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# Generic Marking Criteria by Assessment Type (Undergraduate)

Below are listed some sample, generic marking criteria across each level for different assessment types. Use these to *construct your own* assessment criteria and/or grade descriptor statements for use in your assessments and rubrics, according to your discipline and the specific assessment methodology. These should be specific to the learning outcomes of your course. Please note, these *generic* grade descriptors can only provide you with a *broadly-based guidance* for writing your own. They should be used in conjunction with the undergraduate-level based descriptors to create bespoke grade descriptors for your specific module (if appropriate).

You should also note that you are *not required* to use every 10-mark grade boundary if your rubric does not fit into this structure – you can blend some descriptors together if your rubric has, for example, 0-29 as a grade bracket, as opposed to 0-9, 10-19 and 20-29 grade brackets.

## Essays

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Content, Knowledge and Understanding** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or very little evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. No understanding of essay question, very poor scope and no ideas presented. Major inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 10-19 | Little evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Little understanding of essay question, poor scope and very few ideas presented. Major inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 20-29 | Minimal evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Minimal understanding of essay question, poor scope and minimal ideas presented. Significant inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 30-39 | Lacking evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Lacking understanding of essay question, underdeveloped scope and limited ideas presented. Some pertinent content, but inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements present. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Some evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Partial or underdeveloped understanding of essay question, and underdeveloped – but correct – scope and ideas. Some pertinent content, potentially mixed with some inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 50-59 | A basic factual or conceptual understanding of the subject area, content, reading or research. A basic understanding of the requirements of the essay question, and basic – but correct – scope and ideas present. Generally pertinent content, with potentially some inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 60-69 | A good factual or conceptual understanding of the subject area, content, reading or research. A good, yet broad understanding of the requirements of the essay question, and good scope and ideas present. Pertinent content, with potentially a little repetition and unnecessary statements, or slight overuse of introduction/conclusion. |
| 70-79 | A very good factual or conceptual understanding of the subject area, content, reading or research. A comprehensive understanding of the requirements of the essay question, and very good scope and ideas present. Unnecessary or repeated material almost completely eliminated. |
| 80-89 | An excellent factual or conceptual understanding of the subject area, content, reading or research. A comprehensive and broad understanding of the requirements of the essay question, and excellent scope and ideas present. Entirely pertinent content, with no repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 90-100 | An exceptional factual or conceptual understanding of the subject area, content, reading or research. A sophisticated, comprehensive and broad understanding of the requirements of the essay question, and excellent scope and ideas present. Entirely pertinent content, with no repetition and unnecessary statements. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Analysis, Argument and Intellectual Skills** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or no evidence of analysis, and unsubstantiated opinions. Failure to provide any perspective, analysis or argument. |
| 10-19 | Submission is entirely or almost entirely descriptive, with little to no evidence of analysis, and almost completely unsubstantiated opinions. Almost no provision of any perspective, insight, analysis or argument. |
| 20-29 | Submission is almost entirely descriptive, with little evidence of any analysis, and largely unsubstantiated opinions and information accepted at face value. Very little provision of any perspective, insight, analysis or argument. |
| 30-39 | Submission is mostly descriptive, with minimal evidence of any analysis, and mostly unsubstantiated opinions and information accepted at face value. Little provision of any perspective, insight, analysis or argument. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Submission is largely descriptive, but with some evidence of analysis and criticality. Unsubstantiated opinions are present and information is largely accepted at face-value. Some provision of perspective, insight, analysis and/or argument. |
| 50-59 | Submission is descriptive, but with a developing analytical aspect that may use simple logic. An attempt at constructing an argument, which may be flawed but which is nonetheless established. Some unsubstantiated opinions may be present and some information may be accepted at face-value. |
| 60-69 | Submission makes a good attempt to provide an analysis and construct an overall argument, which in places may be convincing. A few unsubstantiated opinions may still be present and a small amount of information may be accepted at face-value or may be slightly weaker in its critical approach. |
| 70-79 | Submission provides a very good analysis and constructs a strong, sustained argument using predefined techniques and approaches, which may be convincing. |
| 80-89 | Submission provides an excellent analysis and constructs a strong, sustained argument using predefined techniques and approaches, which is likely to be coherent, sophisticated and convincing. |
