

Assessment Rubrics

These rubrics support both formative and summative assessment of student engagement with the Simulating Silence learning resource. They are designed to be adapted to your institutional context — adjust weighting, grade boundaries, and descriptors as appropriate. All rubrics assess critical analytical skills rather than recall of factual content.

Rubric 1: Worksheet Completion (Formative)

For use with Worksheets 1–8. Assess each submission holistically using the descriptors below.

Criterion	Excellent	Good	Developing	Insufficient
Engagement with evidence	Identifies specific sources; analyses provenance, claims, and absences systematically	Engages with sources but analysis is uneven; some elements underdeveloped	Describes sources without systematic analysis; limited attention to absences	Superficial engagement; does not go beyond summarising content
Critical thinking	Identifies tensions, contradictions, and unstated assumptions; asks generative questions	Shows awareness of complexity; some critical observations but not fully developed	Accepts sources at face value; limited questioning of framing or institutional context	No evidence of critical engagement with the material
Application of frameworks	Applies module concepts accurately and productively (e.g., AHD, soft gatekeeping, interpretive accountability)	References relevant concepts but application is partial or imprecise	Mentions concepts without applying them to the specific case	Does not engage with analytical frameworks from the modules
Reflection quality	Reflection is substantive, personal, and connects to broader questions about heritage governance	Reflection shows genuine engagement but remains general	Reflection is brief or formulaic	No meaningful reflection

Rubric 2: Research Essay (2,500–3,000 words)

Analysis of a contested heritage case using frameworks from the resource.

Criterion (Weight)	Distinction (70%+)	Merit (60-69%)	Pass (50-59%)	Fail (<50%)
Argument and thesis (25%)	Clear, original thesis sustained throughout; argument is well-structured and persuasive	Identifiable thesis with generally coherent argument; some structural weaknesses	Thesis present but underdeveloped; argument lacks coherence in places	No clear thesis; descriptive rather than analytical
Use of evidence (25%)	Evidence is specific, well-selected, and critically evaluated; sources are analysed not just cited	Good range of evidence; most sources are critically engaged	Some relevant evidence but analysis is thin; over-reliance on secondary sources	Little or no engagement with primary evidence; claims unsupported
Application of frameworks (20%)	Concepts from the resource (AHD, soft gatekeeping, interpretive accountability, etc.) are applied precisely and productively	Relevant frameworks are identified and applied, though not always with precision	Frameworks mentioned but not effectively applied to the specific case	No engagement with analytical frameworks
Comparative dimension (15%)	Effective comparison that illuminates both the chosen case and the Hashima case; identifies transferable patterns	Some comparative analysis but connections are underdeveloped	Limited comparison; mostly parallel description rather than analytical comparison	No meaningful comparative element

Criterion (Weight)	Distinction (70%+)	Merit (60-69%)	Pass (50-59%)	Fail (<50%)
Writing quality (15%)	Clear, precise academic prose; well-structured paragraphs; appropriate referencing throughout	Generally well-written with minor issues; referencing mostly consistent	Acceptable writing with some clarity or structural problems; inconsistent referencing	Poor writing quality that impedes comprehension; inadequate referencing

Rubric 3: Source Portfolio

Annotated collection of 5-6 primary sources with analytical commentary.

Criterion (Weight)	Distinction	Merit	Pass	Fail
Source selection (20%)	Sources are diverse, well-chosen, and represent genuinely different perspectives; selection itself constitutes an argument	Good range of sources with clear rationale for selection	Adequate sources but limited diversity; rationale unclear	Sources are poorly chosen, repetitive, or insufficient in number
Individual annotations (30%)	Each annotation identifies provenance, analyses claims and absences, and evaluates evidentiary value with precision	Annotations address key questions but depth is uneven across the portfolio	Annotations are primarily descriptive; limited analytical engagement	Annotations are superficial or missing key analytical elements
Connecting commentary (25%)	Commentary synthesises across sources, identifies patterns and contradictions, and builds a coherent analytical narrative	Commentary makes connections between sources but synthesis is partial	Some connections attempted but commentary is fragmented	No meaningful synthesis across sources
Critical reflection (15%)	Reflection addresses what the portfolio reveals about evidence, narrative, and heritage governance; raises productive questions	Reflection shows genuine engagement with broader questions	Reflection is present but generic or formulaic	No substantive reflection
Presentation (10%)	Professional presentation; sources properly attributed; clear organisation	Well-presented with minor issues	Acceptable presentation; some attribution gaps	Poor presentation; significant attribution problems

Rubric 4: Comparative Analysis (2,000 words)

Comparison of heritage governance approaches across two national contexts.

Criterion (Weight)	Distinction	Merit	Pass	Fail
Comparative framework (25%)	Comparison is structured around clear analytical categories; moves beyond description to identify structural similarities and differences	Identifiable comparative structure; some categories well-developed, others less so	Comparison attempted but reads as two parallel descriptions; limited integration	No genuine comparison; separate summaries without analytical connection
Contextual understanding (25%)	Demonstrates nuanced understanding of both national contexts; explains how domestic politics shape heritage governance	Good understanding of both contexts with some nuance	Adequate understanding of one context; the other is underdeveloped	Superficial or inaccurate understanding of the national contexts
Evidence and sources (25%)	Draws on specific evidence from both contexts; engages with primary sources and scholarly analysis	Uses appropriate evidence from both contexts; some analytical engagement	Some relevant evidence but over-reliance on general descriptions	Little or no specific evidence; claims unsupported

Criterion (Weight)	Distinction	Merit	Pass	Fail
Analytical depth (25%)	Analysis identifies transferable patterns, structural dynamics, and productive tensions; draws out implications for heritage governance more broadly	Good analytical observations; some implications drawn but not fully developed	Some analytical content but largely descriptive; limited engagement with broader implications	Descriptive only; no analytical depth

Rubric 5: Digital Heritage Critique

Systematic analysis of a digital heritage project using the Module 05–06 framework.

Criterion (Weight)	Distinction	Merit	Pass	Fail
Systematic application of framework (30%)	All four dimensions (access/perspective, authenticity, mechanics/claims, institutional context) are addressed thoroughly and productively	Framework applied to most dimensions; some sections stronger than others	Framework referenced but application is uneven or superficial	No systematic engagement with the analytical framework
Critical analysis of design choices (25%)	Identifies how specific design decisions make historiographical claims; analyses what mechanics include and exclude	Good awareness of design as interpretation; some specific observations	Describes features without connecting them to interpretive claims	No critical engagement with design choices
Contextual awareness (20%)	Situates the project within its institutional, political, and technological context; understands how these contexts shape interpretation	Some contextual analysis but not fully integrated into the critique	Limited contextual awareness; project analysed in isolation	No attention to institutional or political context
Constructive dimension (15%)	Proposes specific, well-reasoned modifications that would address identified gaps; modifications reflect historiographical understanding	Some constructive suggestions; proposals are reasonable but not fully developed	Brief or vague suggestions for improvement	No constructive dimension
Writing and presentation (10%)	Clear, well-organised, professionally presented	Generally well-written with minor issues	Acceptable with some clarity problems	Poor writing quality

NOTE FOR TEACHERS

These rubrics are designed to be adapted. Adjust grade descriptors to match your institution's marking conventions. The weighting suggestions reflect the learning outcomes of the Simulating Silence resource but should be modified to align with your course's specific objectives. For guidance on integrating these assessments into different teaching contexts, see the Teaching Pathways section of the website.