

 S P Jain London School of Management	Assessment Validation, Grading and Moderation Policy and Procedures
Document Type	Policy and Procedures
Administering Entity	Academic Board, Dean, Programme Directors, Registrar
Latest Approval/ Amendment Date	Oct 19 th 2022
Last Approval/ Amendment Date	
Approval Authority	Academic Board
Indicative Time of Review	Oct 19 th 2025

1. Purpose

- a. This document describes how SP Jain London School of Management ('SPJUK' or 'the School') carries out assessment in programmes leading to the School's own awards. Its purpose is to ensure that assessment is carried out effectively and reliably and conforms to the School's Academic Regulations and other requirements.

2. Responsibilities

- a. The Registrar is responsible for ensuring that the processes and procedures described in this document are adhered to by the School's staff.

3. Principles of assessment

- a. The general principles governing assessment at the School are that assessment must:
 - i. Enable students to demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes at the threshold standard and above;
 - ii. Be reliable – requiring students to demonstrate knowledge and skills in a manner which is consistent between students enrolled on the same programme at the same time and over time;
 - iii. Be valid – effectively measuring the achievement of intended learning outcomes;
 - iv. Be accessible – clear, accurate, consistent and timely information on assessment tasks and procedures must be made available to students, staff and other external assessors or examiners;
 - v. Be inclusive and equitable – not disadvantaging any group or individual (for example students with disabilities);
 - vi. Be manageable for students and staff in terms of total volume and timing;
 - vii. Include both formative and summative assessments within each module;
 - viii. Generate feedback to students as an integral part of the assessment process;
 - ix. Promote academic integrity and minimise opportunities for academic misconduct;
 - x. Promote different approaches to learning by using a range of different assessment types.

4. Overall requirements

- a. Assessment should reflect the achievement of individual students in fulfilling the award outcomes and relate that achievement to a consistent national standard of awards. It should, therefore, be carried out by competent and impartial examiners, using methods which enable them to assess students fairly.
- b. All programmes shall develop an assessment strategy, which will be defined in the approved Programme Specification, to ensure that the defined outcomes of the award are tested through a variety of methods in the context of the programme of summative modular assessments.
- c. The choice of format of module assessment shall be appropriate to test the achievement of all the specified module learning outcomes and designed as an integral feature of the process of learning. Academic staff will be expected to develop assessment criteria which encourage the use of the full range of marks, and to verify summative assessment tasks internally according to the procedures set out below.
- d. Module assessments shall occupy a specified proportion of the notional learning time allocation of the module. Programme teams are expected to develop consistent guidelines on issues such as length, complexity, intellectual challenge and the volume of assessment. The overall assessment strategy should set the context for the range and number of assessments.
- e. The study of all modules will include both formative and summative assessment. Explicit criteria against which performance is to be assessed will be published in advance of all summative assessments.
- f. Students will receive purposeful and systematic feedback on their assessment, according to the process described below. Such feedback may be provided in a variety of forms, including oral, written and electronic formats to individuals or to groups of students.
- g. The Registrar shall publish an annual assessment schedule, which will include the deadlines for the submission of assessments and examination papers, examination board dates, the publication of examination timetable to students and the publication of results.

5. Formative assessment

- a. Within any given module, formative assessment normally takes place before summative assessment and does not contribute to marks or grades but focuses on helping students to reflect on their progress through the module and improve their performance.
- b. All modules should include at least one formative assessment which should be designed to generate purposeful and systematic feedback to students, and be given in time for students to reflect and improve on their performance before undertaking the relevant summative assessment.
- c. Since formative assessment does not contribute to marks or grades, the procedures and requirements set out in the rest of this document do not apply to formative assessment other than the requirement to provide timely feedback.

6. Assessment design

- a. The School's academic staff are responsible for designing assessments according to the specified learning outcomes and assessment strategy described in the relevant Programme and Module Specifications.

- b. The targeted learning outcomes and assessment criteria must be clearly indicated on each assessment instrument to provide a focus for students and to assist with internal standardisation processes.

7. Assessment briefs

- a. All summative assessments must be accompanied by an assessment brief – a document issued to students at the start of the assessment process which explains what they must do. It should support the student toward meeting the assessment and grading requirements of the module.g
- b. An assessment brief should:
 - i. Inform the student of the activities set;
 - ii. Inform the student of the methods of assessment;
 - iii. Inform the student of the targeted learning outcomes and how the work will be assessed (the assessment criteria). If applicable, the brief should include clear instructions for collaborative or group work, including whether and how the contribution of individuals will be assessed;
 - iv. Inform the student of any specific constraints or requirements (such as a word limit on written assignments)
 - v. Set clear instructions and deadlines for submission of work, and explain the consequences of late, incomplete or non-submission as outlined in the Academic Regulations
 - vi. Set clear timescales for when students may expect to receive marks and feedback. Normally, students should expect to receive feedback and provisional marks (i.e. marks subject to the approval of the Examination Board) within 15 working days of submission.
- c. The School's academic staff are responsible for designing assessment briefs and ensuring they comply with these requirements. There is a template for assessment briefs at Appendix A.