| 90-100 | Submission provides an exceptional analysis and constructs a very strong, sustained argument using both predefined techniques and approaches, and potentially identifies areas for further development. Argument is coherent, sophisticated and convincing. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Range, Breadth and Application of Research and Resources** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or no evidence of any ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the submission or to practice. |
| 10-19 | Little to no evidence of any ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the submission or to practice. |
| 20-29 | Limited evidence of ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the submission or to practice. |
| 30-39 | Minimal evidence of ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the submission or to practice. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Shows some established evidence of sourcing, applying and relating wider literature to the submission from a limited selection of sources. Engagement with a text may not be meaningful to the content, but the process of doing so is established. |
| 50-59 | A reasonable attempt to source, examine and apply relevant literature from a range of sources to the submission. Engagement with texts is likely to be correct and in some ways meaningful, but largely surface-level. |
| 60-69 | A good attempt to source, examine and apply relevant literature from a range of sources to the submission. Engagement with texts is likely to be correct and accurate, with mostly meaningful exploration of their relevance and facets. |
| 70-79 | A very good attempt to source, examine and apply relevant literature from a wide range of sources appropriate to this level of study. Engagement with texts is likely to be correct and accurate, with meaningful exploration of their relevance and facets. |
| 80-89 | An excellent attempt to source, examine and apply relevant literature from a wide range of sources appropriate to this level of study. Engagement with texts is correct, accurate and meaningfully explores their different facets and perspectives. |
| 90-100 | An exceptional attempt to source, examine and apply relevant literature from a wide range of sources appropriate to this level of study. Engagement with texts is correct, accurate and meaningfully explores their different facets and perspectives. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Communication, Organisation and Presentation** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or completely unstructured and/or incoherent. Seriously deficient in quantity and quality of submission. No transferable skills demonstrated. |
| 10-19 | Structure is extremely weak and/or incoherent, with serious spelling, grammar and punctuation errors. Very few transferable skills demonstrated. |
| 20-29 | Structure is mostly weak and/or incoherent, with spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax errors common throughout. Some attempt at evidencing some transferable skills. |
| 30-39 | Structure is weak or undeveloped, but logic can be deciphered if looked at closely. Mostly incoherent, though some attempts to present relevant information are in evidence. Some attempt at evidencing transferable skills. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Structure is largely inconsistent and lacking in sequential development, but it is clear that an attempt to do so has been made. Mistakes in spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax are common. Some attempt at evidencing transferable skills. |
| 50-59 | Structure lacks coherence and mistakes in presentation, spelling, punctuation, grammar and syntax are relatively common, but submission does demonstrate some qualities. Some transferable skills are evidenced. |
| 60-69 | Structure has coherence and language used is relevant and mature. There is a logical progression to the argument, and relatively few mistakes in spelling, grammar, punctuation, syntax and presentation. Submission clearly evidences transferable skills for employment contexts. |
| 70-79 | A well-organised submission with clear, logical progression towards an argument. There are few mistakes in spelling, punctuation, grammar, syntax and presentation. Demonstrates evidence of multiple transferable skills for employment contexts. |
| 80-89 | A very well-organised submission with clear, logical progression towards an argument. There are almost no mistakes in spelling, punctuation, grammar, syntax and presentation. Demonstrates evidence of multiple transferable skills for employment contexts. |
| 90-100 | An exceptionally well-organised submission with clear, logical progression towards an argument. Next to no mistakes in spelling, punctuation, grammar, syntax and presentation. Demonstrates a broad range of transferable skills for employment contexts. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Referencing and Source Acknowledgement** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or no citations/bibliography present. |
| 10-19 | Minimal engagement with academic sources, few citations/skeletal bibliography at best, which pays little to no attention to the conventions of academic referencing styles. |
| 20-29 | Little to no engagement with academic sources, very few (incorrect) citations/marginal bibliography that pays little to no attention to the conventions of academic referencing styles. |
| 30-39 | Below average engagement with academic sources, few citations that are incorrect and a marginal bibliography that pays minimal attention to the conventions of academic referencing styles, but which may have made an attempt to do so. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Some attempts made to engage with academic sources, though still likely to be few citations/and a marginal bibliography that only pays some attention to the conventions of academic referencing styles. |
| 50-59 | A developing attempt made to engage with academic sources. Citations are present in the text and are largely correct, though some mistakes may be present. Bibliography is present and largely correct, though some formatting errors may appear. |
