



## **ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT STRATEGY\***

2017–2018

### **Principles of Assessment**

As a College, Mattersey Hall is committed to high academic standards and to offering our students high quality learning opportunities. An important part of that is an appropriate assessment strategy that is robust, fair, transparent, and ensures that students are properly rewarded for the work they do.

In line with what is expected of an effective assessment strategy, we seek to offer:

- A range of assessments that are related to learning outcomes, that are appropriate to the level of study, and that give students a fair and equal opportunity to demonstrate knowledge and understanding and to be properly rewarded for their work;
- Clear instructions regarding the form of assessment (e.g. coursework, examination, presentation), the number of words (including tolerances), the weighting in terms of marks for each component of an assessment (where relevant), the presentation, the deadline for submission, and details of any penalties for late submission or word-count violations;
- Clear guidance about seeking extensions and deferrals;
- A clearly set out marking criteria for all levels of study;
- An efficient process of anonymous marking, monitoring and feedback to students, which offers both formative and summative assessment;
- Clear information about how and why a particular mark has been given, and guidance as to how students may improve their marks in the future;
- A clearly stated time-frame within which students may expect to receive feedback; and timely communication where that time-frame may be exceeded;
- Clear information regarding complaints and appeals;
- Clear information about progression, awards and classification, compensation, re-submission of failed assignments and academic malpractice procedures.

### **The Assessment Process**

#### **Appropriate assessment**

Learning outcomes for each module, and the way these inform assessment are set out in the module descriptor. The module descriptor also indicates the form of assessment and, in the case of more than one component, how each component is weighted.

In accordance with University of Chester guidelines, assessment for Levels 4 – 6 is equivalent to 2000 words per 10 credits. For modules at Level 7 the assessment is 4500 or 5000 per 20 credits. Further details of assignments are included in the Module Descriptors and on the Moodle page for the module. In

---

\* Our assessment strategy is in accordance with the University of Chester's *Quality and Standards Manual: Handbook F*.

each case there is a tolerance of 10%, with a penalty of 5% for every 1000 words (or part thereof) over the allowed limit (there is no direct penalty for assignments that are under the word-count).

Bibliographies and titles, together with references and brief explanations in footnotes are excluded from the overall word-count. More substantial footnotes, which continue the discussion of the main text, should be included in the word-count.

Assignments are normally set by the on-campus lecturer for the respective module, and submitted, via the Director of Studies, to the External Examiner for approval. Soon after the beginning of the module students are informed of the assignment titles and the deadline(s) for submission. It is expected that, unless in exceptional circumstances, those lecturers will also mark student assignments, thus ensuring that students are fully aware of what is required of them.

Forms of assessment are subject to scrutiny by external examiners and are monitored and reviewed annually by the Board of Studies. Changes are submitted as part of the Programme Renewal Pack.

Students recognised as having learning disabilities are given additional support. This may include:

- An automatic two-week extension of coursework submission deadlines;
- Additional time in examinations of 25%;
- Where appropriate examinations may be completed using a 'clean' laptop, or with the assistance of an amanuensis.
- Where appropriate (e.g. in the case of profoundly deaf students) assignments may be completed on video and transcribed for submission by a support assistant.

### **Extensions, deferrals and mitigating circumstances**

Where a student has good reason, an extension to the assessment deadline, normally of up to two weeks, may be given. Students are required to fill in the appropriate form (EX1), which is available for download from the Resources section of the MHC website, and submit it, with appropriate corroborating evidence, that specifically relates to the assessment period, to the Academic Department. Please note the following:

- Extensions will normally be granted only where the circumstances leading to the request for an extension are exceptional or cannot have reasonably been foreseen.
- Applications for extensions will be considered **ONLY** when properly submitted to the Academic Department using the correct form, and providing appropriate corroborating evidence.
- An application for an extension does not guarantee that an extension will be given, so students are advised to apply as early as possible – since if an application is submitted very close to the deadline and subsequently refused, there may be no time to submit the assignment in time, thus incurring late submission penalties.
- Where it is not practical to submit an EX1 or where corroborating evidence is not available before the assignment deadline, students should follow the Mitigating Circumstances procedure (see below).

Where granting an extension means that a student will not have completed the assessment before the relevant Subject Assessment or Awards Assessment Board, it is necessary to complete, instead, a deferral form (DF1), and submit it in the same way. Deferrals will be passed on to the University of Chester, by the Academic Department, for approval at an appropriate Board.

If a student misses an assessment deadline, or fails to attend an examination, for good reason, and it was not possible to request an extension or deferral in advance, it is possible to apply for mitigating circumstances. This should be done as soon as possible after the missed assessment. The appropriate form

(MC1) needs to be completed and returned to the Academic Department, together with corroborating evidence. Applications for mitigating circumstances, like deferrals, need to be passed on to the University of Chester for approval at an appropriate Mitigating Circumstances Board.