8. Validation of assessment briefs

- a. All assessment briefs and/or examinations must be subject to internal validation (and validation by the External Examiner as set out below) before being given to students, to ensure they fulfil the principles and requirements set out above and conform to the School's Academic Regulations.
- b. Internal validation of assessment briefs and/or examinations must be evidenced through completion of the Internal Validation Form.
- c. The Programme Leader should keep a copy of all completed forms for all assessment briefs and/or examinations given to students.
- d. In addition, and pursuant to the External Examiner Policy, internally verified briefs and examination papers for those modules which contribute to the classification of students' awards, both first sits and resits, must be sent to the External Examiner for approval prior to their publication.
- e. Any changes recommended by the External Examiner, if accepted by the Programme Director, shall be incorporated into the final version of the brief or paper. If the proposed changes recommended by the External Examiner are not accepted, the Programme Director should discuss the issue with the Dean before providing feedback to the External Examiner.

9. Grade descriptors

- a. The SP Jain London School of Management grade descriptors are generic statements that describe student achievement at undergraduate and taught postgraduate level. They are expressed in generic terms so that they are applicable to different disciplines. The intention is that these would

be added to our Academic Regulations to demonstrate that our qualifications are credible, valid and reliable as required by the OfS B conditions of registration.

- b. The purpose of the grade descriptors, which are set out in Appendix B, is to provide a guide for the following:
 - i. Preparing level and module intended learning outcomes;
 - ii. Designing assessment beyond content to include skills (discipline-related and professional/scholarly ones);
 - iii. Ensuring that marks are awarded for the full range/ breadth, i.e. 0-100%, so that students can attain top grades, if deserved;
 - iv. Shaping marking schemes and criteria appropriate beyond content to include subject specific and professional and transferable skills;
 - v. standardisation exercises to ensure members of a programme team are all marking to comparable standards at the relevant level.

10. Marking and grading

- a. Summative assessment is the final consideration of a student's assessment or examination, agreeing which assessment criteria the student has met and recording those decisions.
- b. The marking and grading of summative assessments must be done in accordance with the assessment criteria specified in the assessment brief and in accordance with the grade descriptors.
- c. With the exception of assessed activities for which the anonymity of the candidate is not possible or desirable (such as group work), all summative assessments for modules which may contribute to the classification of a student's award must be marked anonymously.
- d. There are six stages in the marking and grading process for summative assessments:
 - i. Standardisation;
 - ii. Marking;
 - iii. Internal moderation;
 - iv. Programme Leader approval;
 - v. External Examiner.

Stage 1: Standardisation

- e. The standardisation process precedes full marking of scripts and ensures that markers are confident that they are marking consistently in accordance with the assessment criteria.
- f. The Programme Director and markers are all expected to take part in the standardisation process by marking the standardisation scripts and then meeting to discuss the marks awarded, their approach to the assessment criteria, and, where permitted, to make changes to the mark scheme to ensure it reflects the appropriate academic standards.
- g. The Programme Director must choose one of the following methods of determining how many scripts are standardised:
 - i. At least one common script standardised by all markers; or
 - ii. At least three scripts standardised by all markers where the Programme Director has determined that one is a top mark script, one is a middle mark script, and one is a fail mark script.

Stage 2: Marking

- h. Assessments which contribute less than 30 credits shall be marked once by a single marker.
- i. Assessments which contribute 30 or more credits shall be double marked. The second
- j. marker should assess the work independently without sight of the mark or feedback from the first marker. The two examiners will then agree an appropriate final mark for submission to the Programme Director at stage 4.
- k. Where first and second markers cannot agree a final mark a third marker will be engaged on the same basis as the second marker and, with both the first and second marker, they shall determine a final mark to be presented to the Programme Director through discussion.

Stage 3: Internal moderation

- l. Moderation is where a moderator examines a batch of papers or assessments from a single marker, to determine if the marker has correctly applied the assessment criteria.
- m. There will be a single moderator for each assessment or module.
- n. The sample of assessed work for Moderation must be at least 10 pieces of work or 10 per cent of the work submitted, whichever is the greater, *and* reflect the full spectrum of grades given by the first marker.
- o. The moderator's role is to determine the following question: Has the marker correctly applied the assessment criteria to the scripts in the moderation bundle?
- p. If the answer is yes, the first marker's marks for all scripts (i.e., not just those included in the bundle) are approved. If the answer is no, the moderator must decide between the following two options:
- q. If the moderator takes the view that the marker has misapplied the assessment criteria consistently (e.g. one particular question has been marked incorrectly), then the moderator must reject the sample and return it to the first marker, and ask them to remark all scripts (i.e., not just those included in the bundle) on this point, or, where multiple points are identified, on each point identified. The moderator must discuss the issue with the first marker to ensure that any differences in approach are resolved and inform the Programme Director of the issue.
- r. If the moderator takes the view that the marker has misapplied the assessment criteria inconsistently, they must reject the bundle and all scripts marked by the initial marker will be marked by a new first marker. Where this happens, the new marker will be subject to the moderation process. The moderator will record their view on the sample(s) they receive in writing. At any point in the moderation process, a moderator is entitled to ask to see other scripts from the same marker to determine whether the marker has correctly applied the assessment criteria.

Stage 4: Programme Director approval

- s. Where a moderator has determined that the marker has correctly applied the assessment criteria to the papers or assessments in the moderation bundle, the Programme Director can approve the marks awarded by that marker. Where a moderator has determined that the marker has not correctly applied the assessment criteria to the papers in the moderation bundle, the Programme Director must be satisfied that the remedial work required to all the marker's scripts has been completed to her or his satisfaction, at which point she or he may approve the marks awarded by that marker.

Stage 5: External Examiner

- t. For all examinations and other assessments which may contribute to the classification of students' awards, both first sittings and resits, a sample must be sent to the External Examiner. Further details of how this process works appears in the School's External Examining Policy and Procedure.

