



MARKING CRITERIA

| | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Document Title | Marking Criteria |
| Approved by | Management Committee |
| Date Approved | 21/08/23 |
| Last Reviewed | New Document |
| Next Review Due | May 2024 |
| Staff Member Responsible | Director of Training |
| Related Policies | Assessment Policy and Procedure |

Amendment History

| Revision Summary | Date Approved | Author |
|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

UNDERGRADUATE MARKING CRITERIA

The criteria offer descriptions of standards of achievement relating to four types of learning outcome, and four separate charts of these appear below:

- Knowledge and understanding
- Cognitive skills
- Practical or professional skills
- Communication skills.

There are various descriptors under these headings, describing different aspects of understanding or skill. Assessors use the ones that apply to the particular outcomes you should demonstrate: if the learning outcomes of your module do not require (for example) practical skills, then those criteria do not apply.

HONOURS DEGREES

| Honours Degrees | 1st | 2.1 | 2.2 | 3rd | Fail |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Distinction | Merit | Pass | Pass | Fail |
| Knowledge and understanding | Excellent command of highly relevant, extensively-researched material; very sound understanding of complexities. | Clear, sound understanding of subject matter; breadth and depth of material, accurate and relevant. | Basic knowledge sound but may be patchy; reasonable range of source material. | Limited consistency of depth and accuracy of detail; background material relevant but over-reliant on few sources. | Content may be thin or irrelevant; scant evidence of background investigation. |
| Cognitive skills | Convincing ability to synthesise a range of views or information and integrate references sophisticated perception, critical insight & interpretation; logical, cogent development of argument. | Ability to synthesise a range of views or information and incorporate references; perceptive, thoughtful interpretation; well- reasoned discussion; coherent argument. | Evidence of drawing information together; ideas tend to be stated rather than developed; attempt made to argue logically with supporting evidence, although some claims may be unsubstantiated. | Limited perspective or consideration of alternative views largely descriptive; some ability to construct an argument but may lack clarity or conviction, with unsupported assertion. | Superficial use of information; explanations may be muddled at times; poorly structured, little logic; may have unsubstantiated conclusions based on generalisation. |
| Practical or professional skills | Expert demonstration and accomplished and innovative application of specialist skills; very high level of professional competence. | Good performance; capable and confident application of specialist skills; substantial level of professional competence. | Mostly competent and informed application of specialist skills; sound level of professional competence. | Sufficient evidence of developing specialist skills; satisfactory level of professional competence. | Little evidence of skill development or application; questionable level of professional competence. |
| Communication skills | Very clear, fluent, sophisticated and confident expression; highly effective vocabulary and style; near perfect spelling, punctuation and syntax. | Clear, fluent, confident expression; appropriate vocabulary and style; high standard of accuracy in spelling, punctuation and syntax. | Clearly written, coherent expression; reasonable range of vocabulary and adequate style; overall competence in spelling, punctuation and syntax. | Expression, vocabulary and style reasonably clear but lack sophistication; inaccuracies in spelling, syntax and punctuation do not usually interfere with meaning. | Expression of ideas insufficient to convey clear meaning; inaccurate or unprofessional terminology; many errors in spelling, punctuation and syntax. |

KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING

| | Range and relevance of reading and research | Breadth and depth of knowledge | Understanding of subject matter and theory | Textual studies | Contextual studies |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 90-100 (First class) | Far-reaching investigation and insight | Develops new knowledge or novel perspective going beyond the literature | Work produced could hardly be bettered when produced under parallel conditions | Outstanding engagement with text | Outstanding understanding of artistic or critical context |
| 80-89 (First class) | Comprehensive research and coverage of topic integrating wide range of academic sources | Extensive subject knowledge with detailed insight into and understanding of relevant theory | Sophisticated understanding of complexities of key theoretical models, concepts and arguments | Sophisticated engagement with text | Sophisticated understanding of artistic or critical context |
| 70-79 (First class) | Excellent command of highly relevant, extensively- researched material | Extensive, thorough coverage of topic, focused use of detail and examples | Excellent, very sound understanding of complexities of key theoretical models, concepts and arguments | Excellent, consistent engagement with text | Comprehensive understanding of artistic or critical context |
| 60-69 (Upper second) | Wide range of core and background reading, effectively used | Breadth and depth of coverage, accurate and relevant in detail and example | Clear, sound understanding of subject matter, theory, issues and debate | Good, careful engagement with text | Good understanding of artistic or critical context |
| 50-59 (Lower second) | Reasonable range of reading; references to relevant but not wide variety of sources | Content generally relevant and accurate, most central issues identified; basic knowledge sound but may be patchy | Reasonable level of understanding of subject matter, theory and ideas; main issues satisfactorily understood | Reasonably good ability to respond to text | Sound, but may be limited, understanding of artistic or critical context |
| 40-49 (Third class) | Background reading mostly relevant but over- reliant on few sources | Fairly basic knowledge, limited consistency of depth and accuracy of detail; not all aspects addressed, some omissions | Partial understanding of subject matter, core concepts and relevant issues; basic reference to theory | Some ability to respond to the text | Adequate but partial understanding of artistic or critical context |
| 30-39 (Fail) | Scant evidence of background reading; weak investigation | Contains very slight detail; content may be thin or irrelevant; issues poorly identified | Very little understanding of subject matter, ideas and issues; may be issue of misreading/ misinterpretation of question | Inadequate familiarity with the text | Weak understanding of artistic or critical context |
| 20-29 (Fail) | No evidence of relevant reading | Little relevance of content; unacceptably weak or inaccurate knowledge base | Significant weaknesses and gaps in understanding of subject matter, ideas and issues; misunderstanding of question | Little awareness of text | Lack of understanding of artistic or critical context |
| 10-19 (Fail) | No evidence of reading | Knowledge base extremely weak; content almost entirely irrelevant or erroneous | Devoid of understanding of subject matter, ideas and issues | Misunderstanding of text | Inaccurate reference to artistic or critical context |
| 0-9 (Fail) | No use of sources | Material not relevant or correct; no evidence of knowledge | No relevant understanding evident; response to question virtually nil | No reference to text | No awareness demonstrated of artistic or critical context |

COGNITIVE SKILLS

| | Selection and use of information | Interpretation of information | Critical analysis using theory | Structure and argument | Awareness of self-development, and /or personal engagement |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 90-100 (First class) | Outstanding level of original synthesis, analysis, argument and evaluation | Work produced could hardly be bettered when produced under parallel conditions | Work produced could hardly be bettered when produced under parallel conditions | Work produced could hardly be bettered when produced under parallel conditions | Thorough and sophisticated appreciation of learning gained and impact on self; pertinent personal analysis; imaginative, insightful, creative |
| 80-89 (First class) | Creative, innovative synthesis of ideas | Sophisticated perception, critical insight and interpretation | Challenging, comprehensive critical analysis sustained throughout | Authoritative and persuasive argument | Thorough and sophisticated appreciation of learning gained and impact on self; pertinent personal analysis; imaginative, insightful, creative |
| 70-79 (First class) | Convincing ability to synthesise a range of views or information and integrate references | Excellent perception, critical insight and interpretation | Very good depth and breadth of critical analysis; sustained, thorough questioning informed by theory | Excellent organisation of ideas; clear, coherent structure and logical, cogent development of argument | Thorough appreciation of learning gained and impact on self; pertinent personal analysis; imaginative, insightful, creative |
| 60-69 (Upper second) | Ability to synthesise a range of views or information and incorporate references | Perceptive, thoughtful interpretation | Consistent development of critical analysis and questioning, using theory | Logically structured; good organisation of ideas; well- reasoned discussion; coherent argument | Good awareness of learning and self-development; pertinent personal comment; some freshness of insight, some creative thinking and imagination |
| 50-59 (Lower second) | Evidence of drawing information together | Sound explanation; this may be partly descriptive and factual; ideas tend to be stated rather than developed | Some attempt at critical analysis using theory; may be limited and lack consistency or conviction | Reasonable structure; organisation may lack some logical progression; attempt made to argue logically with supporting evidence, although some claims may be unsubstantiated | Reasonable awareness of learning and self- development; may show a little indication of originality or personal engagement |
| 40-49 (Third class) | Little discrimination in use of material; limited perspective or consideration of alternative views | Some interpretation or insight; may be largely descriptive, or superficial; over- reliance on narrative or anecdote for explanation | Some evidence of rationale; minimal attempt to examine strengths and weaknesses of an argument | Basic structure; may be some repetition or deviation; some ability to construct an argument but may lack clarity or conviction, with unsupported assertion | Some awareness of learning and self-development; personal engagement only very slight |
| 30-39 (Fail) | Superficial use of information, minimal association; references not integrated | Little attempt to interpret material, or merely descriptive; explanations may be muddled at times | Limited breadth and depth of analysis, inadequate critical skills; shallow and superficial | Poorly structured, little logic; may have unsubstantiated conclusions based on generalisation | Little or muddled awareness of learning and self- development; minimal appraisal |