| 60-69 | A good attempt made to engage with academic sources. Citations are present throughout the text and are mostly correct, though a few mistakes may be present with citing some more complex sources. Bibliography is present and mostly correct, though formatting errors may appear in places. |
| 70-79 | A very good attempt made to engage with academic sources. Citations are present throughout the text and used in the right context(s), and are almost completely correct (though one or two mistakes may appear). Bibliography is extensive and almost completely correct. |
| 80-89 | Excellent engagement with academic sources. Citations are common, used correctly, and almost completely accurate. Bibliography is correctly formatted and presented, with only few errors present. |
| 90-100 | Sophisticated engagement with academic sources. Citations are frequent, correctly-used, and almost completely accurate with only one or two errors at most. Bibliography is similarly almost-perfect (or perfect). |

## Examinations (In-Person/Online)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Content, Knowledge and Understanding** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or very little evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area or course content. No understanding of examination question(s) evident in the responses, with barely any ideas presented. Entirely inaccurate or incorrect answers presented, with significant or complete repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 10-19 | Little evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area or course content. Little understanding of examination question(s) evident in the responses, with almost no ideas presented. Major inaccuracies or incorrect answers presented, with mostly repetition and unnecessary statements throughout. |
| 20-29 | Minimal evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area or course content. Minimal understanding of examination question(s) evident in the responses, with minimal ideas presented. Significant inaccuracies or incorrect answers presented, with significant repetition and unnecessary statements throughout. |
| 30-39 | Lacking evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area or course content. Lack of understanding of examination question(s) evident in the responses, with limited ideas presented. Some pertinent content, but with inaccuracies and incorrect answers, as well as repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Some evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area or course content. Some understanding of examination question(s) evident in the responses, with limited ideas presented. Some pertinent content, but with inaccuracies and incorrect answers, as well as repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 50-59 | Satisfactory evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area or course content. Satisfactory understanding of examination question(s) evident in the responses, with some basic ideas presented. Mostly pertinent content, but with inaccuracies and incorrect answers, as well as repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 60-69 | Good evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area or course content. Good understanding of examination question(s) evident in the responses, with some strong ideas presented. Pertinent content throughout, but with some slight inaccuracies and incorrect answers, as well as repetition and unnecessary statements, potentially present. |
| 70-79 | Very good evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area or course content. Very good understanding of examination question(s) evident in the responses, with some strong ideas presented. Pertinent content throughout, but with some slight inaccuracies and incorrect answers, as well as repetition and unnecessary statements, potentially present. |
| 80-89 | An excellent factual or conceptual understanding of the subject area, content, reading or research. A comprehensive and broad understanding of the requirements of the examination question(s), and excellent scope and ideas present. Entirely pertinent content, with no repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 90-100 | An exceptional factual or conceptual understanding of the subject area, content, reading or research. A sophisticated, comprehensive and broad understanding of the requirements of the examination question(s), and excellent scope and ideas present. Entirely pertinent content, with no repetition and unnecessary statements. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Analysis, Argument and Intellectual Skills** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or no evidence of analysis, argument or criticality in responses to examination questions. No evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, and no attempt to construct a critical argument. |
| 10-19 | Very little to no evidence of analysis, argument or criticality in responses to examination questions. Very little evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, and very little to no attempt to construct a critical argument. |
| 20-29 | Minimal evidence of analysis, argument or criticality in responses to examination questions. Minimal evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, and minimal attempt to construct a critical argument. |
| 30-39 | Lacking or underdeveloped analysis, argument or criticality in responses to examination questions. Some, but lacking, evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, but an underdeveloped attempt at using it to construct a critical argument. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level**. Limited, but some evidence of analysis, argument or criticality in responses to examination questions. Some developing evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with a minimal attempt to use it to construct a critical argument. |
| 50-59 | Satisfactory evidence of analysis, argument or criticality in responses to examination questions. Developing evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with a satisfactory, but perhaps underdeveloped attempt to use it to construct a critical argument. |