11. Feedback to students

- a. The provision of good feedback to students is an integral part of their learning experience. Therefore, for all assessed work, other than examinations, students must be given timely, relevant, meaningful and encouraging feedback to help them reflect and develop.
 - i. Timely means feedback should be returned as quickly as possible – at the most within 15 days of submission – and, preferably, in sufficient time for students to be able to review the work in order to improve, on the basis of feedback, the next related piece of work.
 - ii. Relevant and meaningful means students need to know how to correct their mistakes. Focused, specific comments on aspects of the work will help students to understand key points. Clear marking criteria which articulate the important aspects of the piece of work provide a framework against which feedback can be given.
 - iii. Encouraging means feedback should offer a balance of encouraging comments and criticism. Feedback should state what is good about the work as well as what could be improved.

12. Examination Board

- a. The Examination Board (EB) is responsible, as delegated by Academic Board, for approving student marks/grades, student progression, including with respect to resubmission of assessment and repeat of modules, and final awards for programmes leading to an award of the School. It is chaired by the Dean of School.
- b. The EB also receives the reports and recommendations of the External Examiner(s), and notes actions taken in response to previous External Examiner reports.

13. Ownership of Students' Assessed Work

- a. Students hold the intellectual property inherent in all work produced for assessments, but the material produced by students for assessment (essays, projects, examination scripts, dissertations, artworks, computer disks, etc.) is the property of the School, and may be retained pending confirmation of marks awarded by Examination Boards, possible appeals and quality audits. With the exception of examination scripts, the School will endeavour to return to students any artefacts or hard copy dissertations whenever a student explicitly requests this.
- b. Assessed coursework that has not been collected by the student will be retained by the School for six months after the relevant Examination Board, after which time it may be disposed of.

Appendix A

Assessment Brief

Remove all italicised text (for staff information only) before proceeding to internal validation.

Module name	
Module number	
Staff member setting exercise	<i>This should be your first point of contact for queries about the assessment.</i>
Moderator (for assessment brief)	
Word or time length guide	<i>If a word or time length is specified, set out the penalty for failing to meet it.</i>
Contribution to module assessment (%)	<i>Check this is the same as on the module reference sheet.</i>
First sit or referral	<i>Specify if this is a first sit assessment brief or if it is a referral assessment brief</i>
Date set	
Submission deadline [date + time]	<i>Insert date/time of submission (Tuesdays, Wednesdays or Thursdays only).</i>
Arrangements for submission	
Return date/feedback	<i>Insert date and time of feedback. Feedback should be provided online, give information on the type of feedback and its location if possible</i> <i>Coursework should be returned in 15 working days.</i>
University regulations for assessment	All assessments are subject to the Royal Agricultural University's <u>Academic Regulations</u> .
Requirements for the assessment	<i>Insert details of the type of assessment (essay title, details of case study, topic for presentation etc.).</i>
Learning outcomes tested	<i>Insert relevant module outcomes from the module reference sheet/module descriptor.</i>
Marking criteria	The assessment will be marked according to the following specific marking criteria: <i>All briefs should indicate the specific marking criteria for the work. These may be very detailed and prescriptive (e.g. marking grid) or may be simply a list of bullet points. They should be relevant to the module outcomes listed above.</i> <i>Reference may also be made, as appropriate, to the RAU generic marking criteria.</i> <i>If different parts of the assessment are weighted differently, insert details.</i>
Special instructions (only include if required)	<i>For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Recommended resources.</i> • <i>Structure for work.</i>

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Timetable for presentations.</i>• <i>Timetable for support tutorials.</i>• <i>Arrangements for working in groups:</i><ul style="list-style-type: none">○ <i>Group size</i>○ <i>Rules for managing group work and procedures for handling problems.</i> |
|--|--|

Appendix B: SP Jain London School of Management Generic Grade Descriptors

1. Introduction

- a. The design, approval and development of a programme is informed by a range of sources, including the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Qualification Frameworks that set out the various levels of higher education qualifications and the requirements for each level, subject benchmark statements and, where relevant, Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements. The grade descriptors are intended to complement these national-level sources. In particular, they will help to confirm at the assessment stage that the breadth and depth of the learning experience has been undertaken and the required standards achieved.
- b. The Office for Students (OfS) has adopted the [Framework for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies \(FHEQ\)](#) and the UKSCQA degree classification descriptors for Level 6 bachelors' degrees into the regulatory framework so there is a single reference point for sector-recognised standards. These are contained in the [QAA Annex D: Outcome classification descriptors for FHEQ Level 6](#) which supplements the FHEQ. These grade descriptors for FHEQ Level 6 have been incorporated into the grade descriptors at Level 6 in Appendix 1 below.
- c. The descriptors relate to a wide range of skills and capabilities. Some of these will be more relevant to specific programmes and modules, and others less so – this is a matter of academic judgement. Staff using the descriptors to set assessment criteria will refer to the appropriate level and select skill and capability areas that are most relevant to the assignment, customising descriptors for the specific assignment.
- d. The grade descriptors signpost student achievement generically – they are not exhaustive. They are expressed in positive terms about the characteristics of student learning demonstrated to achieve a particular grade. They are designed as a reference point for the calibration of outcome standards and should be 'translated' into the programme, module or assessment context for greater detail and specificity. Thus, they should be viewed alongside the specific statements of intended learning outcomes for a programme or a module.