COGNITIVE SKILLS CONT...

| | Selection and use of information | Interpretation of information | Critical analysis using theory | Structure and argument | Awareness of self-development, and /or personal engagement |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 20-29 (Fail) | Incorrect use of material or information | Purely descriptive; very limited discussion | Lacking or erroneous analysis; negligible evidence of thought | Structure confused or incomplete; poor if any relationship between introduction, middle and conclusion; lack of evidence to support views expressed | Discussion of own learning and development incoherent ; issues are not appraised |
| 10-19 (Fail) | Little or no use of material or information | Any attempt at discussion limited to personal view; no discernible insight | Isolated statements indicating lack of thought | Lack of recognisable structure or reference to argument; no related evidence or conclusions | Very little evidence of self-awareness |
| 0-9 (Fail) | Little or no use of material or information | No interpretation of information | Isolated statements indicating lack of thought | Lack of evidence of reasoning | No evidence of self-awareness |

PRACTICAL OR PROFESSIONAL SKILLS

| | Specialist skills | Integration of theory and practice | Professional competence | Reflective practice | Technical understanding and use of materials | Relationship between content, form and technique | Analysis of performance |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| 90-100 (First class) | Outstanding expertise and flair in the application of specialist skills | Skilled integration of theory and practice | Extremely high level of professional competence | Sophisticated reflection on personal and professional practice | Excellent technical understanding and judgement; work produced could hardly be bettered when produced under parallel conditions | Work produced could hardly be bettered when produced under parallel conditions | Outstanding critical analysis of performance |
| 80-89 (First class) | Sophisticated expertise and flair in the application of specialist skills | Skilled integration of theory and practice | Extremely high level of professional competence | Sophisticated reflection on personal and professional practice | Excellent technical understanding and judgement; exceptional level of competence in use of materials and appropriate application of working processes and techniques | Excellent design and sophisticated relationship between content, form & technique | Sophisticated critical analysis of performance |
| 70-79 (First class) | Expert demonstration, accomplished and innovative application of specialist skills | Skilled integration of theory and practice | Very high level of professional competence | Clear and insightful reflection on personal and professional practice | Thorough technical understanding and judgement; excellent level of competence in use of materials and appropriate application of working processes and techniques | Excellent design; strong relationship between content, form & technique | Strong and thorough critical analysis of performance |
| 60-69 (Upper second) | Good performance; capable and confident application of specialist skills | Useful links drawn between theory and practice | Substantial level of professional competence | Clear understanding, reflection and evaluation of implications for personal and professional practice | Accurate technical understanding and judgement; good level of competence in use of materials and appropriate application of working processes and techniques | Good design; meaningful relationship between content, form & technique | Good critical analysis of performance |
| 50-59 (Lower second) | Mostly competent and informed application of specialist skills | Consideration of related theory and practice | Sound level of professional competence | Sound reflection on personal and professional practice | Mostly accurate technical understanding and judgement; satisfactory level of competence in use of materials and appropriate application of working processes and techniques | Fair design; generally sound relationship between content, form & technique | Sound analysis of performance |
| 40-49 (Third class) | Sufficient evidence of developing specialist skills | Consideration of both theory and practice, which may be uneven | Satisfactory level of professional competence | Adequate but limited reflection on personal and professional practice issues | Adequate though only partially accurate technical understanding and judgement; adequate level of competence in use of materials and application of working processes and techniques | Adequate evidence of some relationship between content, form & technique | Adequate analysis of performance |

PRACTICAL OR PROFESSIONAL SKILLS CONT...