If mitigating circumstances affect coursework that has already been submitted or an examination that has been taken, an application may still be made, and if approved, the coursework may be resubmitted as a deferred submission. Alternatively, the examination may be taken again in the next assessment period. The mark for the re-submitted assessment will replace any original mark (even if that the new mark is lower).

For further information about Extensions, Deferrals and Mitigating Circumstances, see information on the University of Chester portal (please note access to this page requires login details):

<https://portal.chester.ac.uk/registryservices/SiteAssets/Pages/extensions/Guide%20to%20Mitigating%20Circumstances%202014-15.docx>

### **Marking criteria**

Marking criteria for levels 4 – 8 of study are attached. These are based on the Learning Outcomes of Module Descriptors, which reflect the outcomes of the programmes, and on the University of Chester's *Quality and Standards Manual: Handbook F - Requirements Governing the Assessment of Students 2016/17* – Appendices 5E (Levels 4–6), 5F (Level 7) and 5G (Level 8). These have been further adapted to set out separate criteria for each of Levels 4, 5 and 6.

A student's mark will be based on how well he or she performs against the marking criteria, with no limit on how many students fall into a particular band. In general, the marker will first identify the band into which the assessment fits, and then determine the mark on the basis of where in the band it falls (high end, middle, bottom end). Whilst that part of the grading does not involve comparison with other students, where two or more students' assignments are graded in the same area of the same band, the specific marks given may reflect their relative worth.

Markers are encouraged to use the full range of marks available (including 80% + for very exceptional work). Where a mark of 49%, 59% or 69% is given, markers are asked to consider, carefully, whether the work might satisfy enough of the marking criteria in the next band to justify giving the extra percentage point and moving it into that band. If the marker is satisfied that the essay falls just short of the criteria for the next band, the mark should stand.

### **Submission and marking**

Coursework assignments are submitted via the Chester University Moodle site. This is to enable the submissions to be processed by Turnitin plagiarism detection software. Information about the submission of assignments is the subject of both induction and specific training sessions with students. Information about deadlines is pre-entered for each assignment, and the software records late submissions.

Assignments remain anonymous until a pre-arranged release date, usually around 4 working weeks after submission. During this time they are marked and graded online, and monitored or second-marked as required. After the release date the system returns them to students.

In accordance with rules set out by the University of Chester, students are penalised by 5% for every twenty-four hour period (or part thereof) that the essay is submitted after the deadline. Where an assignment receives a simple Pass or Fail (as in the case of taught DMin modules), any late assignment will be deemed to have failed.

Marks given will normally be whole numbers. Where an assignment has several components, the overall mark for the module is based on the marks and weightings of the individual components, and is then rounded to the nearest whole number (i.e. 0.5, and above, is rounded up; less than 0.5 is rounded down). These rounded numbers are then used in determining average overall grades for the year.

Marking of assignments includes formative and summative assessment.

- Markers are expected to consult the marking criteria and give a summative assessment that reflects the appropriate level and grade for the assignment.
- Markers are also expected to include formative comments that will help the student to improve performance in future assignments.

#### *Anonymous marking*

Students' names do not appear on submitted assignments. All students are allocated a unique reference number, which is used as the identifier for assignments, thus ensuring that, at the point of marking, assessment is anonymous.

#### *Second marking and monitoring:*

See UoC *Quality and Standards Manual: Handbook F*, Section 5 and Appendix 5B.

[Note: for the purpose of this document, 'double marking' is used, specifically, where all of the assignments in a batch, rather than a sample of assignments, are second marked. 'Monitoring' refers to second marking a sample of assignments; the procedures for monitoring are a little different – see below.]

At Level 4 all assignments given a fail grade will be second marked. No other second marking at Level 4 is necessary.

At Levels 5 and 6, a sample of assignments will be monitored in order to check the consistency of marking. The sample will comprise: (a) the highest marked assignment, (b) all assignments first marked at 40% or below, and (c) at least 5 others spread across grade classifications (or all of the assignments, if there are fewer than 5). In cohorts of 25 or above the number in category (c) may be increased to ensure that the sample includes at least 25% of the total number of assignments (see *Quality and Standards Manual: Handbook F*, Section 5.2). [Though see below].

All assignments in the sample first marked at 40% and below, or 69% and above, will be second marked. Where the second marker proposes a change, a final mark will be agreed between first and second markers. In such cases, the second marker will record comments and proposed marks on the monitoring form. These should form part of the discussion leading to the agreed mark, which will also be recorded on the monitoring form. In line with the University of Chester guidelines, only the first-marker's comments and the agreed mark will be communicated in feedback to students (though under FOI students have a right to access other comments made about them). The first marker may also want to adjust remarks in the light of the second marker's comments and the finally agreed mark. Where no agreement can be reached, the marks will be referred to the Academic Dean (as the nominee of the Chair of the Assessment Board) for arbitration and a final decision. Where a monitor proposes a change to a mark of 69% or above, then the monitor shall also consider all other assignments in that category (including those not part of the sample). **In the light of this, it is our normal policy to include all assignments first-marked at 69% and above in the initial sample**, though this may also mean increasing the sample size in order to include a representative spread across other grade classifications.