| 60-69 | Good evidence of analysis, argument or criticality in responses to examination questions. Clear evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with a good attempt to use it to construct a critical argument, which may have some flaws but which is nonetheless coherent. |
| 70-79 | Very good evidence of analysis, argument or criticality in responses to examination questions. Clear evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with very strong use of this knowledge to construct a critical argument, which has minimal flaws and which is likely to be convincing. |
| 80-89 | Excellent evidence of analysis, argument or criticality in responses to examination questions. Very strong evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with excellent use of this knowledge to construct a critical argument, which has minimal flaws and which is convincing. |
| 90-100 | Comprehensive and sophisticated evidence of analysis, argument or criticality in responses to examination questions. Excellent evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with sophisticated use of this knowledge to construct a critical argument, which has almost no flaws and which is convincing. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Communication, Organisation and Presentation** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or completely unstructured and/or incoherent. Seriously deficient in quantity and quality of submission, with spelling, grammar and punctuation errors present common throughout. |
| 10-19 | Structure is extremely weak and/or incoherent, with serious spelling, grammar and punctuation errors common throughout. |
| 20-29 | Structure is mostly weak and/or incoherent, with spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax errors common throughout. |
| 30-39 | Structure is weak or immature, but logic can be deciphered if looked at closely. Mostly incoherent, though some attempts to present relevant information are in evidence. Spelling, punctuation and grammar mistakes are common. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Structure is largely inconsistent and lacking in sequential development, but it is clear that an attempt to do so has been made. Mistakes in spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax are common. |
| 50-59 | Structure lacks coherence and mistakes in presentation, spelling, punctuation, grammar and syntax are present, but not overly common, and response does demonstrate some developing qualities. |
| 60-69 | Structure has coherence and language used is relevant and mature. There is a logical progression to the argument, and relatively few mistakes in spelling, grammar, punctuation, syntax and presentation. |
| 70-79 | A well-organised submission with clear, logical progression towards an argument. There are few mistakes in spelling, punctuation, grammar, syntax and presentation. |
| 80-89 | A very well-organised submission with clear, logical progression towards an argument. There are almost no mistakes in spelling, punctuation, grammar, syntax and presentation. |
| 90-100 | An exceptionally well-organised submission with clear, logical progression towards an argument. Next to no mistakes in spelling, punctuation, grammar, syntax and presentation. |

## Viva Voce/Oral Examinations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Content, Knowledge and Understanding** |
| 0-9 | No response, or barely any evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area in responses to questions. No understanding of question(s) evident in verbal responses, with barely any ideas presented. Entirely inaccurate or incorrect responses, with significant or complete repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 10-19 | Little evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area in responses to questions. Little understanding of question(s) evident in verbal responses, with almost no ideas presented. Major inaccuracies or incorrect responses, with mostly repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 20-29 | Minimal evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area in responses to questions. Minimal understanding of question(s) evident in the responses, with minimal ideas presented. Significant inaccuracies or incorrect responses, with significant repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 30-39 | Lacking evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area in responses to questions. Lack of understanding of question(s) evident in verbal responses, with limited ideas presented. Some pertinent content, but with inaccuracies and incorrect responses, as well as repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Some evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area in responses to questions. Some understanding of question(s) evident in verbal responses, but with some limitations in ideas presented. Some pertinent content, but accompanied by inaccuracies and incorrect information, as well as repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 50-59 | Satisfactory evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area in responses to questions. Satisfactory understanding of question(s) evident in verbal responses, with some basic ideas presented. Pertinent content for the most part, but with some inaccuracies and incorrect answers, as well as repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 60-69 | Good evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area in responses. Good understanding of question(s) evident in verbal responses, with some strong ideas presented. Pertinent content throughout, but with slight inaccuracies and incorrect answers potentially present, as well as slight repetition/unnecessary statements. |