| | Specialist skills | Integration of theory and practice | Professional competence | Reflective practice | Technical understanding and use of materials | Relationship between content, form and technique | Analysis of performance |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| 30-39 (Fail) | Little evidence of skill development or application | Uneven balance between theory and practice | Questionable level of professional competence, e.g., may be some evidence of unsafe practice | Inadequate reflection on personal and professional practice issues | Slight technical understanding and judgement, with inaccuracies; lack of competence in use of materials and erroneous application of working processes and techniques | Limited or unresolved relationship between content, form & technique | Limited information about performance |
| 20-29 (Fail) | Very little evidence of specialist skill development | Little appreciation of theory in practice | Lack of professional competence | Slight, if any, reflection or reference to personal and professional practice | Feeble technical understanding and judgement; incompetence in use of materials and erroneous application of working processes and techniques | Very limited relationship between content, form & technique | Very limited information about performance |
| 10-19 (Fail) | Minimal evidence of specialist skill development | Relationship between theory and practice not evident | Serious lack of professional competence | Slight, if any, reflection or reference to personal and professional practice | Almost no technical understanding or judgement; serious incompetence in use of materials and erroneous application of working processes and techniques | Minimal evidence of understanding of relationship between content, form & technique | Insufficient evidence of knowledge of performance |
| 0-9 (Fail) | No evidence of skill development | No awareness of theory in practice evident | Professional incompetence | Slight, if any, reflection or reference to personal and professional practice | No technical understanding or judgement; uninformed and arbitrary use of material, methods, processes and techniques | No evidence of understanding of the relationship between content, form & technique | No evidence of knowledge of performance |

COMMUNICATION SKILLS

| | Written vocabulary and style | Spelling, punctuation and syntax | Referencing | Presentation skills | Dialogic skills |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 90-100 (First class) | Exceptional clarity and coherence; highly sophisticated expression; work produced could hardly be bettered when produced under parallel conditions | Near perfect spelling, punctuation and syntax | All sources acknowledged and meticulously presented | Complete accuracy in presentation; highly autonomous, thorough and well-managed approach | Outstanding ability to stimulate and enable discussion |
| 80-89 (First class) | Extremely well- written, with accuracy and flair; Highly sophisticated, fluent and persuasive expression of ideas | Near perfect spelling, punctuation and syntax | All sources acknowledged and meticulously presented | Great clarity and maturity of presentation; independence in extensive planning and preparation | Excellent ability to stimulate and enable discussion |
| 70-79 (First class) | Very clear, fluent, sophisticated and confident expression; highly effective vocabulary and style | Near perfect spelling, punctuation and syntax | All sources acknowledged and meticulously presented | High standard of presentation; evidence of thorough planning, preparation and organisation | Excellent ability to stimulate and enable discussion |
| 60-69 (Upper second) | Clear, fluent, confident expression; appropriate vocabulary and style | High standard of accuracy in spelling, punctuation and syntax | Sources acknowledged and accurately presented | Good standard of presentation; well-organised; relevant planning and preparation | Clear evidence of ability to stimulate and facilitate discussion |
| 50-59 (Lower second) | Clearly written, coherent expression; reasonable range of vocabulary and adequate style | Overall competence in spelling, punctuation and syntax, although there may be some errors | Sources acknowledged and referencing mostly accurate | Presentation generally sound, maybe some weaknesses; fairly good organisation, planning and preparation | Capable attempts at participation in discussion |
| 40-49 (Third class) | Expression, vocabulary and style reasonably clear but lack sophistication | Inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and syntax do not usually interfere with meaning | Sources acknowledged; references not always correctly cited/presented | Some confidence in presentation, with some lapses; adequate organisation, planning and preparation | Adequate participation in discussion |
| 30-39 (Third class) | Expression of ideas insufficient to convey clear meaning; inaccurate or unprofessional terminology | Many errors in spelling, punctuation and syntax | Referencing incomplete or inaccurate | Few presentation skills; weaknesses of organisation, planning and preparation | Little constructive participation in discussion |
| 20-29 (Third class) | Lack of clarity, very poor expression; style inappropriate, terminology inadequate and inappropriate | Many serious errors of spelling, punctuation and syntax | Referencing incomplete or absent | Ineffective presentation skills; serious deficiency in organisation, planning and preparation | Inadequate attention given to discussion |
| 10-19 (Third class) | Inaccuracies of expression and vocabulary render meaning of written work extremely unclear | Many serious errors of even basic spelling, punctuation and syntax | No attempt at referencing | Inadequate presentation skills; almost no evidence of organisation, planning or preparation | No attention given to discussion |
| 0-9 (Third class) | Incoherent expression | Heavily inaccurate; inappropriate use of language | No attempt at referencing | Presentation totally ineffective; no evidence of organisation, planning or preparation | No attention given to discussion |

POSTGRADUATE MARKING CRITERIA

Explanatory Notes

Postgraduate degrees and diplomas are classified at Level 7 Postgraduate with Distinction, Merit and Pass. Classifications are made at the point of award.

