

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
KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING 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)

CRITICAL ENGAGEMENT WITH SOURCES 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)

STRUCTURE AND ARGUMENT 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)

COMMUNICATION AND PRESENTATION 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
Creation and interpretation of new knowledge	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.
Systematic acquisition and understanding of a substantial body of knowledge	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.
Ability to conceptualise, design and implement a project for the generation of new knowledge, applications or understanding.	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.
Understanding of applicable techniques for research and advanced academic enquiry.	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.