For assignments first marked at 41%–68%, no changes to individual marks should be proposed, and comments should not be recorded. The monitor puts a tick in the box on the monitoring form to indicate that assignments have been looked at, and in a separate section indicates whether, in his or her opinion, the overall marks given are about right or there is a general trend of marking that is too high or too low, requiring a shift in the marks of the whole cohort. A mark that differs by 2% or less suggests broad agreement, and, consequently, we would expect a monitor to recommend a cohort shift of less than 3% only in exceptional circumstances. If, as a result of movement of the marks of the cohort, additional marks fall into the categories of 40% or below or 69% and above, they, too, will be treated in accordance with the guidelines set out above. Note that papers that were previously assessed as 40% or below or 69% and above, and were subject to second marking, will receive the agreed mark, and will not be included in the cohort shift.

For Levels 7 and above all assignments are routinely second marked (i.e. double marked), in accordance with the instructions for second marking (not monitoring) above.

#### *External examiners*

Marked assignments, together with details of second marking and/or monitoring, are available to external examiners for further scrutiny. External Examiners routinely look at assignments at Level 7 and above. They will normally choose a sample of marked assessments below Level 7.

All marks are provisional until confirmed by the external examiners; and the decision of the external examiners regarding marks should be considered final.

#### **Return of assignments**

Under normal circumstances in accordance with University of Chester guidelines, assignments should be marked and, where appropriate, second marked, within four working weeks of the assignment deadline, or examination date. This corresponds to the ‘post-date’ set for assignments, after which students can access marked assignments on the University of Chester Moodle site, and have access, too, to comments and the provisional mark.

If, for any reason, that four-week time-frame is likely to be exceeded, students will be kept fully informed of the reasons for the delay and notified of the expected new date by which the marked assignments will be available.

In general, the four-week period will be broken down as follows:

- First-markers are expected to mark the work within two to three weeks of receipt;
- Second marking and monitoring will take place in the one to two weeks following the return of scripts by the first marker.

## **Academic appeals**

### *Appeals against a particular mark*

If a student does not understand the mark given for an assignment he or she may discuss this with the lecturer for explanation. However, there are no grounds of appeal against academic judgement. The marking process is monitored internally and scrutinised by external examiners to ensure that the mark received is fair. Consequently, there are no grounds of appealing a particular mark.

### *Missed deadlines*

Students are expected to take all reasonable steps to ensure the safety and security of assignments, and to take full personal responsibility for attendance at examinations and the timely submission of assignments.

Things that are not grounds for appeal include (but are not limited to):

- Missing deadlines because of computer, multimedia or transport difficulties;
- Losing work due to computer or multimedia failure;
- Failing to read an examination timetable correctly;
- Employment commitments;
- Work entrusted to another person or a postal or other service for delivery not submitted on time.

### *Academic appeals – grounds and procedure*

If a student has a legitimate concern about the decision made by an Awards Assessment Board regarding progression or the level of award given, there is a right to request that that decision be reviewed.

Academic appeals must be made within 14 days of the official publication of results, on the Academic Appeal Form, clearly stating the grounds on which the appeal is being made.

Legitimate reasons for an appeal include:

- The assessment was not conducted according to the relevant regulations, leading to a substantial negative impact on the assessment outcome;
- There was an administrative error that resulted in a substantial negative impact on the assessment outcome;

For further guidance regarding Academic Appeals, see Section 10 of the *Quality and Standards Manual: Handbook F*.

## **Compensation and resubmission**

### *Resubmission*

The pass mark for a module (or any specified module component) is 40%. Where the assessment for a module is made up of more than one assignment the mark for the module is the weighted average of the components (rounded to the nearest whole number). If that weighted average is 40% or above, and 20% or above was achieved in all components, the module is passed. If less than 20% was achieved in any component, even if the weighted average is 40% or above, the module is failed, with a mark of 39%.

If no assignment is submitted it will be marked as 'non-submission' and receive a mark of zero.

Failed assignments (or failed components of assignments) may be resubmitted. There is no need to resubmit components that have received a mark of 40% or above; these will be carried forward into calculations following reassessment. No failed marks will be carried forward, even where they are higher than marks obtained on reassessment.

Resubmission of assignments would normally take place in time for the next available Module or Awards Assessment Board.

All resubmitted work for UG and MA modules will be capped at 40%, though, to help the student, the marker will give formative feedback and a summative grade as if the assignment was being marked for the first time. Where any part of the assessment of a module has been resubmitted, the overall mark for the module will also be capped at 40%, even though the weighted average following resubmission may be higher than that. In the case of taught DMin modules, assignments are graded only as pass or fail. Failed assignments may be resubmitted.

