

Course Title	:	Social Policy Analysis: Global Comparative Perspectives
Course Code	:	SOC501
Recommended Study Year	:	Taught Master Year 1
No. of Credits/Term	:	3
Mode of Tuition	:	Lecture and Group Seminar
Class Contact Hours	:	3 hours per week
Category in Major Prog.	:	Master of Social Sciences in Comparative Social Policy (International)
Discipline	:	Sociology and Social Policy
Prerequisite(s)	:	N/A
Co-requisite(s)	:	N/A
Exclusion(s)	:	N/A
Exemption Requirement(s)	:	N/A

Brief Course Description

This course consists of a weekly lecture and tutorial (3hrs), which explore the field of ‘social policy analysis’ from a global comparative perspective. Social policy analysis can be broken down into several key areas: (1) ageing, families and the life course; (2) education, employment and life-long learning; (3) health, well-being and social care; (4) housing, spatial differentiation, and urban planning; (5) welfare regimes and governance; (6) digital transformation, data governance, and algorithmic welfare; (7) climate adaptation, environmental justice, and sustainability; (8) migration, mobility, and transnational social protection. The analysis of each of these key areas comprises three constituent elements dealing with distinct but related tiers of knowledge: the broad macro-level context (such as (de)globalisation, colonial legacies, international organisations, and divergent state transitions); the micro-level implementation level of policies (i.e. how policy is formulated and delivered by street-level bureaucrats, citizens, and communities across different institutional settings); and the meso-level dealing with structures and processes sitting between the macro- and micro-levels (e.g. post-colonial institutions, policy networks, and cross-national policy learning). A central aim of the course is to problematise the assumption that Western policy models are universally applicable and instead to understand how policies are created, translated, adapted, resisted, or hybridised in different world regions.

Aims

1. To introduce the key concepts, techniques and theories employed in the social policy and the policy process literature, while critically examining their origins and assumptions (including their frequent grounding in Western industrialised contexts);
2. To apply this knowledge to specific challenges and dilemmas facing social policy from a global and comparative perspective, with attention to low-, middle-, and high-income countries.
3. To develop students’ ability to compare social policy making processes across diverse political, economic, and cultural settings, moving beyond simple “best practice” transfer to context-sensitive analysis.

Learning Outcomes (LOs)

By the end of the course, students should be able to:

1. Be familiar with the key concepts and ideologies of social policy and critically evaluate their applicability across different world regions;
2. Understand the role of economic, political, historical (including colonial), and cultural factors shaping social policy in different countries;
3. Identify the complex issues surrounding the formation, implementation and evaluation of social policies in different world regions (e.g., East Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and Europe);

4. Appreciate the institutional and organisational contexts that shape the social policy process from a genuinely comparative perspective that includes non-Western state traditions (e.g., developmental states, post-colonial states, fragile states).
5. Demonstrate the ability to compare two or more countries or territories from different regions on a specific social policy domain, using appropriate global and comparative frameworks.

Indicative Contents

1. What is global comparative social policy analysis: De-centring the Western policy cycle
2. Comparative political economies: Varieties of capitalism, developmental states, and informal economies
3. Globalisation and post-industrial society: New social risks and the transformation of welfare
4. Decision-making and agenda setting: From rational models to the Multiple Streams Approach
5. Social protection vs. social investment: the global welfare regime debate
6. Governance beyond the state: Global governance (ILO, World Bank, WHO), non-state actors, and informal institutions
7. Institutions and institutional change I: Colonial legacies, post-socialist transitions, and path dependency
8. Institutions and institutional change II: Ideas, narratives, and institutional hybridity
9. Policy networks and epistemic communities: North-South power asymmetries in policy knowledge
10. Policy learning and lesson drawing: How governments learn from experience
11. Policy transfer and translation: Why social policies fail when moved across contexts
12. Implementation in diverse state capacities: Street-level bureaucracy, discretion, and the limits of the state
13. Policy evaluation across cultures: Whose criteria? Indigenous evaluation frameworks and participatory methods
14. Course conclusion: Synthesis, critique, and future directions for global comparative social policy