| 70-79 | Very good evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area in verbal responses. Very good understanding of question(s) evident in verbal responses, with some strong ideas presented. Pertinent content throughout, with minimal inaccuracies and incorrect answers, or repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 80-89 | An excellent factual or conceptual understanding of the subject area evident in verbal responses. A comprehensive and broad understanding of the question(s), and excellent ideas presented. Entirely pertinent content, with no repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 90-100 | An exceptional factual or conceptual understanding of the subject area, content, reading or research. A sophisticated, comprehensive and broad understanding of the questions, and excellent ideas presented. Entirely pertinent content, with no repetition and unnecessary statements. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Analysis, Argument and Intellectual Skills** |
| 0-9 | No-response, or no evidence of analysis, argument or criticality of research or research methodology in responses to questions. No evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, and no attempt to construct a critical argument. |
| 10-19 | Very little to no evidence of analysis, argument or criticality of research or research methodology in responses to questions. Very little evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, and very little to no attempt to construct a critical argument. |
| 20-29 | Minimal evidence of analysis, argument or criticality of research or research methodology in responses to questions. Minimal evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, and minimal attempt to construct a critical argument. |
| 30-39 | Lacking or underdeveloped analysis, argument or criticality of research or research methodology in responses to questions. Some, but lacking, evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, but an underdeveloped attempt to construct a critical argument. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level**. Limited, but some evidence of analysis, argument or criticality of research or research methodology in responses to questions. Some developing evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with a slight attempt to use it to construct a critical argument. |
| 50-59 | Satisfactory evidence of analysis, argument or criticality of research or research methodology in responses to questions. Developing evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with a satisfactory, but perhaps slightly underdeveloped attempt to use it to construct a critical argument. |
| 60-69 | Good evidence of analysis, argument or criticality of research or research methodology in responses to questions. Clear evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with a good attempt to use it to construct a critical argument, which may have some flaws but which is nonetheless coherent. |
| 70-79 | Very good evidence of analysis, argument or criticality of research or research methodology in responses to questions. Clear evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with very strong use of this knowledge to construct a critical argument, which has minimal flaws and which is likely to be convincing. |
| 80-89 | Excellent evidence of analysis, argument or criticality in responses to examination questions. Very strong evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with excellent use of this knowledge to construct a critical argument, which has minimal flaws and which is convincing. |
| 90-100 | Comprehensive and sophisticated evidence of analysis, argument or criticality of research or research methodology in responses to questions. Excellent evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with sophisticated use of this knowledge to construct a critical argument, which has almost no flaws and which is convincing. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Communication, Organisation and Presentation** |
| 0-9 | No response, or answers to verbal questions structurally and linguistically incoherent, with no attempt to address the question or meaningfully engage with the examiner. |
| 10-19 | Answers to verbal questions mostly structurally and linguistically incoherent, with very little attempt to address the question or meaningfully engage with the examiner. |
| 20-29 | Answers to verbal questions are largely structurally and/or linguistically incoherent, with a minimal attempt to address the question or meaningfully engage with the examiner. |
| 30-39 | Answers to verbal questions are structurally and linguistically problematic in the majority of places, but with some clear attempts made to engage with the question and the examiner, but which is largely underdeveloped. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Answers to verbal questions are structurally and linguistically competent in the majority of places, but with some overall weaknesses, inconsistencies or incoherencies. Some clear attempts made to engage with the question and the examiner, but which is largely underdeveloped. |
| 50-59 | Answers to verbal questions are structurally and linguistically satisfactory in the majority of places, but with some slight overall weaknesses, inconsistencies or incoherencies. Clear attempts made to engage with the question and the examiner, but which is underdeveloped in places. |
| 60-69 | Good answers to verbal questions, which are structurally and linguistically coherent in the majority of places, but with potentially some slight overall weaknesses, inconsistencies or incoherencies. Good engagement with both the question and the examiner, but which may benefit from some additional development in places. |
| 70-79 | Very good answers to verbal questions, which are structurally and linguistically coherent throughout, with minimal overall weaknesses, inconsistencies or incoherencies. Very good engagement with both the question and the examiner. |
| 80-89 | Excellent answers to verbal questions, which are structurally and linguistically coherent throughout, with almost no overall weaknesses, inconsistencies or incoherencies. Excellent engagement with both the question and the examiner. |
| 90-100 | Sophisticated and comprehensive answers to verbal questions, which are structurally and linguistically coherent throughout, with no overall weaknesses, inconsistencies or incoherencies. Exceptional engagement with both the question and the examiner. |