The criteria offer descriptions of standards of achievement relating to three types of learning outcomes:

1. Knowledge and Understanding of the academic discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice
2. Critical Analysis & Interpretation
3. Communication Skills: Creative, Written & Presented

POSTGRADUATE MARKING CRITERIA

| | Knowledge Knowledge and understanding of the academic discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice. SCOPE: critical engagement with the primary and secondary sources used to answer the question. | Analysis Critical analysis and interpretation. SCOPE: appropriate analytical discussion and interpretation of source material. | Communication Communication skills: creative, written and presented. SCOPE: communication of intent, adherence to academic subject discipline protocols. |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Distinction 90-100% Evidence of ... | <p>Insightful and sophisticated engagement with research and/or practice pertaining to field(s) and disciplines of study;</p> <p>Sophisticated demonstration and application of knowledge, offering innovative and/or original insights, possibly unparalleled in their application;</p> <p>A sophisticated degree of synthesis, quite likely of complex and disparate material.</p> | <p>A sophisticated command of imaginative, insightful, original or creative interpretations;</p> <p>An unparalleled level of analysis and evaluation;</p> <p>A sophisticated cogent argument offering new and original contributions to knowledge.</p> | <p>A sophisticated response, the academic form matches that expected in published and professional work;</p> <p>Mastery and command of specialist skills pertaining to the academic form;</p> <p>Idiomatic and highly coherent, scholarly expression.</p> |
| Distinction 80-89% Evidence of ... | <p>Advanced engagement with research and or practice pertaining to the field(s) and disciplines of study;</p> <p>Accomplished demonstration of knowledge, contributing towards innovative and/or original insights;</p> <p>Extremely high degree of synthesis of research material.</p> | <p>Advanced command of imaginative, insightful, original or creative interpretations;</p> <p>Accomplished level of analysis and evaluation;</p> <p>A highly developed cogent argument with the potential to bring new and original contributions to knowledge.</p> | <p>Persuasive articulation, where the academic form largely matches that expected in published work;</p> <p>Accomplished command of specialist skills pertaining to the academic form, discipline and context(s);</p> |
| Distinction 70-79% Evidence of ... | <p>A high degree of engagement with research and/or practice pertaining to field(s) and disciplines of study;</p> <p>Excellent demonstration of knowledge, with the possibility for new insights;</p> <p>A high degree of synthesis relating to research material.</p> | <p>An excellent command of imaginative, original or creative interpretations;</p> <p>A high degree of analysis and evaluation;</p> <p>A sustained argument with the possibility for new insights to knowledge.</p> | <p>A high degree of skill, the academic form shows exceptional standards of presentation or delivery;</p> <p>A high command of specialist skills pertaining to the academic form, discipline and context(s).</p> |
| Merit 60-69% Evidence of ... | <p>Sustained engagement with research and/or practice pertaining to disciplines of study;</p> <p>An assured understanding of current problems, supported by critical analysis with the potential for new insights;</p> <p>A sustained application and depth of research material and accuracy in detail.</p> | <p>A convincing and sustained command of accepted critical positions;</p> <p>A developed conceptual understanding that enables the student to find new meanings in established hypotheses;</p> <p>A developed and sustained argument with the possibility for new insights to knowledge.</p> | <p>Secure and sustained expression, observing appropriate academic form;</p> <p>Fluent and persuasive expression of ideas, work shows flair;</p> <p>Assured interpretation of the style and genre, content, form and technique for specialist and non-specialist audiences as appropriate.</p> |

POSTGRADUATE MARKING CRITERIA CONT...

