to which critical-thinking skills have been used to analyse and evaluate the research undertaken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Descriptor of strands and indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The work does not reach a standard outlined by the descriptors below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–3</td>
<td>The research is limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The research presented is limited and its application is not clearly relevant to the RQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis is limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is limited analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where there are conclusions to individual points of analysis these are limited and not consistent with the evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion/evaluation is limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An argument is outlined but this is limited, incomplete, descriptive or narrative in nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The construction of an argument is unclear and/or incoherent in structure hindering understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where there is a final conclusion, it is limited and not consistent with the arguments/evidence presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is an attempt to evaluate the research, but this is superficial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the topic or research question is deemed inappropriate for the subject in which the essay is registered no more than four marks can be awarded for this criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–6</td>
<td>The research is adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some research presented is appropriate and its application is partially relevant to the Research question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis is adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is analysis but this is only partially relevant to the research question; the inclusion of irrelevant research detracts from the quality of the argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any conclusions to individual points of analysis are only partially supported by the evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion/evaluation is adequate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An argument explains the research but the reasoning contains inconsistencies.
The argument may lack clarity and coherence but this does not significantly hinder understanding.
Where there is a final or summative conclusion, this is only partially consistent with the arguments/evidence presented.
The research has been evaluated but not critically.

7–9 The research is good.
- The majority of the research is appropriate and its application is clearly relevant to the research question.

Analysis is good.
- The research is analysed in a way that is clearly relevant to the research question; the inclusion of less relevant research rarely detracts from the quality of the overall analysis.
- Conclusions to individual points of analysis are supported by the evidence but there are some minor inconsistencies.

Discussion/evaluation is good.
- An effective reasoned argument is developed from the research, with a conclusion supported by the evidence presented.
- This reasoned argument is clearly structured and coherent and supported by a final or summative conclusion; minor inconsistencies may hinder the strength of the overall argument.
- The research has been evaluated, and this is partially critical.

10–12 The research is excellent.
- The research is appropriate to the research question and its application is consistently relevant.

Analysis is excellent.
- The research is analysed effectively and clearly focused on the research question; the inclusion of less relevant research does not significantly detract from the quality of the overall analysis.
- Conclusions to individual points of analysis are effectively supported by the evidence.

Discussion/evaluation is excellent.
- An effective and focused reasoned argument is developed from the research with a conclusion reflective of the evidence presented.
- This reasoned argument is well structured and coherent; any minor inconsistencies do not hinder the strength of the overall argument or the final or summative conclusion.
- The research has been critically evaluated.

Criterion D: Presentation
This criterion assesses the extent to which the presentation follows the standard format expected for academic writing and the extent to which this aids effective communication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Descriptor of strands and indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The work does not reach a standard outlined by the descriptors below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Presentation is acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The structure of the essay is generally appropriate in terms of the expected conventions for the topic, argument and subject in which the essay is registered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Some layout considerations may be missing or applied incorrectly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Weaknesses in the structure and/or layout do not significantly impact the reading, understanding or evaluation of the extended essay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Presentation is good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The structure of the essay clearly is appropriate in terms of the expected conventions for the topic, the argument and subject in which the essay is registered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Layout considerations are present and applied correctly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The structure and layout support the reading, understanding and evaluation of the extended essay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Criterion E: Engagement**

This criterion assesses the student’s engagement with their research focus and the research process. It will be applied by the examiner at the end of the assessment of the essay, and is based solely on the candidate’s reflections as detailed on the RPPF, with the supervisory comments and extended essay itself as context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Descriptor of strands and indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The work does not reach a standard outlined by the descriptors or a RPPF has not been submitted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1–2   | Engagement is limited.  
  - Reflections on decision-making and planning are mostly descriptive.  
  - These reflections communicate a limited degree of personal engagement with the research focus and/or research process. |
| 3–4   | Engagement is good.  
  - Reflections on decision-making and planning are analytical and include reference to conceptual understanding and skill development.  
  - These reflections communicate a moderate degree of personal engagement with the research focus and process of research, demonstrating some intellectual initiative. |
| 5–6   | Engagement is excellent.  
  - Reflections on decision-making and planning are evaluative and include reference to the student’s capacity to consider actions and ideas in response to challenges experienced in the research process.  
  - These reflections communicate a high degree of intellectual and personal engagement with the research focus and process of research, demonstrating authenticity, intellectual initiative and/or creative approach in the student voice. |