In the event of a resubmitted assignment also failing, students may request the opportunity to make a third attempt. This will be granted only to students who have offered resubmissions in all components where a reassessment was required. Where a student has been given the opportunity for a resubmission, but has not submitted, there will be no opportunity for a third attempt.

### *Compensation*

Under certain circumstances, a failed module can be compensated, and a student does not need to resubmit work. However, the fail mark will appear on the student's transcript and, where appropriate, will be included in calculations of the degree classification.

Undergraduate students may be compensated for

- 40 credits at Level 4
- 20 credits at Level 5
- 20 credits at Level 6

Compensation may only be applied if:

- The overall module mark is 30% or above, and no component has achieved less than 20%;
- No more than the allowed number of credits at each level (see the list above) has been failed. If those numbers are exceeded, no compensation may be applied and all failed assignments must be resubmitted. If the number of credits allowed for compensation is not exceeded, any eligible modules may be compensated. Assignments for modules not eligible for compensation (e.g. where the overall mark was less than 30% or less than 20% was achieved in a component) must be resubmitted.
- All other modules presented to the same board have been completed successfully, and the overall average all modules presented at that board – including the failed module(s) – is 40% or above. Please take special note that this average mark is based only on *modules presented to the same assessment board as the module(s) for which compensation is sought*, and not to the overall average of all modules at the same level.

### **Progression and award classification**

#### *Undergraduate Students*

In order to progress or to receive an award, a student must pass, or have compensated, 120 credits at each level.

The degree classification is based on the following

- A weighted average of Level 5 (one-third) and Level six (two-thirds) marks (expressed to two decimal places). Level 4 marks are not included in the calculation. If numerical marks (rather than

APL) are available for all 120 credits at that level, the lowest mark (to a value of 20 credits) at each of Level 5 and Level 6 may be excluded from the calculation of the average mark.

- The following classifications apply:

69.50% +	First class honours
59.50–69.49%	Upper second class honours (2.1)
49.50–59.49%	Lower second class honours (2.2)
39.50–49.49%	Third class honours
0–39.49%	Fail

- Where a student's average mark is within 3% of a classification boundary (i.e. 47.00–49.49%, 57.00–59.49%, 67.00–69.49%), he or she will be awarded the higher classification if half (or more) of the credits are at the higher level.

### *Masters Level students*

In order to receive an award a student must pass 60 credits for a PGCert; 120 credits for a PGDip; 180 credits for an MA. Only the MA receives a classification.

MA modules are assessed on the following basis:

70–100	Distinction
60–69	Merit
40–59	Pass
0–39	Fail

To achieve an overall classification, students must achieve that classification (or above) in at least half of the credits. The overall average mark is not considered in this process.

### **Academic malpractice**

#### *Definition*

Academic malpractice includes (but is not confined to):

- Using, without acknowledgement, another person's words or ideas and submitting them for assessment as though they were your own, for instance by copying, using essay mills, translating from one language to another or unacknowledged paraphrasing;
- Failure to identify, clearly, material that is reproduced verbatim (or near verbatim) as quotations (even where the material may be referenced);
- Falsification of data;
- Collusion;
- Cheating in examinations.

#### *Academic malpractice procedure*

If an invigilator suspects academic malpractice in an examination, he or she should allow the student to continue (if that can be done without disturbing other students). The invigilator should call another invigilator as witness, and if unauthorised material is present, that should be removed. The point at which the infringement occurred should be noted on the cover of the answer book. The invigilator and student should then meet with the Director of Studies or Academic Dean who will record the allegation of



malpractice. Where appropriate, the allegation, with supporting evidence will be sent to the nominee of the Module Assessment Board (MAB) Chair (currently the Academic Dean) for further action.

The use of Turnitin plagiarism detection software makes certain forms of academic malpractice in coursework more evident. Each submitted assignment will receive an originality report. That report needs to be interpreted by the marker, and a high score does not necessarily imply academic malpractice. It does, though, provide an indicator for further consideration. If a marker does suspect academic malpractice in coursework, he or she first needs to speak to the Director of Studies, who will then liaise with the Academic Dean to confirm that what is alleged is indeed academic malpractice. If confirmed, the assignment will be referred to the University and dealt with using the Academic Malpractice procedure. Details are provided in Section 6 of the *Quality and Standards Manual: Handbook F*. In each case, students suspected of academic malpractice will be invited to a meeting with the local nominee of the MAB Chair at the University of Chester (currently the Academic Dean) for an explanation of the allegations, and so as to have an opportunity to respond. In the case of first offences at Level 4, the issue is dealt with by the local nominee of the MAB Chair, who will impose a prescribed penalty. In all other cases, or where the student challenges the allegations, the issue is referred to an Academic Malpractice Panel at the University of Chester.

If it is decided to proceed with the case, the student will be contacted by the University with details of the allegation, and inviting a written response, within seven working days.

