

Module: Politics of Human Rights

Assessment 2: Human Rights Case Study.

	Weighting	100-80%	79-70%	69-60%	59-50%	49-40%	39-30%	29-0%
		The work produced is exceptional in most/all aspects, substantially exceeding expectations for this level	The work produced is of excellent quality, exceeding expectations for this level in many aspects.	The work produced meets all of the intended learning outcomes and exceeds the threshold expectations for this level in several of them	The work produced meets all of the intended learning outcomes and exceeds the threshold expectations for this level in some of them.	The work produced meets all of the intended learning outcomes at, but rarely exceeding the threshold expectations for this level.	The work produced fails to meet all of the intended learning outcomes and is marginally inadequate for this level.	The work produced fails to meet all of the intended learning outcomes and is inadequate for this level.
<p>Knowledge and Understanding of the Subject</p> <p>Demonstrated ability to operate and apply the theoretical knowledge to a particular case study: student is able to provide an exhaustive factual data regarding human rights situation based ratified human rights treaties as well as reports of international and regional human rights bodies, and civil society.</p>	40%	<p>Highly detailed knowledge and data regarding human rights situation in a given country.</p> <p>Demonstrates exemplary exploration and highly developed critical understanding within specialised human rights area, with an exceptional critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights at the forefront of the human rights field.</p> <p>Exemplary knowledge and understanding of the relevant literature and the main debates in the field.</p>	<p>Detailed knowledge and data regarding human rights situation in a given country.</p> <p>Demonstrates exceptional mastery of a complex and specialised area of knowledge and skills, with an exceptional critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights at the forefront of the human rights field.</p> <p>Detailed knowledge and understanding of the relevant literature and the main debates in the field.</p>	<p>Good, consistent knowledge and data regarding human rights situation in a given country.</p> <p>Demonstrates a systematic knowledge, understanding and critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of the academic human rights discipline, field of human rights study or area of human rights professional practice.</p> <p>Good, consistent knowledge and understanding of the relevant literature and the main debates in the field.</p>	<p>Sound, routine knowledge and data regarding human rights situation in a given country.</p> <p>Demonstrates a sound knowledge and understanding of material within a specialised human rights field.</p> <p>Demonstrates an understanding of current theoretical and methodological approaches and how these affect the way the knowledge base is interpreted.</p>	<p>Broadly accurate knowledge and data regarding human rights situation in a given country.</p> <p>Demonstrates knowledge of the human rights field and awareness of current evidence and issues, but with some notable weaknesses.</p> <p>Broadly accurate knowledge and understanding of the relevant literature and the main debates in the field.</p>	<p>Gaps in knowledge and data regarding human rights situation in a given country.</p> <p>Demonstrates significant weaknesses in the knowledge base, and/or simply reproduces knowledge without evidence of understanding of the human rights field.</p> <p>Gaps in knowledge and superficial understanding of the relevant literature and the main debates in the human rights field.</p>	<p>Major gaps in knowledge and data regarding human rights situation in a given country.</p> <p>Demonstrates no knowledge or understanding in the human rights field.</p> <p>Major gaps in knowledge and understanding of the relevant human rights literature and the main human rights debates in the field.</p>
<p>Cognitive Skills</p> <p>Demonstrated ability to analyse human rights situation taking into consideration political and economic variables as well as cultural relativism. Critical analysis of the possible role of international and regional human rights institutions as well as civil society.</p>	40%	<p>Excellent analysis of the human rights situation and of possible role of international and regional human rights institutions as well as civil society.</p> <p>Excellent and explicit acknowledgement of limitations of human rights institutions and of the debate regarding human rights universal application and enforcement. Excellent analysis of the human rights foreign policy/ies the country implements and/or is exposed to.</p> <p>Shows exceptional critical judgment in analysis.</p> <p>Exceptional communication of excellent arguments, evidence and conclusions to specialist audiences.</p>	<p>Thorough analysis of the human rights situation and of possible role of international and regional human rights institutions as well as civil society.</p> <p>Explicit acknowledgement of limitations of human rights institutions and the debate regarding human rights universal application and enforcement. In-depth analysis of the human rights foreign policy/ies the country implements and/or is exposed to.</p>	<p>Good analysis of the human rights situation and of possible role of international and regional human rights institutions as well as civil society.</p> <p>Acknowledgement of limitations of human rights institutions and the debate regarding human rights universal application and enforcement. Analysis of the human rights foreign policy/ies the country implements and/or is exposed to.</p> <p>Is able to evaluate methodologies critically and, where appropriate,</p>	<p>Some analysis of the human rights situation.</p> <p>Some analysis of the possible role of international and regional human rights institutions as well as civil society.</p> <p>Provides evidence of relevant and sound analysis within the specialised area, with some ability to evaluate critically. Is able to analyse complex issues and make appropriate judgments</p> <p>Able to communicate argument, evidence and conclusions clearly</p>	<p>Little analysis of the human rights situation and the role of human rights institutions and civil society.</p> <p>Some appropriate analysis, but some significant inconsistencies which affect the soundness of argument and/or conclusions. Demonstrates very limited critical ability</p> <p>Argument is attempted and relevant but lacks in clarity and/or logic.</p>	<p>Analysis of the human rights situation and the role of human rights institutions is largely missing.</p> <p>Very little or no critical ability. Poor, inconsistent analysis</p> <p>Argument is irrelevant to the subject and lacks any clarity and/or logic</p> <p>Almost absence of examples or evidence to</p>	<p>Lacks analysis of human rights situation in a given country. Lack of analysis of the role of international and regional human rights institutions as well as civil society.</p> <p>No critical ability. Absence of analysis.</p> <p>Argument is absent.</p> <p>No use of examples or</p>