| | Knowledge Knowledge and understanding of the academic discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice. SCOPE: critical engagement with the primary and secondary sources used to answer the question. | Analysis Critical analysis and interpretation. SCOPE: appropriate analytical discussion and interpretation of source material. | Communication Communication skills: creative, written and presented. SCOPE: communication of intent, adherence to academic subject discipline protocols. |
|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Pass 50-59% Evidence of ... | Engagement with relevant knowledge pertaining to discipline and key issues; Satisfactory understanding and conceptual awareness enabling critical analysis; Response is appropriate and addresses the range of learning outcomes; where the knowledge is accurate. Work may lack sustained depth. | An ability to deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively; A satisfactory evaluation of current research and critical scholarship in the discipline; Ability to devise a coherent critical/ analytical argument is supported with evidence. | Good expression, observing appropriate academic form; Predominantly accurate in spelling and grammar, ideas communicated appropriately and satisfactorily; Satisfactory application of specialist skills with effective technical control. |
| Fail 40-49% Evidence of ... | Unsatisfactory engagement with relevant knowledge pertaining to discipline and key issues; Insufficient understanding and conceptual awareness of knowledge(s) pertaining to the field; Response does not address the full range of learning outcomes, inaccurate and/or missing knowledge at times. | A lack of ability to deal with complex issues; Judgements not fully substantiated and understood; The ability to construct an argument is underdeveloped and not supported fully with evidence. | Unsatisfactory demonstration and application of key communication skills; Recurring errors in spelling and grammar, ideas limited and underdeveloped, possibly poor paraphrasing; Skills demonstrated are insufficient for the task and work may lack technical judgement. |
| Fail 30-39% Evidence of ... | Inadequate coverage of relevant issues, inconsistent understanding shown; Inadequate understanding of underpinning issues, weak and underdeveloped analysis; Response does not address learning outcomes, inaccurate and missing knowledge. | A lack of ability to deal with complex issues; Judgements are not substantiated or understood and the critical position is not made clear; Weak interpretation of research and work is not supported with evidence. | Significant errors evident in the academic form; Weaknesses in spelling and grammar, lacks coherence and structure, possibly poor paraphrasing; Work lacks technical judgement. |
| Fail 20-29% Evidence of ... | Lack of relevant research and little understanding shown; Very weak understanding of key issues, work lacks critical oversight; Substandard engagement with research material, misunderstanding evident. | Very weak analysis, possibly limited to a single perspective; Substandard argument, work lacks scholarly analysis and interpretation; Episodes of self-contradiction and/or confusion. | Very weak observation of academic conventions; Severe deficiencies in spelling and grammar and expression undermines meaning, possibly poor paraphrasing; Substandard relationship between content, form and technique. |

POSTGRADUATE MARKING CRITERIA CONT ...

| | Knowledge | Analysis | Communication |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>Knowledge and understanding of the academic discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice.</p> <p>SCOPE: critical engagement with the primary and secondary sources used to answer the question.</p> | <p>Critical analysis and interpretation.</p> <p>SCOPE: appropriate analytical discussion and interpretation of source material.</p> | <p>Communication skills: creative, written and presented.</p> <p>SCOPE: communication of intent, adherence to academic subject discipline protocols.</p> |
| <p>Fail 10-19% Evidence of ...</p> | <p>Severely lacking in relevant research and underpinning knowledge;</p> <p>Slight understanding of key issues, little attempt at critical analysis;</p> <p>Slight engagement with research material, inaccurate knowledge and misunderstanding throughout.</p> | <p>Slight indication of ability to deal with key issues;</p> <p>Slight analytical engagement and reflection, work lacks criticality throughout;</p> <p>Lacks evidence, work shows self-contradiction and confusion.</p> | <p>Slight observation of academic conventions;</p> <p>Weak expression, mostly incoherent and fails to secure meaning, poor paraphrasing;</p> <p>Slight engagement with the work.</p> |
| <p>Fail 0-9% Evidence of ...</p> | <p>Negligible understanding of key issues, which is likely to show no critical analysis or engagement with the learning brief;</p> <p>No engagement with research tasks.</p> | <p>Negligible coverage of learning outcomes;</p> <p>No attempt to interpret research material.</p> | <p>Negligible observation of academic conventions;</p> <p>Incoherent and confused expression, poor paraphrasing;</p> <p>No discernible demonstration of key skills (pertaining to the discipline);</p> <p>No engagement with the work.</p> |