On receipt of the letter alleging Academic Malpractice the student may:

- Accept the charge and any penalty incurred;
- Appeal the charge and request to appear before the Academic Malpractice Panel. A student appearing before the panel has the right to see and respond to any evidence against him or her. The student may also choose to have a personal representative present.

Following the Academic Malpractice Panel the student will be informed of the decision and of the penalty. Mattersey Hall and the University of Chester take matters of academic malpractice very seriously, and penalties, particular for second and subsequent offences are likely to be severe.

#### *Academic malpractice appeals*

Because the decision of the Academic Malpractice Panel is a matter of academic judgement, a student may not appeal the decision on the grounds of disagreement. Other grounds for academic appeal may be available. See *Quality and Standards Manual: Handbook F*, Section 10.

# MARKING CRITERIA - Levels 4, 5, 6

Marking criteria taken from University of Chester, *Quality and Standards Manual: Handbook F - Requirements Governing the Assessment of Students 2016/17* (Appendix 5E)

Key areas	Grade	L4	L5	L6
<b>KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING</b> Range and relevance of reading and research; breadth and depth of knowledge; understanding of subject area	80+	As 70–79: wide-ranging research and insight.	As 70–79: wide-ranging research and insight.	As 70–79: wide-ranging research and insight.
	70–79	Excellent command of a good range of relevant material; extensive coverage of topic; excellent understanding of key issues, concepts and arguments.	Excellent command of relevant, extensively-researched material; extensive coverage of topic; excellent critical understanding of key issues, concepts and arguments.	Excellent command of relevant, extensively-researched material, including some at the forefront of the discipline; extensive coverage of topic; excellent systematic understanding of key issues, concepts and arguments.
	60–69	Wide range of core and background reading, used effectively; good breadth and depth of knowledge; good understanding of subject area, and key issues.	Wide range of core and background reading, used effectively; good breadth and depth of knowledge; good critical understanding of subject area, and key issues.	Wide range of core and background reading, used effectively; good breadth and depth of knowledge; good systematic understanding of subject area, and key issues.
	50–59	Reasonable range of relevant sources; central issues identified, but treatment may be patchy; reasonable understanding of subject area and of the main issues.	Reasonable range of relevant sources; central issues identified, but treatment may be patchy; reasonable understanding of subject area and of the main issues.	Reasonable range of relevant sources; central issues identified, but treatment may be patchy; reasonable understanding of subject area and of the main issues.
	40–49	Limited range of sources, and over-reliance on a few; limited knowledge, inaccuracies and some key issues not addressed; partial understanding of subject area.	Limited range of sources, and over-reliance on a few; limited knowledge, inaccuracies and some key issues not addressed; partial understanding of subject area.	Limited range of sources, and over-reliance on a few; limited knowledge, inaccuracies and some key issues not addressed; partial understanding of subject area.
	30–39	Little evidence of background reading; very little detail, with issues poorly identified; little understanding of subject area.	Little evidence of background reading; very little detail, with issues poorly identified; little understanding of subject area.	Little evidence of background reading; very little detail, with issues poorly identified; little understanding of subject area.
	<30	No relevant reading; scant knowledge and understanding of the subject area and key issues.	No relevant reading; scant knowledge and understanding of the subject area and key issues.	No relevant reading; scant knowledge and understanding of the subject area and key issues.

Marking Criteria - Levels 4, 5, 6 (ctd)

<b>CRITICAL ENGAGEMENT WITH SOURCES</b> Use of sources; interpretation and critical engagement with source information.	80+	As 70–79: sophisticated use of source material.	As 70–79: sophisticated use of source material.	As 70–79: sophisticated use of source material.
	70–79	Excellent ability to synthesise a range of views from sources; excellent insight and interpretation; very good, sustained analysis and evaluation of current views.	Excellent ability to set out a range of views from sources; excellent critical insight and interpretation; very good, sustained, critical analysis and evaluation of current views; excellent recognition of the limitations of knowledge and its impact on interpretation.	Excellent ability to synthesise a range of views from sources; excellent critical insight and interpretation; very good, sustained, critical analysis and evaluation of current views; excellent recognition of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limitations of knowledge
	60–69	Good ability to synthesise a range of views from sources; good insight and interpretation; good, sustained, analysis and evaluation of current views.	Good ability to synthesise a range of views from sources; good critical insight and interpretation; good, sustained, critical analysis and evaluation of current views; good recognition of the limitations of knowledge and its impact on interpretation.	Good ability to synthesise a range of views from sources; good critical insight and interpretation; good, sustained, critical analysis and evaluation of current views; good recognition of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limitations of knowledge
	50–59	Evidence of engagement with sources and drawing information together; may be largely descriptive; ideas may be stated but not developed.	Evidence of engagement with sources and drawing information together; may be partly descriptive, with some critical analysis; ideas may be stated but not developed; some recognition of the limitations of knowledge and its impact on interpretation.	Evidence of engagement with sources and drawing information together; may be partly descriptive, with some critical analysis; ideas may be stated but not developed; some recognition of the uncertainty or ambiguity of knowledge
	40–49	Limited evidence of engagement with sources; limited consideration of alternate views; may be largely descriptive with little attempt to analyse arguments.	Limited evidence of engagement with sources; limited consideration of alternate views; may be largely descriptive with some critical engagement, but little attempt to analyse arguments.	Limited evidence of engagement with sources; limited consideration of alternate views; may be largely descriptive with some critical engagement, but little attempt to analyse arguments.
	30–39	Superficial use of information; muddled explanations; little attempt to interpret material.	Superficial use of information; muddled explanations; little attempt to interpret material; little evidence of critical skills.	Superficial use of information; muddled explanations; little attempt to interpret material; little evidence of critical skills.
	<30	Incorrect or no use of information; purely descriptive, with no interpretation or evaluation.	Incorrect or little or no use of information; purely descriptive, with little or no interpretation or evaluation.	Incorrect or little or no use of information; purely descriptive, with little or no interpretation or evaluation.