Teaching Method

One weekly lecture and tutorial (3hrs)

Assessment Weightings

Participation and Preparation (incl. One Reading Synthesis)	15%
Multiple Choice Quizzes	10%
Reflective Essay	15%
Group Case Presentation	20%
Research Essay	40%

Measurement of Learning Outcomes

Assessment	Weight	Description
Participation and Preparation (incl. One Reading Synthesis)	15%	Active engagement in class discussions, Q&A sessions, and tutorial tasks. Includes quality of comments, listening skills, and building on others' remarks. Reading synthesis (Weeks 1–6) accounts for 5% of this component.
Multiple Choice Quizzes	10%	4 quizzes (Weeks 2–10). 10 questions each. Lowest score dropped. Tests comprehension of previous week's lecture and readings.

Reflective Essay	15%	800 words. Reflects on students comparative learning journey in the first six weeks. What assumptions did the students bring into the course? How have they been challenged? What puzzles remain?
Group Case Presentation	20%	20 min + 10 min Q&A. Compares two countries from different world regions (or two time periods) on a social policy issue. Requires explicit comparative analysis and engagement with course frameworks. The course instructor reserves the right to raise or lower individual student's scores based on peer group evaluation.
Research Essay	40%	4,000 words. One of 6 AI-resistant questions requiring two-country comparison, engagement with decentring Western models, and use of required sources. Includes in-class handwritten essay plan submission.

Measurement of Learning Outcomes

<i>Assessment</i>	LO1: Be familiar with the key concepts and ideologies of social policy and critically evaluate their applicability across different world regions	LO2: Understand the role of economic, political, historical (including colonial), and cultural factors shaping social policy in different countries	LO3: Identify the complex issues surrounding the formation, implementation and evaluation of social policies in different world regions (e.g., East Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and Europe)	LO4: Appreciate the institutional and organisational contexts that shape the social policy process from a genuinely comparative perspective that includes non-Western state traditions (e.g., developmental states, post-colonial states, fragile states)	LO5: Demonstrate the ability to compare two or more countries or territories from different regions on a specific social policy domain, using appropriate global and comparative frameworks
<i>Participation and Preparation (15%)</i>	X	X	X	X	
<i>Multiple Choice Quizzes (10%)</i>	X	X	X	X	
<i>Reflective Essay (15%)</i>	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Group Case Presentation (20%)</i>	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Research Essay (40%)</i>	X	X	X	X	X

Core Readings

Barrientos, A., and others (eds), (2026) *The Oxford Handbook of Social Policies in the Global South*, (Oxford, 2026; online edn, Oxford Academic, 15 June 2026), <https://doi.org/10.1093/9780191992025.001.0001>.

Midgley, J., Surender, R., & Alfars, L. (Eds.). (2019). *Handbook of Social Policy and Development*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Onyango, G., & Jamil, I. (2025). *Routledge Handbook of Public Policy in the Global South*. Routledge.

Patel, L., Plagerson, S., & Chinyoka, I. (Eds.). (2023). *Handbook on Social Protection and Social Development in the Global South*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Onyango, G., & Jamil, I. (2025). *Routledge Handbook of Public Policy in the Global South*. Routledge.

Supplementary readings

Aspalter, C. (Ed.). (2023). *The Routledge International Handbook to Welfare State Systems: Towards Global Social Policy Science*. Taylor & Francis.

Brik, A. B. (Ed.). (2025). *Handbook of Public Policy Evaluation in the Global South: Politics, Praxes and Futures*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Brik, A. B. (Ed.). (2026). *The Oxford Handbook of Social Welfare in the Global South*. Oxford University Press.

Dolowitz, D. P., & Marsh, D. (2000). Learning from abroad: The role of policy transfer in contemporary policy-making. *Governance*, 13(1), 5-23.

Gough, I., & Wood, G. (2004). *Insecurity and Welfare Regimes in Asia, Africa and Latin America: Social Policy in Development Contexts*. Cambridge University Press.