2. Levels

- a. There is an expectation as students move through the levels, that their work will demonstrate the following features:
 - i. Increasingly sophisticated knowledge and understanding of the discipline from basic concepts and principles at Level 4 to critiquing of advanced scholarship and research – much of which is at the forefront of the discipline at Level 7
 - ii. Increasing awareness and critical understanding of the methods and techniques of enquiry within the discipline and ability to apply these to design, plan, analyse and address increasingly complex problems at Level 7
 - iii. Cumulative skills to deal with uncertainty and ambiguity alongside independent autonomous learning ability to create and interpret knowledge and evidence within the discipline, demonstrating originality in the generation of new and personal knowledge from research/enquiry at Level 7
 - iv. Growing confidence and skills in critical analysis, evaluation and critical reflection from standard application of established principles at Level 4 to detailed and creative analysis and insight at Level 7
 - v. Effective communication skills that increasingly take account of audience, mode, academic rigour and a range of perspectives or viewpoints to sustain scholarly, coherent and sustained personal arguments
 - vi. Development of a repertoire of disciplinary technical/specialist/creative/ methodological skills and increasingly reflective, competent and sophisticated demonstration of key transferable skills

- vii. Ability to demonstrate personal responsibility in relation to initiative, decision making and judgement in clearly structured and defined contexts at Level 4 to unstructured and unpredictable contexts at Level 7.

Level 4	0-34 Fail	35-39 Marginal fail	40-49 Adequate	50-59 Acceptable	60-69 Good	70-79 Excellent	80-100 Outstanding
Knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories, topics and/or practice.	substantially inadequate evidence of knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories and/or topics. The work contains omissions and flaws.	Weak work. Inaccuracies in knowledge and understanding which indicate a limited grasp of key concepts, theories and/or topics. Some omissions and inaccuracies.	Adequate identification of key concepts, theories and/or topics, this may be imitative and/or lack depth. May include some omissions and inaccuracies.	Acceptable descriptions of key concepts, theories and/or topics, there may also be a recognition of peripheral issues. Few or no omissions.	Good explanations of a range of key concepts, theories and/or topics, some of which are explored in-depth. Some awareness of wider issues demonstrated.	Detailed discussions of relevant of key concepts, theories and/or topics, evidence of an awareness of their limitations.	Detailed exploration of relevant key concepts, theories and/or topics, including a critical account of ambiguities and limitations.
Application of knowledge (i.e. concept, theory, topic) and/or skill to the assessment task and practice (assessment brief to include details of the problem to be addressed and skills required plus additional factors to be considered e.g. ethical issues, sustainability factors, environmental factors etc.)	Inadequate understanding of discipline. Very limited and/or irrelevant application of concepts and ideas to the assessment task.	Limited understanding of the discipline demonstrated with inaccurate, inappropriate and/or limited attempt(s) to apply theory.	Adequate identification of theory(s) leading to perfunctory explanation and application(s).	Acceptable descriptions of theories leading to generalised applications(s), there may also be a recognition of peripheral issues.	Good explanation and application of theory. Some of the work may suggest a deeper engagement with the discipline.	Systematic and logical application of relevant theory which critically explores elements of the discipline.	Original integration and application of relevant theory which critically evaluates elements of the discipline.

Development of supported/substantiated argument and evidence of analysis and critical reasoning	No evidence of analysis. Unsubstantiated opinions presented. Largely descriptive work not relevant to the task set.	Entirely or almost entirely descriptive, little or no evidence of analysis. Has accepted information uncritically. Unsubstantiated opinions usually present.	Limited evidence of analysis, work is mainly descriptive, uncritical acceptance of information, and unsubstantiated opinions may be evident.	Evidence of analysis using simple logic and some use of critical argument. On balance the work is still descriptive.	Analysis of a range of information. Arguments are coherent and critical with appropriate amounts of evidence; substantiated opinions are presented.	Relevant information is analysed using defined techniques and principles. Arguments are critical and concise. Opinions are justified using evidence.	Relevant information is fluently synthesised to formulate critical arguments which are concisely presented. These are sustained throughout to form a coherent piece which evidences an analytical approach to information handling.
Use of resources and information, evidence of selection and engagement with relevant resources (academic/ discipline based/ current information and data).	No evidence of reading. Academic conventions and referencing have been largely ignored.	Evidence of indiscriminate reading. Academic conventions and referencing have been applied but there are numerous errors.	Limited evidence of reading. Academic conventions and referencing have been applied inconsistently.	Evidence of reading. Literature is accurately but, descriptively utilised. Academic conventions and referencing have been correctly applied.	Evidence of reading beyond keys texts which, is used appropriately to substantiate opinions. Academic conventions and referencing have been correctly and consistently	Relevant evidence is presented which suggests a critical engagement with the literature. Academic conventions and referencing have been correctly and consistently	Relevant evidence is presented which suggests a critical engagement with current research literature(s). Academic conventions and referencing have been correctly and consistently applied.