## Dissertations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Content, Knowledge and Understanding** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or almost no evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Very poor or non-existent project scope, construction, methodology, and execution. No pertinent ideas presented. Major inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 10-19 | Little evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Significantly poor project scope, construction, methodology, and execution. Very few pertinent ideas presented. Major inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 20-29 | Minimal evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Poor project scope, construction, methodology, and execution. Few pertinent ideas presented. Substantial inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 30-39 | Lacking evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Underdeveloped project scope, construction, methodology, and execution. Few, though potentially some, pertinent ideas presented. Inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements are common. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Some evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Underdeveloped, but potentially adequate, project scope, construction, methodology, and execution. Some evidence of developing pertinent ideas presented. Inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements are present, but not overwhelmingly so. |
| 50-59 | Evidence of a basic, adequate factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Generally adequate project scope, construction, methodology, and execution. Satisfactory, though potentially weak, pertinent ideas presented. Inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements are present, but not overly common. |
| 60-69 | Evidence of a good factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Good project scope, construction, methodology, and execution. Good, mostly pertinent ideas presented throughout. Inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements are present, but minimal. |
| 70-79 | Evidence of a very good factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Very strong project scope, construction, methodology, and execution. Very good, almost entirely pertinent ideas presented throughout. Inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements are minimal. |
| 80-89 | Evidence of an excellent factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Excellent project scope, construction, methodology, and execution. Excellent and entirely pertinent ideas presented throughout. Inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements are almost completely non-existent. |
| 90-100 | Evidence of an exceptional factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Sophisticated project scope, construction, methodology, and exceptional execution. Excellent and entirely pertinent ideas presented throughout. Inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements are almost completely non-existent. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Analysis, Argument and Intellectual Skills** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or no evidence of independent research or analysis. Entirely unsubstantiated opinions. Failure to provide any perspective, analysis or argument. |
| 10-19 | Submission is entirely or almost entirely descriptive, with little to no evidence of independent research and analysis. Almost completely unsubstantiated opinions. Almost no provision of any perspective, insight, analysis or argument. |
| 20-29 | Submission is almost entirely descriptive, with little evidence of any independent research and analysis. Largely unsubstantiated opinions and information accepted at face value. Very little provision of any perspective, insight, analysis or argument. |
| 30-39 | Submission is mostly descriptive, with minimal evidence of any independent research and analysis. Mostly unsubstantiated opinions and information accepted at face value. Little provision of any perspective, insight, analysis or argument. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Submission is largely descriptive, but with some evidence of independent research and analysis and criticality. Unsubstantiated opinions are present and information is largely accepted at face-value. Some provision of perspective, insight, analysis and/or argument. |
| 50-59 | Submission is descriptive, but with a developing analytical aspect that may use simple logic. An attempt at independent research and constructing an argument, which may be flawed but which is nonetheless established. Some unsubstantiated opinions may be present and some information may accepted at face-value. |
| 60-69 | Submission makes a good attempt to perform independent research, provide an analysis and construct an overall argument, which in places may be convincing. A few unsubstantiated opinions may still be present and a small amount of information may accepted at face-value or may be slightly weaker in its critical approach. |
| 70-79 | Submission consists of a carefully and well-designed independent research project, which provides a very good analysis and constructs a strong, sustained argument using predefined techniques and approaches, which may be convincing. |
| 80-89 | Submission consists of an excellent and well-designed research project, which provides an excellent analysis and constructs a strong, sustained argument using predefined techniques and approaches, which is likely to be coherent, sophisticated and convincing. |
| 90-100 | Submission consists of an exceptional and potentially significant independent research project, which provides an exceptional analysis and constructs a very strong, sustained argument using both predefined techniques and approaches, and potentially identifies areas for further development. Argument is coherent, sophisticated and convincing. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Range, Breadth and Application of Research and Resources** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or no evidence of any ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the submission or to practice, or to construct an adequate literature review. |