Marking Criteria - Levels 4, 5, 6 (ctd)

<b>STRUCTURE AND ARGUMENT</b> Identification and application of appropriate approaches; structure and development of argument; application of theory to practical situations (where relevant)	80+	As 70–79: authoritative and persuasive argument	As 70–79: authoritative and persuasive argument	As 70–79: authoritative and persuasive argument
	70–79	Excellent identification of appropriate approaches to key issues; excellent organisation of ideas, coherent structure and clear development of argument; excellent application of theory to practice.	Excellent knowledge of the main methods of enquiry in the subject area and the ability to adapt and apply approaches to solve problems; excellent organisation of ideas, coherent structure and clear development of argument; excellent application of theory to practice.	Excellent identification and critical evaluation of a range of approaches to key issues and ability to apply, accurately appropriate methods to solve problems.; excellent organisation of ideas, coherent structure and clear development of argument; excellent application of theory to practice.
	60–69	Good identification of appropriate approaches to key issues; good organisation of ideas, coherent structure and clear development of argument; good application of theory to practice.	Good knowledge of the main methods of enquiry in the subject area and the ability to adapt and apply approaches to solve problems; good organisation of ideas, coherent structure and clear development of argument; excellent application of theory to practice.	Good identification and critical evaluation of a range of approaches to key issues and ability to identify and apply, accurately appropriate methods to solve problems; good organisation of ideas, coherent structure and clear development of argument; good application of theory to practice.
	50–59	Understanding of appropriate approaches to key issues; reasonable organisation of ideas, coherent structure and clear development of argument; reasonable application of theory to practice.	Reasonable knowledge of the main methods of enquiry in the subject area and the ability to adapt and apply approaches to solve problems; reasonable organisation of ideas, structure and development of argument; reasonable application of theory to practice.	Reasonable identification and critical evaluation of a range of approaches to key issues and ability to apply, accurately appropriate methods to solve problems; reasonable organisation of ideas, coherent structure and clear development of argument; reasonable application of theory to practice.
	40–49	Limited understanding of appropriate approaches to key issues ; some organisation of ideas, basic structure and development of argument, may be with deviation and repetition; limited application of theory to practice.	Limited knowledge of the main methods of enquiry in the subject area and limited ability to adapt and apply approaches to solve problems; some organisation of ideas, basic structure and development of argument; limited application of theory to practice.	Limited identification and critical evaluation of a range of approaches to key issues and limited ability to apply appropriate methods to solve problems; some organisation of ideas, some structure and development of argument; limited application of theory to practice.
	30–39	Minimal understanding of appropriate approaches to key issues; poor organisation of ideas, little structure and development of argument; poor application of theory to practice.	Little knowledge of the main methods of enquiry in the subject area; poor organisation of ideas, little structure and development of argument; poor application of theory to practice.	Minimal attempt to identify and evaluate approaches to key issues; poor organisation of ideas, little structure and development of argument; may include unsubstantiated, generalised conclusions; poor application of theory to practice.
	<30	Little or no understanding of appropriate approaches to key issues; little or no recognisable structure and development of argument; little or no application of theory to practice.	Minimal knowledge of the main methods of enquiry in the subject area; little or no recognisable structure and development of argument; little or no application of theory to practice.	Little or no attempt to identify and evaluate approaches to key issues; little or no recognisable structure or development of argument; little or no application of theory to practice.