		<p>Exceptional use of directly relevant examples for human rights concepts and ideas covered throughout the module. Explicit and critical acknowledgement of discussion around human rights concepts. Ideas exceptionally well-articulated, and logically developed with a range of evidence.</p>	<p>Shows outstanding ability to evaluate methodologies critically and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses. Is able to deal with a range of complex issues both systematically and creatively, making excellent judgments in the absence of complete data.</p> <p>Able to communicate at a very high-level arguments, evidence and conclusions to specialist audiences.</p> <p>Very good use of relevant examples for human rights concepts and ideas covered throughout the module. Explicit acknowledgement of discussion around concepts. Ideas well-articulated, and logically developed with a range of evidence.</p>	<p>to propose new hypotheses. Is able to deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, making sound judgments in the absence of complete data</p> <p>Able to communicate very effectively arguments, evidence and conclusions to specialist audiences.</p> <p>Good examples identified for human rights concepts, and ideas covered throughout the module. Acknowledgement of discussion between concepts and ideas generally logically structured, coherently expressed, well organised and supported.</p>	<p>to specialist and non-specialist audiences.</p> <p>Examples identified for different human rights ideas and concepts. An emerging awareness of different stances and ability to use evidence to support a coherent explanation. Broadly valid structure and logic reasoning. The examples used are overall appropriate and relevant.</p>	<p>Some examples used to explain the human rights ideas and concepts. Sense of structure emerging though not completely coherent. Some evidence to support views, but not always consistent. Some relevant structure and logic.</p>	<p>apply the knowledge. Views/ findings sometimes illogical or contradictory. Generalisations/ statements made with scant evidence. Structure of ideas and logic is not appropriate and the examples used are neither relevant nor valid.</p>	<p>evidence to apply the knowledge. Only personal views offered. Unsubstantiated generalizations. Little or no attempt to structure ideas in a logical manner.</p>
<p>Practical and Professional Skills Competence in practical assessment of human rights instruments applicable to a given case study.</p>	10%	<p>Explores and evaluates information/ideas from a wide range of sources (may include primary sources). Range of information is of extreme relevance.</p> <p>Accurately recounts a wide range of factual information, with many indications of greater breadth and depth of knowledge, beyond expectations for this level.</p>	<p>Explores and deploys information from a wide range of mostly secondary sources. Range of information is of great relevance.</p> <p>Accurately recounts a wide range of factual information with several indications of greater breadth and some depth of knowledge;</p>	<p>Locates a wide range of information/evidence. Range of information is of wide relevance.</p> <p>Accurately recounts a range of factual information, with occasional indications of greater breadth of knowledge;</p>	<p>Locates a satisfactory range of information/evidence, some of it beyond the given/familiar. Range of information is of satisfactory relevance.</p> <p>Satisfactory range of factual information accurately recounted.</p>	<p>Locates an acceptable range of information/evidence mostly from given/familiar secondary sources. Range of information is of acceptable relevance.</p> <p>Acceptable range of factual information largely accurately recounted;</p>	<p>Range of information limited to the familiar/given sources. Range of information is of limited relevance.</p> <p>Recounts a limited range of factual information with some inaccuracies/omissions;</p>	<p>Range of information is inadequate. Range of information is irrelevant.</p> <p>Substantial inaccuracies/omissions in factual information</p>
<p>Transferrable and Key Skills The Human Rights case study presents minimal grammatical errors and uses a good writing style. Ideas are communicated in written form at a very high level to specialist audiences. Moreover, the references reflect adequate reading and</p>	10%	<p>Sentence structure and fluency outstanding and demonstrates sophisticated command of lexis, syntax and register, written in idiomatic language. Tone corresponds to original text. Consistent and accurate referencing and citations. Harvard referencing style accurately and consistently followed with no errors.</p>	<p>Overall impression is of accuracy and complex sentences used regularly and successfully. Fluency very good and broad range of vocabulary used to very good effect. Tone corresponds to original text. Consistent and accurate referencing and citations. Harvard referencing style</p>	<p>Overall impression is of accuracy. Sentence structure and fluency good and generally able to use appropriate vocabulary, though there may be a few gaps in knowledge or in understanding of usage. Consistent and accurate referencing and citations. Harvard referencing style accurately and</p>	<p>Sentence structure and fluency reasonable and adequate to convey the sense. Some errors but rarely interfering with communication: not very successful attempts to use complex structures and appropriate connectors and/or predominant use of simple structures. Evidence of consistent and largely accurate</p>	<p>Sentence structure and fluency poor and clumsy on occasions. The literal sense of the original passage is conveyed to some degree, but lexical and syntactical problems impede fluency to a noticeable extent. Evidence of referencing and citations. Harvard referencing style not consistently followed.</p>	<p>Inappropriate syntax, lexis or register may turn reading into a very difficult task. Some relevant vocabulary is present but shows inability to handle relatively common structures and vocabulary. Some citation evident but referencing style inaccurate and inconsistent.</p> <p>No evidence of extended</p>	<p>Incomprehensible or significantly incomplete. Demonstrates inability to produce basic grammatical structures and vocabulary in context. No evidence of referencing.</p> <p>No evidence of extended reading. Substantial errors in referencing, or none.</p>

<p>research from reliable human rights academic sources. Quality of referencing (academic journals, academic books), consistency of referencing, i.e. Harvard style.</p>			<p>accurately and consistently followed. Significant evidence of extended reading. Extensive, accurate referencing/citation.</p>	<p>consistently followed. Some evidence of extended reading. Referencing consistent and accurate.</p>	<p>referencing and citations. Harvard referencing style followed with some errors. Limited evidence of extended reading. Referencing mostly consistent/accurate.</p>	<p>Little evidence of extended reading. Some errors in referencing.</p>	<p>reading. Errors/omissions in referencing, or none.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	---	---	---	--