					applied.	applied.	
Relevant technical and transferable skills development to include data analysis and numeracy where appropriate	Seriously lacking in evidence of skills development or application	Weak evidence of relevant skills development or application	Good demonstration of relevant skills in problem-solving	Strong demonstration of relevant skills in problem-solving	Very strong demonstration of relevant skills in problem-solving	Excellent demonstration of relevant skills in problem-solving	Exceptional demonstration of relevant skills in problem-solving
Clear, coherent and appropriate presentation of assessment task (written, recorded, oral, etc.), full acknowledgement through correct use of referencing conventions of the source of ideas/information/quotes etc and accurate use of English (including spelling punctuation and grammar).	Unstructured, very disorganised and/or incoherent. Inappropriate style of presentation. Poor use of English	Minimal attempt to address the task, poorly structured and generally disorganised. Incorrect or inconsistent style of presentation. Poor use of English	Addresses the task but shows limited evidence of technical competence, the submission is organised but there are numerous shortcomings in style and formatting. Acceptable level of English	Addresses the task appropriately and indicates technical competence. The submission is organised and there are few errors in style and formatting. Appropriate use of English	Addresses the task clearly and evidences technical competence. The submission is generally well-organised and there are few errors in style and formatting. Appropriate use of English	Interprets the task to present an original piece which evidences a confident grasp of technical conventions. The submission is deftly organised with only slight errors in style and formatting.	Interprets the task in an original fashion to present a piece which demonstrates a sophisticated grasp of technical convention. The submission is highly organised with no discernible errors. accurate

						accurate English use.	English use.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--------------------------	--------------

Level 5	0-34 Fail	35-39 Marginal fail	40-49 Adequate	50-59 Acceptable	60-69 Good	70-79 Excellent	80-100 Outstanding
Knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories, topics and/or practice.	Very unsatisfactory work showing flawed understanding of knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories and/or topics. Omissions and inaccuracies in the work presented.	Weak work. Limited and/or fragmentary knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories and/or topics demonstrated. Some omissions and/or inaccuracies presented.	Simple, largely factual approach showing limited or narrow knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories and/or topics. May include some inaccuracies.	Acceptable work, largely descriptive, showing knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories and/or topics but lacking depth and breadth.	Good and consistent knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories and/or topics. Explanations and some detail presented.	High quality work presenting a detailed discussion of knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories and/or topics.	Outstanding quality work showing detailed knowledge, understanding and exploration of key concepts, theories and/or topics.
Application of knowledge (i.e. concept, theory, topic) and/or skill to the assessment task and practice (assessment brief to include details of the problem to be addressed and skills required plus additional factors to be considered e.g. ethical issues, sustainability factors, environmental factors etc.)	Very limited and/or irrelevant understanding of the discipline. Application of concepts and ideas to the assessment task is also lacking development.	Limited understanding of the discipline and the application of ideas and concepts to the assessment task. Limited links between theory and practice.	Adequate identification and explanation of relevant theories and concepts. Some application to the task but few direct linkages made.	Accurate and generally consistent discussion of theories and concepts with appropriate application to the assessment task. Links made between the theories/concepts and their	Good application of theory and concepts to practice, appropriate and well-articulated links made between the two.	Excellent, detailed application of theory and concepts to practice. Highly appropriate, well developed and articulated links made between theory and practice.	Excellent, detailed exploration and application of theory and concepts to practice. Demonstration of original thought. Highly appropriate and well developed and articulated

				application.			links made between theory and practice.
Development of supported/substantiated argument and evidence of analysis and critical reasoning	Largely irrelevant or inaccurate descriptive work. Views expressed lack logic and are largely unsubstantiated. Some content not relevant to the assessment task.	Largely descriptive work lacking logic or argument development. Little or no evidence of analysis. Has accepted information uncritically. Unsubstantiated opinions usually present.	Limited and inconsistent use of evaluation and critical analysis. Some emerging arguments developing but not always logical, coherent or accurate. Limited critical evaluation of information.	Evidence of use of evaluation and critical analysis to support arguments. May include some errors and inconsistencies. Limited critical evaluation of information.	Evidence of use of evaluation and critical analysis. Development of logical and coherent arguments using supporting evidence. Analysis of a range of information. Some evidence of originality. Critical use of information with some awareness of its limitations.	Consistent use of critical and evaluative skills to develop logical and coherent arguments. Excellent use of a range of supporting information. Evidence of originality and discussion of alternative arguments.	Excellent and consistent use of critical and evaluative skills to develop highly logical and coherent arguments. Excellent and critical use of a range of supporting information. Evidence of originality. Explicit discussion of alternative arguments and a strong awareness of their limitations.
Use of resources and information, evidence of selection and engagement with relevant resources (academic/ discipline based/ current information	No or limited evidence of reading or engaging in taught elements of the module.	Poor engagement with core resources and module information.	Evidence of reading and engagement with core module content. Largely reliant	Engagement with an appropriate range of resources, including information	Engagement with a wide range of resources. Good application of	Good, critical engagement with a wide range of relevant resources.	Excellent, critical engagement with a wide range of relevant resources including current