Marking Criteria - Levels 4, 5, 6 (ctd)

<b>COMMUNICATION AND PRESENTATION</b> Writing and style, spelling and grammar, referencing, presentational skills (where relevant)	80+	As 70–79: extremely well written, sophisticated expression.	As 70–79: extremely well written, sophisticated expression.	As 70–79: extremely well written, sophisticated expression.
	70–79	Very clear expression, effective vocabulary and style, very good spelling and grammar; accurate identification, acknowledgement and referencing of sources; very good presentation, planning and organisation.	Very clear, fluent expression, effective vocabulary and style, very good spelling and grammar; accurate identification, acknowledgement and referencing of all sources; very good presentation, planning and organisation.	Very clear, fluent, confident expression, highly effective vocabulary and style, near perfect spelling and grammar; meticulous identification, acknowledgement and referencing of all sources; high standard of presentation, planning and organisation.
	60–69	Clear expression, appropriate vocabulary and style, good spelling and grammar; clear identification, acknowledgement and referencing of sources; good standard of presentation, planning and organisation.	Clear, fluent, expression, appropriate vocabulary and style, good spelling and grammar; accurate identification, acknowledgement and referencing of sources; good standard of presentation, planning and organisation.	Clear, fluent, confident expression, appropriate vocabulary and style, high standard of spelling and grammar; accurate identification, acknowledgement and referencing of sources; good standard of presentation, planning and organisation.
	50–59	Clearly written, reasonable range of vocabulary and adequate style, competent spelling and grammar (with some errors); sources identified and acknowledged, mostly accurate referencing; fairly good standard of presentation, planning and organisation.	Clearly written, coherent expression, reasonable range of vocabulary and adequate style, competent spelling and grammar (with some errors); sources identified and acknowledged, mostly accurate referencing; fairly good standard of presentation, planning and organisation.	Clearly written, coherent expression, reasonable range of vocabulary and adequate style, competent spelling and grammar (with some errors); sources identified and acknowledged, mostly accurate referencing; fairly good standard of presentation, planning and organisation.
	40–49	Reasonably clear expression, vocabulary and style; inaccuracies in spelling and grammar; sources identified and acknowledged; referencing not always accurate; adequate standard of presentation, planning and organisation.	Reasonably clear expression, vocabulary and style; inaccuracies in spelling and grammar; sources identified and acknowledged; referencing not always accurate; adequate standard of presentation, planning and organisation.	Reasonably clear expression, vocabulary and style; some inaccuracies in spelling and grammar; sources identified and acknowledged; referencing not always accurate; adequate standard of presentation, planning and organisation.
	30–39	Expression insufficient to convey clear meaning, poor style, many spelling and grammatical errors; sources acknowledged but referencing incomplete or inadequate; poor presentation, weak planning and organisation.	Expression insufficient to convey clear meaning, poor style, many spelling and grammatical errors; sources acknowledged but referencing incomplete or inadequate; poor presentation, weak planning and organisation.	Expression insufficient to convey clear meaning, poor style, many spelling and grammatical errors; sources acknowledged but referencing incomplete or inadequate; poor presentation, weak planning and organisation.
	<30	Lack of clarity, poor expression and style; many serious spelling and/or grammatical errors; sources acknowledged, but referencing inaccurate or inadequate; weak presentation, little or no planning and organisation.	Lack of clarity, poor expression and style; many serious spelling and/or grammatical errors; sources acknowledged, but referencing inaccurate or inadequate; weak presentation, little or no planning and organisation.	Lack of clarity, poor expression and style; many serious spelling and/or grammatical errors; sources acknowledged, but referencing inaccurate or inadequate; weak presentation, little or no planning and organisation.

# MARKING CRITERIA - Level 7

Marking criteria taken from University of Chester, *Quality and Standards Manual: Handbook F - Requirements Governing the Assessment of Students 2016/17* (Appendix 5F)

	70+ Distinction	60–69 Merit	50–59	40–49	20–39	0–19
KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING of the academic discipline or field of study	<i>As 60–69 - and:</i> Excellent coverage, offering sophisticated or original insights; a synthesis of possibly disparate material; extensive reading.	<i>As 50–59 - and:</i> Awareness of problems and insights much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of the discipline; wide range of reading.	Systematic understanding of relevant knowledge; good identification, selection and sound understanding of key issues; conceptual awareness enabling critical analysis; awareness of current problems and/or new insights; accurate knowledge and detail; good range of reading beyond core an basic texts , with reasonably wide reference to current research at the cutting edge of the discipline and appropriate acknowledgement of sources.	Adequate understanding of relevant knowledge; identification, selection and moderate understanding of key issues; some conceptual awareness enabling critical analysis; accurate knowledge, but may lack sustained depth or detail; reading beyond core and basic texts with reference to current research, and appropriate acknowledgement of sources.	Poor coverage of relevant issues; limited understanding; identification of some issues; reading range limited to core and basic texts; sources not always accurately acknowledged.	Little relevant material; inadequate reading and use of sources; sources insufficiently acknowledged.
CRITICAL ENGAGEMENT WITH SCHOLARSHIP AND SOURCES	<i>As 60–69 - and:</i> Imaginative, insightful, original or creative interpretations; sustained level of analysis and evaluation.	<i>As 50–59 - and:</i> A convincing command of accepted critical positions; a conceptual understanding that enables the student to propose new hypotheses.	Ability to deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, and make sound judgements; consistent analysis and critical evaluation of current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline;	Some ability to deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, and to make sound judgements; adequate critical evaluation of current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline.	Lack of ability to deal with complex issues; judgements not all well substantiated; some critical evaluation of research and scholarship.	Very limited analysis from limited sources.