Midgley, J. O. (1995). *Social Development: The Developmental Perspective in Social Welfare*.

Midgley, J., & Piachaud, D. (Eds.). (2011). *Colonialism and Welfare: Social Policy and the British Imperial Legacy*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Mumtaz, Z., Mokomane, Z., Sumarto, M., Velázquez Leyer, R., & Kühner, S. (2027). *Formal and Informal Social Protection in the Global South: The Co-Constitutive Welfare Regime*. Bristol: Bristol University Press.

Mumtaz, Z., & Kühner, S. (2025). Towards a theorization of the global community welfare regime: Depicting four ideal types of the community's role in welfare provision. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 35(2), 189-209.

Kwon, H. J. (2005). Transforming the developmental welfare state in East Asia. *Development and change*, 36(3), 477-497.

Leisering, L. (2021). *One Hundred Years of Social Protection: The Changing Social Question in Brazil, India, China, and South Africa*. Springer Nature.

Becker, B., & Ricart-Huguet, J. (2024). *Colonial Legacies of Social Policy*.

Schmitt, C. (2015). Social security development and the colonial legacy. *World Development*, 70, 332-342.

Stone, D. (2012). Transfer and translation of policy. *Policy studies*, 33(6), 483-499.

Surender, R., & Walker, R. (Eds.). (2013). *Social Policy in a Developing World*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice*. Sage Publications.

Yang, N., & Kühner, S. (2025). From Productivism to Post-Productivism: Unpacking the Socio-Economic Conditions for Welfare Development in Six East Asian Economies. *Political Studies*, 00323217251369291.

Important Notes

- Students are **expected to spend a total of 9 hours (i.e. 3 hours of class contact and 6 hours of personal study) per week** to achieve the course learning outcomes.
- Students shall be aware of the University regulations about dishonest practice in course work, tests and examinations, and the possible consequences as stipulated in the Regulations Governing University Examinations. In particular, plagiarism, being a kind of dishonest practice, is “the presentation of another person’s work without proper acknowledgement of the source, including exact phrases, or summarised ideas, or even footnotes/citations, whether protected by copyright or not, as the student’s own work”. Students are required to strictly follow university regulations governing academic integrity and honesty.
- Students are required to submit writing assignment(s) using Turnitin.
- To enhance students’ understanding of plagiarism, a mini-course “Online Tutorial on Plagiarism Awareness” is available on <https://pla.ln.edu.hk/>.

Marking rubric for Participation and Preparation:

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Excellent 5-4</i>	<i>Good 3</i>	<i>Pass 2</i>	<i>Failure 1</i>
Frequency of participation (40%)	Actively participates in class by asking questions and contributing to classroom discussions frequently.	Actively participates in class by asking questions and contributing to classroom discussions regularly.	Actively participates in class by asking questions and contributing to classroom discussions when prompted.	Not actively engaged in tutorial discussions and does not contribute to classroom discussions even when prompted.
Quality of comments (30%)	Comments always insightful and constructive; uses appropriate terminology. Comments balanced between general impressions, opinions, and specific, thoughtful criticisms or contributions. Actively connects comments to comparative and global perspectives from the course.	Comments mostly insightful and constructive; mostly uses appropriate terminology. Occasionally comments are too general or not relevant to the discussion.	Comments are sometimes constructive, with occasional signs of insight. Student does not use appropriate terminology; comments not always relevant to the discussion.	Comments are uninformative, lacking appropriate terminology. Heavy reliance on opinion and personal taste. No engagement with comparative dimensions of the discussion.
Listening skills (30%)	Student listens attentively when others present materials and perspectives, as indicated by comments that build on others' remarks. Student hears what others say and contributes to the dialogue.	Student is mostly attentive when others present ideas, as indicated by comments that reflect and build on others' remarks. Occasionally needs encouragement or reminder from instructor/TA of focus of comment.	Student is often inattentive and needs reminder of focus of class. Occasionally makes disruptive comments while others are speaking.	Does not listen to others; regularly talks while others speak or does not pay attention while others speak; detracts from discussion; sleeps, etc.