and data).	No or incoherent use of academic conventions and referencing.	Inconsistent and weak use of academic conventions and referencing.	on taught content. Use of academic conventions and referencing but some inconsistencies and inaccuracies.	beyond the core module content. Referencing and academic conventions largely correct but may have minor inconsistencies and inaccuracies.	referencing and academic conventions with only minor errors or inconsistencies.	Consistent and largely accurate use of referencing and academic conventions.	research informed literature. Consistent and accurate use of referencing and academic conventions.
Relevant technical and transferable skills development to include data analysis and numeracy where appropriate	Seriously lacking in evidence of skills development or application	Weak evidence of relevant skills development or application	Adequate demonstration of application of relevant technical/creative/transferable skills outside of areas in which first studied	Sound demonstration of relevant technical/creative/transferable skills outside of areas in which first studied	Good demonstration of application of relevant technical/creative/transferable skills outside of areas in which first studied	Excellent demonstration of relevant skills in managing and developing own learning and making decisions in relatively complex contexts	Exceptional demonstration of skills in managing and developing own learning and making decisions in complex contexts
Clear, coherent and appropriate presentation of assessment task (written, recorded, oral, etc.), full acknowledgement through correct use of referencing conventions of the source of ideas/information/quotes etc. and accurate use of	Extremely disorganised work, content confusingly expressed. Poor expression and inappropriate style of presentation.	Disorganised work, some or all information and ideas poorly and confusingly expressed. Incorrect or inconsistent style of	Work addresses the task and has a relevant structure but there are some shortcomings in the style of presentation and there may be some errors	Work is structured in a largely coherent manner. The assessment task is correctly addressed and ideas and information are clearly expressed.	Good presentation of work with ideas and information clearly presented. The assessment task is correctly addressed.	Excellent presentation of work with a coherent and consistent structure. Highly effective and clear expression of ideas and	Excellent presentation of work with a coherent and consistent structure. Sophisticated, effective, and possibly innovative,

English (including spelling punctuation and grammar).		presentation.	in use of language.		Good expression of ideas and information.	concepts.	expression of ideas and concepts.
---	--	---------------	---------------------	--	---	-----------	-----------------------------------

Level 6	0-34 Fail	35-39 Marginal fail	40-49 Adequate	50-59 Acceptable	60-69 Good	70-79 Excellent	80-100 Outstanding
Knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories, topics and/or practice.	Unsatisfactory work, weak knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories and topics. Work includes inaccuracies and no awareness of latest research and developments in the discipline. No demonstration of the application of discipline-specific specialist skills.	Weak and fragmentary knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories and topics. Work includes omissions and/or inaccuracies and no or limited awareness of latest research and developments in the discipline. Little demonstration of the application of discipline-specific specialist skills.	Factual and largely descriptive knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories and topics. Narrow interpretation/coverage of the discipline. Limited awareness of latest research and developments in the discipline. Demonstrated some application of discipline-specific specialist skills.	Acceptable work, largely descriptive, showing knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories and/or topics but lacking depth and breadth. Some awareness of latest research and developments in the discipline. Demonstrated application of discipline-specific specialist skills.	Good and consistent knowledge, understanding and explanation of key concepts, theories and/or topics. Awareness of latest research and developments in the discipline beyond core lecture/seminar content. Demonstrated an accomplished application of discipline-specific specialist skills.	Detailed and thorough discussion of knowledge, understanding of key concepts, theories and/or topics. Discussion informed by latest research and developments in the discipline beyond core lecture/seminar content. Demonstrated an extremely accomplished application of discipline-specific specialist skills.	Exceptional knowledge of the subject and critical understanding of theories and concepts. Critical evaluation explicitly informed by latest research and developments in the discipline. Demonstrated an accomplished and innovative application of discipline-specific specialist skills.
Application of knowledge (i.e. concept, theory, topic) and/or skill to the assessment task and	Very weak and/or irrelevant understanding	Limited understanding of the application of	Relevant and appropriate understanding of the	Accurate and largely consistent application of theories,	Good, consistent, accurate and logical	Detailed, consistent, accurate and logical	Exceptional application of theories, concepts and ideas to

practice (assessment brief to include details of the problem to be addressed and skills required plus additional factors to be considered e.g. ethical issues, sustainability factors, environmental factors etc.)	of the application of theories, concepts and ideas to practice. No or only occasional links between theory and practice made.	theories, concepts and ideas to practice. Only occasional links and applications made and no evidence of evaluation.	application of theories, concepts and ideas to practice demonstrated. Some links between theory and practice made, adequate but limited evaluation.	concepts and ideas to practice. Appropriate links and applications made and acceptable evidence of evaluation.	application of theories, concepts and ideas to practice. Clearly articulated links and applications made and good evidence of evaluation.	application of theories, concepts and ideas to practice. Clearly articulated and reasoned links and applications made and evidence of excellent evaluation using current research and information.	practice. Clearly articulated and reasoned links and applications made demonstrating outstanding skills. Evidence of evaluation using current research and information.
Development of supported/substantiated argument and evidence of analysis and critical reasoning	Largely irrelevant or inaccurate descriptive work. No or very limited evidence of evaluation or analysis. No evidence of originality.	Largely descriptive work, weak or superficial evaluation and analysis. Information accepted uncritically and arguments are unsubstantiated. No evidence of originality.	Limited use of critical evaluation. Judgements and arguments are present but not always appropriately supported and substantiated. Omissions and inconsistencies may be present. Limited	Largely logical and coherent judgements and substantiated arguments presented. Use of critical evaluation skills demonstrated but some omissions and inconsistencies still present. Some evidence	Sound use of critical evaluation to make well informed judgements and substantiated arguments. Use of appropriate supporting evidence. Work shows sine originality and understanding	Excellent and detailed use of critical analysis and evaluation to make well informed judgements and coherent, substantiated arguments. Clearly articulated links between different	Exceptional and detailed use of critical analysis and evaluation. Judgements and arguments are well informed, substantiated, accurate and consistent. Excellent use of supporting evidence. High levels of originality