Marking Criteria - Level 7 (ctd)

<p>STRUCTURE, ARGUMENT, METHODOLOGY</p>	<p><i>As 60–69 - and :</i> Excellent structure and development of argument, with awareness of limitations; sophisticated use and evaluation of possibilities and limitations of the methodologies used by the student.</p>	<p><i>As 50–59 - and :</i> A very good, coherent structure and sustained development of argument; critical use and interpretation of applicable methodologies and methods.</p>	<p>A good, coherent structure and clear, sustained, development of argument, supported by evidence; comprehensive understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline; planning to allow gathering of robust and appropriate evidence.</p>	<p>Some coherent structure and development of argument, supported by evidence; a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline; planning to allow gathering of adequate and appropriate evidence.</p>	<p>Lack of structure and limited development of argument; some understanding of methodologies, but applied ineffectively.</p>	<p>Little or no structure and unclear or contradictory argument; very limited understanding of methodologies and approaches to the subject.</p>
<p>COMMUNICATION AND PRESENTATION</p>	<p><i>As 60–69 - and :</i> Authoritative, articulate communication demonstrating a balance of enthusiasm and control.</p>	<p><i>As 50–59 - and :</i> Persuasive communication skills; the academic form largely matches that expected in published work</p>	<p>Clear expression, observing academic form; accurate in spelling and grammar; conclusions communicated clearly; sources referenced using appropriately conventions.</p>	<p>Adequate expression, observing academic form; largely accurate in spelling and grammar; conclusions communicated satisfactorily; sources referenced using appropriately conventions.</p>	<p>Some errors in academic form and/or in spelling and grammar; incomplete or inadequate referencing of sources.</p>	<p>Very poor observation of academic conventions; repeated deficiencies in spelling and grammar; sources inadequately referenced.</p>
<p>INDEPENDENT STUDY AND SELF-EVALUATION (where appropriate)</p>	<p><i>As 60–69 - and :</i> A very sophisticated critical self-evaluation; new insights informing practical situations.</p>	<p><i>As 50–59 - and :</i> Decision-making in complex situations; originality in addressing needs or specifications, and /or solving problems.</p>	<p>Collaborative or individual problem-solving, and planning and implementing of tasks the independent learning ability and self-evaluation required to continue to advance the student’s knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills appropriate to a professional context.</p>	<p>Some collaborative or individual problem-solving, and planning and implementing of tasks; the independent learning ability and self-evaluation required to continue to advance the student’s knowledge and understanding, but limited ability to develop new skills.</p>	<p>Minimal initiative and personal or professional responsibility; limited self-evaluation</p>	<p>Clear weakness in independent learning, decision-making and/or self-evaluation.</p>

# MARKING CRITERIA - Level 8

Marking criteria taken from University of Chester, *Quality and Standards Manual: Handbook F - Requirements Governing the Assessment of Students 2016/17* (Appendix 5G)

Key criteria	Strong Pass	Pass	Fail
<b>Creation and interpretation of new knowledge</b>	All of the qualities of pass with the addition of: clear evidence of original research and/or advanced scholarship; potentially extending the forefront of the discipline, and with the potential to be published.	The creation and interpretation of new knowledge; systematic acquisition and understanding of a substantial body of knowledge which is at the forefront of an academic discipline or area of professional practice; a good grasp of key ideas, debates and methods within the discipline; good conceptual awareness and sound academic scholarship.	An overall lack of knowledge and understanding, showing significant gaps and/or errors in scholarship. A tendency to express unsupported assertions with limited critical analysis and interpretation.
<b>Systematic acquisition and understanding of a substantial body of knowledge</b>	A level of understanding and knowledge which is at the forefront of an academic discipline or area of professional practice.	Rigorous and appropriate methodology; evidence of clear understanding, with scope for further research.	Inappropriate and/or unsystematic collation of data, with no evidence of a clear understanding of a body of knowledge.
<b>Ability to conceptualise, design and implement a project for the generation of new knowledge, applications or understanding.</b>	A creatively inspired and exceptionally well-designed project, appropriate for implementation and application, and with requisite flexibility to accommodate unforeseen problems.	A well-conceived and well-designed project, appropriate for implementation and application, at the forefront of the discipline or area of professional practice.	Poorly conceived and/or poorly designed. Inappropriate for implementation and/or application.
<b>Understanding of applicable techniques for research and advanced academic enquiry.</b>	A very detailed understanding of the appropriate methods and methodologies in relation to the academic enquiry. Demonstrating an ability to manage any complex issues arising.	A competent understanding of the appropriate methods and methodologies in relation to the academic enquiry.	Poor understanding and/or inappropriate methods and methodologies with little relationship to the academic enquiry.