Marking rubric for Reading Synthesis

<i>Grade</i>	<i>Excellent 5-4</i>	<i>Good 3</i>	<i>Pass 2</i>	<i>Failure 1</i>
Summary clarity (25%)	Concise, accurate, and clearly highlights the key argument(s) of the reading(s). Identifies the author's central claims and supporting evidence.	Mostly accurate summary with some minor omissions. Key argument(s) are identifiable.	Vague or overly detailed; misses key points of the reading(s).	Inaccurate or incomprehensible summary. Shows clear misunderstanding of the reading(s).
Critical engagement (25%)	Goes beyond summary to offer thoughtful critique. Identifies assumptions, gaps, biases, or limitations in the reading(s). Engages meaningfully with the reading's comparative or global implications.	Some critical points, but mostly descriptive. Identifies at least one assumption or limitation.	Minimal critique; mostly restatement of the reading(s). Little evidence of independent thinking.	No critique; pure summary with no engagement with the reading's arguments or limitations.
Discussion questions (25%)	Poses 2–3 thoughtful, open-ended questions that link the reading(s) to comparative social policy and global contexts. Questions invite genuine debate and reflection.	Questions are relevant but basic or closed-ended. Limited connection to comparative/global dimensions.	Questions are vague, not clearly linked to the reading(s), or not clearly posed.	No questions, or questions are irrelevant, incomprehensible, or purely factual ("What is the author's name?").
Time management & delivery (25%)	Perfectly timed (8–10 minutes). Clear, audible, engaging delivery. All group members contribute meaningfully. Smooth transitions.	Slightly over/under time. Generally clear delivery. Most group members contribute.	Significant timing issues (too short or too long). Delivery is hard to follow or lacks energy.	Disorganised, inaudible, or abandoned. One group member does all the work.

Marking Rubric for Quiz Performance:

Grade Band	Percentage Correct	Description	Equivalent Score (out of 10)
Excellent	90–100%	Demonstrates excellent comprehension of course readings and lectures. Consistently accurate recall of key concepts, frameworks, and terminology. Shows ability to apply concepts to hypothetical scenarios.	9.0–10.0
Good	75–89%	Demonstrates good comprehension of course readings and lectures. Mostly accurate recall of key concepts. Some minor gaps in understanding.	7.5–8.9
Pass	60–74%	Demonstrates adequate comprehension of course readings and lectures. Recalls some key concepts but has noticeable gaps. May struggle with application questions.	6.0–7.4
Marginal Pass	50–59%	Demonstrates limited comprehension . Recalls basic concepts but struggles with detail or application. Significant gaps in understanding.	5.0–5.9
Failure	Below 50%	Demonstrates insufficient comprehension . Unable to recall key concepts or apply frameworks. Suggests lack of engagement with readings or lectures.	Below 5.0

Marking rubric for Reflective Essay:

Grade	Excellent 5-4	Good 3	Pass 2	Failure 1
Depth of self-reflection (30%)	Demonstrates exceptional self-awareness. Clearly articulates prior assumptions and explains how and why they have been challenged or changed. Identifies specific moments of learning (a reading, a discussion, a tutorial task). Shows intellectual humility and curiosity.	Demonstrates good self-awareness. Identifies prior assumptions and describes how they have been challenged. Mentions specific learning moments, though perhaps not in great detail.	Demonstrates some self-awareness. Identifies a change in thinking but does not fully explain why or how it occurred. Tends toward general statements rather than specific moments.	Demonstrates little or no self-awareness. Describes a policy or issue without reflecting on personal assumptions or learning. No evidence of intellectual growth or change.
Engagement with course concepts (30%)	Explicitly and insightfully engages with at least one course concept or framework (e.g., decentring, welfare regimes, path dependency, policy transfer, street-level bureaucracy, evaluation). Uses the concept to illuminate the reflective experience, not just name-drop it. Shows understanding of the concept's comparative or global implications.	Engages with at least one course concept. The concept is relevant, though the connection to the reflective experience could be deeper. Shows understanding of the concept.	Mentions a course concept but does not fully explain it or connect it meaningfully to the reflective experience. May be superficial or tangential.	Does not engage with any course concept. Or mentions a concept but demonstrates clear misunderstanding.
Critical awareness of assumptions (20%)	Explicitly names assumptions brought to the course (e.g., about how policy "should" work, about Western models being universal, about one's own country's policy superiority). Explains why those assumptions existed and how they were disrupted.	Identifies assumptions but may not fully explore their origins or why they were held. Describes disruption but in general terms.	Acknowledges that assumptions existed but does not name them specifically or explain their origin. Disruption is mentioned but not explored.	No evidence of critical awareness of assumptions. Treats policy analysis as neutral and unproblematic.
Clarity and structure (10%)	Exceptionally clear and well-organised. Logical flow from introduction to conclusion. Each paragraph has a clear purpose. Uses reflective voice effectively (first-person) without being informal or self-indulgent.	Clear and organised. Most paragraphs have a clear purpose. Minor issues with flow or coherence.	Generally clear but some organisational issues. May wander or repeat points.	Disorganised, difficult to follow, or rambling. No clear structure.
Writing and referencing (10%)	Demonstrates excellent writing skills. Concise, precise language. Few or no grammatical errors. Referencing is thorough and correct (APA/Harvard).	Competent writing skills. Some minor grammatical errors or stylistic issues. Referencing is mostly correct.	Writing is adequate but has noticeable errors. Referencing is inconsistent or incomplete.	Writing is poor, with frequent grammatical errors. Referencing is absent or completely incorrect.

Marking rubric for Group Case Presentation:

Grade	Excellent 4	Good 3	Pass 2	Failure 1
Structure of presentation (15%)	Consistently clear, concise, and well organised. Points were easy to follow. Transitions between sections smooth and coordinated. Logical flow from introduction to comparison to conclusion.	Usually clear, concise, and well organised. Most of the presentation was easy to follow. Transitions between sections usually coordinated.	Not always clear or concise. Organisation was adequate but weak. Occasionally wandered and was sometimes difficult to follow. Transitions between sections weak.	Often unclear and disorganised; rambled too much. The presentation was confusing and difficult to follow. Transitions between sections awkward. No discernible structure.
Substantive content (25%)	Displayed an excellent grasp of the material. Key points supported with evidence critically evaluated. Demonstrates clear understanding of the chosen framework(s) from the course. Data and evidence are analysed thoroughly and linked to the literature. Explicitly engages with the decentring agenda (e.g., questions assumptions about Western models).	Displayed a general grasp of the material. Most points illustrated with relevant evidence. Demonstrates understanding of chosen framework(s). Data analysed in detail with good links to the literature. Some engagement with comparative/global dimensions.	Displayed some grasp of the material. Use of evidence acceptable, but with common flaws (e.g., overly complex or crowded content). Framework(s) mentioned but not deeply applied. Limited engagement with comparative or global dimensions.	Little-to-no linkage between evidence and the wider narrative and literature. No clear framework applied. No engagement with comparative or global dimensions. Inappropriate measures or styles adopted.
Comparative analysis (20%)	Excellent comparative design. Case selection is clearly justified and appropriate. Comparison is systematic (not just side-by-side description). Draws explicit, insightful conclusions about what the comparison reveals that a single-country study would miss. Identifies similarities and differences with clear analytical weight.	Good comparative design. Case selection is justified. Comparison is mostly systematic, though some points are descriptive rather than analytical. Draws some conclusions about the value of comparison.	Adequate comparative design. Case selection is acceptable but not fully justified. Comparison is mostly descriptive. Conclusions about comparison are weak or implicit.	Poor or absent comparative design. No clear justification for case selection. Comparison is absent or purely descriptive. No conclusions about the value of comparison.
Visual aids including charts (15%)	Simple, clear, easy to interpret, and easy to read. Well coordinated with content, well designed, used very effectively. Excellent example of how to prepare and use good visual aids. Charts and data visualisations are analysed and interpreted, not just shown.	Variable quality. Most charts are clear and support the narrative. Generally well coordinated with content. Generally used effectively. Some charts could be better designed or more clearly analysed.	Usually clear, easy to interpret, and easy to read. Generally well coordinated with content, design was okay, generally used effectively. Demonstrated generally reasonable understanding of how to use visual aids. Some charts are too complex or not clearly explained.	Poor quality visual aids, hard to read, technically inaccurate, poorly constructed. Poor coordination with content. Used poorly. The presenters did not seem to know how to prepare or use visual aids effectively. Charts are not analysed – just shown.