			evidence of originality.	and examples of originality and understanding of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge.	of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge . Very limited inconsistencies and inaccuracies.	elements of the key arguments. Use of appropriate supporting evidence. Work shows originality and clear understanding of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge.	and clear understanding of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge..
Use of resources and information, evidence of selection and engagement with relevant resources (academic/ discipline based/ current information and data).	No or limited evidence of reading or engaging in taught elements of the module. No or incoherent use of academic conventions and referencing.	Poor engagement with core resources and module information. No evidence of wider reading. Inconsistent and weak use of academic conventions and referencing.	Evidence of reading and engagement with core module content. Largely reliant on taught content. Use of academic conventions and referencing but may show some inconsistencies and inaccuracies.	Engagement with an appropriate range of resources, including literature informed by latest research and information beyond the core module content. Referencing and academic conventions largely correct but may have minor	Critical engagement with an appropriate range of resources, including literature informed by latest research and information beyond the core module content. Sound application of referencing and	Critical engagement with a good range of resources, including literature informed by latest research and information beyond the core module content. Consistent and accurate	Excellent and creative critical engagement with a wide range of relevant resources including current research informed literature and information beyond the core content of the module. Consistent and accurate use of referencing and academic

				inconsistencies and inaccuracies.	academic conventions with no or very minor inconsistencies and inaccuracies.	application of referencing and academic conventions.	conventions.
Relevant technical and transferable skills development to include data analysis and numeracy where appropriate	Seriously lacking in ability to apply relevant skills and/or little evidence of ability to manage own Learning and problem solve	Weak evidence of application of relevant skills or communication of information and ideas and/or limited ability to take responsibility for and reflect on own work and problems solve	Adequate demonstration of application of skills outside of areas in which first studied Including some evidence of communicating information, ideas, problems and solutions together with appropriate ability to manage, take responsibility for, and reflect on own work and problem solve	Sound demonstration of application of relevant skills outside of areas in which first studied including: communicating information, ideas, problems and solutions verbally, electronically and in writing – to both specialist and non-specialist audiences, together with good ability to manage, take responsibility for, and reflect on own work and problem solve	Very good demonstration of application of relevant skills outside of areas in which first studied Including: communicating information, ideas, problems and solutions verbally, electronically and in writing – to both specialist and non-specialist audiences. Strong ability to manage, initiate and critically reflect on own work and problem solve	Excellent demonstration of application of relevant skills in new contexts including: communicating information, ideas, problems and solutions to an high level verbally, electronically and in writing – to both specialist and non-specialist audiences. Excellent management of learning using personal initiative and ability to critically reflect independently on own work	Exceptional demonstration of application of relevant skills in new contexts. Including: communicating information, ideas, problems and solutions to an accomplished level verbally, electronically and in writing – to both specialist and non-specialist audiences Exceptional management of learning using personal initiative and ability to critically reflect independently on own work and problem solve

						and problem solve.	
Clear, coherent and appropriate presentation of assessment task (written, recorded, oral, etc.), full acknowledgement through correct use of referencing conventions of the source of ideas/information/quotes etc and accurate use of English (including spelling punctuation and grammar).	Extremely disorganised work, content confusingly expressed and does not address the task requirements. Very poor expression and inappropriate style of presentation.	Disorganised work, some or all information and ideas poorly and confusingly expressed. Incorrect or inconsistent style of presentation.	Work addresses the task and has a relevant structure but there are some shortcomings in the style of presentation. Relevant ideas and concepts are reasonably expressed. There may be some errors in use of language.	Work addresses the task and has a relevant structure. No or very few shortcomings in style of presentation. Relevant ideas and concepts are clearly expressed. Good use of language.	Good, competent presentation of ideas and concepts. Work addresses the task and has a good structure. Work is clearly expressed with very few errors in style and formatting. Good use of language.	Excellent presentation of ideas and concepts. Work addresses the task and has a coherent and consistent structure. Work is effectively and clearly expressed with no or very few errors in style and formatting. Good use of language.	Excellent presentation of work with a coherent and consistent structure. Sophisticated, effective, and possibly innovative, expression of ideas and concepts. No errors in style and formatting. Good use of language.

Level 7 Generic Marking Criteria	0-39 Fail	40-49 Marginal fail	50-59 Acceptable	60-69 Good	70-79 Excellent	80-100 Outstanding
Development of supported/substantiated argument and evidence of analysis and critical reasoning	Lacks analysis and development of a supported and substantiated argument. No or	Weak and/or ineffective analysis and development of a supported and	Evidence of analysis and development of critical thought and reasoning.	Evidence of strong critical thought and reasoning. Development of original supported	Excellent analysis and development of critical thought and reasoning. Use of complex arguments, including	Exceptional and thorough analysis and development of critical thought and reasoning. Use of highly complex