**Assessment grade descriptors for the extended essay**

**Effective May 2018**

**Grade descriptors**

The extended essay is externally assessed, and as such, supervisors are not expected to mark the essays or arrive at a number to translate into a grade. Predicted grades for all subjects should be based on the qualitative grade descriptors for the subject in question. These descriptors are what will be used by senior examiners to set the boundaries for the extended essay in May 2018, and so schools are advised to use them in the same way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Demonstrates effective research skills resulting in a well-focused and appropriate research question that can be explored within the scope of the chosen topic; effective engagement with relevant research areas, methods and sources; excellent knowledge and understanding of the topic in the wider context of the relevant discipline; the effective application of source material and correct use of subject-specific terminology and/or concepts further supporting this; consistent and relevant conclusions that are proficiently analysed; sustained reasoned argumentation supported effectively by evidence; critically evaluated research; excellent presentation of the essay, whereby coherence and consistency further supports the reading of the essay; and present and correctly applied structural and layout elements.  
**Engagement with the process is conceptual and personal, key decision-making during the research process is documented, and personal reflections are evidenced, including those that are forward-thinking.** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates appropriate research skills resulting in a research question that can be explored within the scope of the chosen topic; reasonably effective engagement with relevant research areas, methods and sources; good knowledge and understanding of the topic in the wider context of the relevant discipline; a reasonably effective application of source material and use of subject-specific terminology and/or concepts; consistent conclusions that are accurately analyzed; reasoned argumentation often supported by evidence; research that at times evidences critical evaluation; and a clear presentation of all structural and layout elements, which further supports the reading of the essay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Engagement with the process is generally evidenced by the reflections and key decision-making during the research process is documented.

### Grade C

Demonstrates evidence of research undertaken, which has led to a research question that is not necessarily expressed in a way that can be explored within the scope of the chosen topic; partially effective engagement with mostly appropriate research areas, methods and sources—however, there are some discrepancies in those processes, although these do not interfere with the planning and approach; some knowledge and understanding of the topic in the wider context of the discipline, which is mostly relevant; the attempted application of source material and appropriate terminology and/or concepts; an attempted synthesis of research results with partially relevant analysis; conclusions partly supported by the evidence; discussion that is descriptive rather than analytical; attempted evaluation; satisfactory presentation of the essay, with weaknesses that do not hinder the reading of the essay; and some structural and layout elements that are missing or are incorrectly applied.

Engagement with the process is evidenced but shows mostly factual information, with personal reflection mostly limited to procedural issues.

### Grade D

Demonstrates a lack of research, resulting in unsatisfactory focus and a research question that is not answerable within the scope of the chosen topic; at times engagement with appropriate research, methods and sources, but discrepancies in those processes that occasionally interfere with the planning and approach; some relevant knowledge and understanding of the topic in the wider context of the discipline, which are at times irrelevant; the attempted application of source material, but with inaccuracies in the use of, or underuse of, terminology and/or concepts; irrelevant analysis and inconsistent conclusions as a result of a descriptive discussion; a lack of evaluation; presentation of the essay at times is illogical and hinders the reading; and structural and layout elements that are missing.

Engagement with the process is evidenced but is superficial, with personal reflections that are solely narrative and concerned with procedural elements.

### Grade E (failing condition)

Demonstrates an unclear nature of the essay; a generally unsystematic approach and resulting unfocused research question; limited engagement with limited research and sources; generally limited and only partially accurate knowledge and understanding of the topic in the wider context of the relevant discipline; ineffective connections in the application of source material and inaccuracies in the terminology and/or concepts used; a summarizing of results of research with inconsistent analysis; an attempted outline of an argument, but one that is generally descriptive in nature; and a layout that generally lacks or incorrectly applies several layout and structural elements.

Engagement with the process is limited, with limited factual or decision-making information and no personal reflection on the process.