Time management (10%)	Perfectly timed; delivery of material very well paced. Each section given appropriate time. Q&A handled within allocated time.	Well organised; more or less to time and with delivery of material in the main well-paced. Slightly rushed or slow in minor sections.	Delivery of material rushed and/or ran out of time before covering all parts of presentation. Or significantly under time, leaving gaps.	Significantly under time or significantly over time. Disorganised delivery. Q&A cut short or non-existent.
Audience engagement (10%)	Excellent stage presence. Confident, used notes well, at ease, excellent gestures, good audience attention, good eye contact. Handled Q&A with confidence and clarity.	Good stage presence. Fairly confident, used notes fairly well, good gestures, acceptable audience attention and eye contact. Handled Q&A competently.	Adequate stage presence. Read parts, fumbled with notes, several distracting mannerisms, minimal gestures, minimal eye contact, too many 'ums'. Q&A handled adequately but with some uncertainty.	Poor stage presence. Unprepared, awkward, shuffled papers, poor eye contact, lots of 'ums', turned from audience to read overheads, shuffled feet, fidgeted. Poor gestures. Q&A mishandled or defensive.
Use of AI Declaration & Academic Integrity (5%)	Full and correct AI declaration provided on the title slide and in the submitted slide deck. All AI-generated content (text, images, data visualisations) clearly attributed. Prompts used with AI clearly listed. Compliance with university GAI guidelines.	Adequate AI declaration provided. Most AI-generated content attributed, though some minor omissions. Generally compliant with university guidelines.	Partial or unclear AI declaration. Some AI-generated content not attributed. Declaration is vague or incomplete. May indicate lack of understanding of university GAI guidelines.	No AI declaration provided, or declaration is clearly false/incomplete. AI-generated content presented as original work. Violation of academic integrity. May result in a zero for the assignment and referral to university disciplinary procedures.

Marking rubric for research essay:

Criteria	Excellent (A/A-) 80-100	Good (B+/B/B-) 65-79	Pass (C+/C/C-) 50-64	Failure (F) 49-0
Understanding of topic (15%)	Comprehensive understanding and coverage of issues. Insightful and well-informed. Clearly answers the question in all its parts. Demonstrates sophisticated grasp of the chosen framework(s). Engages with nuances and complexities.	Clear discussion of relevant issues. Shows good insight into the subject. Answers the question, though perhaps not all parts equally well. Demonstrates solid understanding of chosen framework(s).	Shows some coverage and understanding of main issues. Does not answer the question fully or directly enough. Demonstrates basic understanding of chosen framework(s) but with some gaps.	Superficial coverage and significant misunderstanding of the issues. Does not answer the question. Demonstrates little or no understanding of chosen framework(s).
Use of evidence (20%)	Wide range of evidence used to support arguments. Thoroughly researched. Uses all required sources effectively. Self-sourced evidence (policy documents, evaluation reports, academic case studies) is relevant, recent (where appropriate), and well-integrated. Demonstrates ability to find and evaluate sources independently.	Good use of evidence to support arguments. Uses most required sources. Self-sourced evidence is relevant and generally well-integrated. Some minor gaps in range or quality.	Adequate range of evidence used. Could have drawn on more suitable evidence. Uses some required sources but not all. Self-sourced evidence is limited or not fully relevant.	Relies on limited range of sources. Has not been thoroughly researched. Required sources are missing or misused. Self-sourced evidence is absent, irrelevant, or of poor quality.
Comparative analysis & decentring (20%)	Excellent comparative analysis. Case selection is clearly justified and appropriate. Comparison is systematic and analytical. Draws explicit, insightful conclusions about what the comparison reveals that a single-country study would miss. Deep engagement with the decentring agenda: questions assumptions about Western models, acknowledges where frameworks originated, and discusses adaptation or critique.	Good comparative analysis. Case selection is justified. Comparison is mostly systematic, though some points are descriptive rather than analytical. Draws some conclusions about the value of comparison. Shows engagement with the decentring agenda: acknowledges the need to adapt Western models, though perhaps without full critical depth.	Adequate comparative analysis. Case selection is acceptable but not fully justified. Comparison is mostly descriptive. Conclusions about comparison are weak or implicit. Limited engagement with decentring: mentions the issue but does not fully interrogate assumptions or discuss adaptation.	Poor or absent comparative analysis. No clear justification for case selection. Comparison is absent or purely descriptive. No conclusions about the value of comparison. No engagement with decentring: assumes Western models are universal or does not address the issue.
Critical analysis (20%)	Excellent critical awareness of subject matter and current issues. Shows original thinking and analysis. Goes significantly beyond description.	Goes beyond description. Analyses material to develop argument. Shows critical awareness, though some points remain descriptive.	More description than analysis. Needs to draw material together to develop argument. Critical awareness is	Too descriptive. Fails to develop an argument. No critical awareness; merely summarises sources. No evaluation of

	Evaluates evidence, identifies assumptions, and considers counter-arguments. Develops a nuanced, well-supported position.	Considers some counter-arguments but may not fully address them.	limited; tends to accept sources at face value. Counter-arguments are absent or weak.	evidence or assumptions.
Structure of argument (15%)	Clear structure. Presents a convincing and well-developed argument. Logical flow from introduction to conclusion. Each paragraph has a clear purpose and contributes to the overall argument. Introduction sets up the argument; conclusion synthesises and reflects.	Clear structure. Develops a sound argument. Most paragraphs contribute to the overall argument. Some minor issues with flow or transitions. Introduction and conclusion are present and functional.	Argument needs further development. Structure needs more clarity. Some paragraphs wander or do not clearly contribute to the argument. Introduction or conclusion may be weak.	Arguments not clear. Structure is not clear. Some repetition. Little clear linkage from point to point. No clear introduction or conclusion.
Writing and referencing (10%)	Thorough referencing throughout. Uses references correctly (APA/Harvard). Demonstrates excellent writing skills: concise, precise, appropriate academic tone. Few or no grammatical errors. Adheres to word limit.	Generally uses references correctly but some parts less well referenced. Competent writing skills. Some minor grammatical or stylistic issues. Adheres to word limit.	Some parts not referenced correctly. Writing skills could be improved. Noticeable grammatical or stylistic errors. May be slightly over or under word limit.	Referencing is inconsistent or absent. Writing skills need considerable improvement. Frequent grammatical errors. Sentence structure needs work. Needed proof reading. Significantly over or under word limit.
Use of AI Declaration & Academic Integrity (5%)	Full and correct AI declaration provided on the title page and in the appendix. All AI-generated content (text, ideas, structure) clearly attributed. Full list of prompts used with AI included in an appendix. All AI-generated content has been reviewed, verified, and adapted by the student. Compliance with university GAI guidelines.	Adequate AI declaration provided. Most AI-generated content attributed, though some minor omissions. List of prompts provided but may be incomplete. Generally compliant with university guidelines.	Partial or unclear AI declaration. Some AI-generated content not attributed. Declaration is vague or incomplete. List of prompts is absent or insufficient. May indicate lack of understanding of university GAI guidelines.	No AI declaration provided, or declaration is clearly false/incomplete. AI-generated content presented as original work. Violation of academic integrity. May result in a zero for the assignment and referral to university disciplinary procedures.