	very limited evidence of critical thought.	substantiated argument. Limited evidence of critical thought and originality.	Development of original supported and substantiated argument and associated conclusions but more depth required.	and substantiated argument, including consideration of alternative perspectives, and presentation of convincing, conclusions.	consideration of different perspectives. Development of detailed and convincing conclusions. Work shows originality.	and current arguments, including consideration of different perspectives. Work shows originality. Synthesis and development of detailed and convincing conclusions.
Use of resources and information, evidence of selection and engagement with relevant resources (academic/ discipline based/ current information and data).	Little or no evidence of reading and engagement with core module content. No engagement with information beyond the taught content. Use of academic conventions and referencing missing or very limited and includes inconsistencies and inaccuracies.	Limited evidence of reading and engagement with core module content. Largely reliant on taught content. Use of academic conventions and referencing is limited and includes inconsistencies and inaccuracies.	Engagement with a range of resources, including literature informed by latest research and information beyond the core module content. Some evidence of self-directed research and scholarship. Referencing and academic conventions largely correct but may have minor inconsistencies and inaccuracies.	Critical engagement with a wide range of relevant resources including some use of material at the forefront of current research. Is able to evaluate methodologies critically and produces work with a well-defined focus. Evidence of self-directed and independent research and scholarship. Good use of referencing and academic conventions with no or very minor inconsistencies and inaccuracies.	Critical engagement with a wide range of relevant resources including those at the forefront of current research. Shows outstanding ability to evaluate methodologies critically and deal with a range of complex issues both systematically and creatively. Evidence of self-directed and independent research and scholarship. Consistent and accurate use of referencing and academic conventions.	Excellent and creative critical engagement with a wide range of relevant resources including those at the forefront of current research. Evidence of self-directed and proficient research and scholarship. Consistent and accurate use of referencing and academic conventions.

<p>Research</p>	<p>Demonstrates little or no skill in selected techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship. Significant inadequacies in research design or analysis, indicating limited understanding and/or ability to deal with complex issues or make sound judgements. References to literature/ evidence and use of academic conventions are flawed or inconsistent.</p>	<p>Demonstrates some skill in selected techniques applicable to own research. Research findings not presented effectively and research design/ application and/or interpretation of data is flawed, with little reflection or analysis of this</p>	<p>Research complex issues systematically and creatively and make sound academically rigorous judgements in analysis and interpretation of outcomes, albeit with minor limitations. Makes consistently sound use of academic conventions and integrity. Able to communicate argument, evidence and conclusions clearly to specialist and non-specialist audiences.</p>	<p>Research complex issues systematically and creatively, drawing on thorough skills, knowledge and understanding to make independently sound, academically rigorous judgements in analysis and interpretation of outcomes. Shows some originality in application of knowledge, and some understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge. Makes consistently sound use of academic conventions and integrity. Able to communicate argument, evidence and conclusions clearly to specialist and non-specialist audiences.</p>	<p>Research complex issues systematically and creatively, drawing on a mastery of analytical and specialist disciplinary skills, knowledge and understanding to make original contributions to scholarship in the field Shows originality in application of knowledge, and excellent understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline. Makes consistently excellent use of academic conventions and integrity. Able to communicate at very high level arguments, evidence and conclusions to specialist and non-specialist audiences. Displays an exceptional grasp of techniques applicable to own research.</p>	<p>The work meets and often exceeds the standard for distinction as described in the 70-79 band, across all sub-categories of criteria: knowledge and understanding of subject; cognitive skills; research skills; use of research informed literature and resources; and transferable skills for life and professional employment. The work is of publishable quality, with only very minor amendments, and would be likely to receive that judgement if submitted to a peer reviewed journal. The work is of such outstanding quality that the student is highly capable of doctoral research in the discipline</p>
-----------------	---	--	--	---	---	---

Relevant technical and transferable skills development to include data analysis and numeracy where appropriate	Very limited evidence of advanced skills development, serious lack of professional judgement and inability to demonstrate self-direction	Insufficient evidence of advanced skills development, lack of professional judgement and/or little or no demonstration of ability to manage own learning, take personal responsibility or initiative	Consistent and effective demonstration at a professional level of application of relevant technical/creative/transferable skills in managing and developing own learning and making autonomous decisions	Capable and effective application at a professional level of command of relevant technical/creative/transferable skills in managing and developing own learning and making autonomous decisions in complex and unpredictable contexts	Excellent demonstration at a professional level of competency in relevant technical/creative/transferable skills to manage and develop own learning and make autonomous decisions in complex and unpredictable contexts. Demonstrates high level communication skills in a range of complex contexts, and ability to write at a very high standard. Demonstrates autonomy and notable originality in tackling and solving demanding problems	Shows a very high level of employability skill, including team working, project management and IT / computer literacy. Exceptional demonstration at a professional level of competency in relevant technical/creative/transferable skills to manage and develop own learning and make autonomous decisions in complex and unpredictable contexts. Demonstrates very high-level communication skills in a range of complex contexts, and ability to write at an exceptionally high standard. Demonstrates autonomy and notable originality in tackling and solving demanding problems

Clear, coherent and appropriate presentation of assessment task (written, recorded, oral, etc.), full acknowledgement through correct use of referencing conventions of the source of ideas/information/quotes etc and accurate use of English (including spelling punctuation and grammar).	Extremely disorganised work, content confusingly expressed and does not address the task requirements. Very poor expression and inappropriate style of presentation.	Disorganised work, some or all information and ideas poorly and confusingly expressed. Incorrect or inconsistent style of presentation.	Work addresses the task and has a relevant structure. No or very few shortcomings in style of presentation. Relevant ideas and concepts are clearly expressed. Good use of language.	Good, competent presentation of ideas and concepts. Work addresses the task set and has a good structure. Work is clearly expressed with very few errors in style and formatting. Good use of language.	Excellent presentation of ideas and concepts. Work addresses the task and has a coherent and consistent structure resulting. Work is effectively, clearly and persuasively expressed with no or very few errors in style and formatting. Good use of language.	Excellent presentation skills demonstrated with work having a coherent and consistent structure. Sophisticated, effective and innovative expression of ideas and concepts. Impressive clarity of expression, work may be close to publishable or exhibit able quality. No errors in style and formatting. Good use of language.
--	--	---	--	---	--	---