| 10-19 | Little to no evidence of any ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the submission or to practice, or to construct an adequate literature review. |
| 20-29 | Limited evidence of ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the submission or to practice, or to construct an adequate literature review. |
| 30-39 | Minimal evidence of ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the submission or to practice, or to construct an adequate literature review. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Shows some established evidence of sourcing wider literature, organising it into a literature review, and applying and relating it to the submission from a limited selection of sources. Engagement with a text may not be meaningful to the content, but the process of doing so is established. |
| 50-59 | A reasonable attempt to source relevant wider literature from a range of sources, organise it into an adequate literature review, and examine and apply it to the submission. Engagement with texts is likely to be correct and in some ways meaningful, but largely surface-level. |
| 60-69 | A good, competent attempt to source relevant wider literature from a range of sources, organise it into an adequate literature review, and examine and apply it to the submission. Engagement with texts is likely to be correct and accurate, with mostly meaningful exploration of their relevance and facets. |
| 70-79 | A very good sourcing of relevant wider literature from a range of sources, which has been organised into an adequate literature review, and examined and applied to the submission. Engagement with texts is likely to be correct and accurate, with meaningful exploration of their relevance and facets. |
| 80-89 | Excellent sourcing of relevant wider literature from a range of sources, which has been organised into an adequate literature review, and examined and applied to the submission. Engagement with texts is correct, accurate and meaningfully explores their different facets and perspectives. |
| 90-100 | Exceptional sourcing of relevant wider literature from a range of sources, which has been organised into an adequate literature review, and examined and applied to the submission. Engagement with texts is correct, accurate and meaningfully explores their different facets and perspectives. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Communication, Organisation and Presentation** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or completely unstructured and/or incoherent. Seriously deficient in quantity and quality of submission. No transferable skills demonstrated. |
| 10-19 | Structure is extremely weak and/or incoherent, with serious spelling, grammar and punctuation errors. Very few transferable skills demonstrated. |
| 20-29 | Structure is mostly weak and/or incoherent, with spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax errors common throughout. Some attempt at evidencing some transferable skills. |
| 30-39 | Structure is weak or undeveloped, but logic can be deciphered if looked at closely. Mostly incoherent, though some attempts to present relevant information are in evidence. Some attempt at evidencing transferable skills. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Structure is largely inconsistent and lacking in sequential or relevant development, but it is clear that an attempt to do so has been made. Mistakes in spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax are common. Some attempt at evidencing transferable skills. |
| 50-59 | Structure lacks coherence and mistakes in presentation, spelling, punctuation, grammar and syntax are relatively common, but submission does demonstrate some qualities. Some transferable skills are evidenced. |
| 60-69 | Structure has coherence and language used is relevant and mature. There is a logical progression to the argument, and relatively few mistakes in spelling, grammar, punctuation, syntax and presentation. Submission clearly evidences transferable skills for employment contexts. |
| 70-79 | A well-organised submission with clear, logical progression towards an argument. There are few mistakes in spelling, punctuation, grammar, syntax and presentation. Demonstrates evidence of multiple transferable skills for employment contexts. |
| 80-89 | A very well-organised submission with clear, logical progression towards an argument. There are almost no mistakes in spelling, punctuation, grammar, syntax and presentation. Demonstrates evidence of multiple transferable skills for employment contexts. |
| 90-100 | An exceptionally well-organised submission with clear, logical progression towards an argument. Next to no mistakes in spelling, punctuation, grammar, syntax and presentation. Demonstrates a broad range of transferable skills for employment contexts. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Referencing and Source Acknowledgement** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or no citations/bibliography present. |
| 10-19 | Minimal engagement with academic sources, few citations/skeletal bibliography at best, which pays little to no attention to the conventions of academic referencing styles. |
| 20-29 | Little to no engagement with academic sources, very few (incorrect) citations/marginal bibliography that pays little to no attention to the conventions of academic referencing styles. |
| 30-39 | Below average engagement with academic sources, few citations that are incorrect and a marginal bibliography that pays minimal attention to the conventions of academic referencing styles, but which may have made an attempt to do so. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Some attempts made to engage with academic sources, though still likely to be few citations/and a marginal bibliography that only pays some attention to the conventions of academic referencing styles. |
| 50-59 | A developing attempt made to engage with academic sources. Citations are present in the text and are largely correct, though some mistakes may be present. Bibliography is present and largely correct, though some formatting errors may appear. |
| 60-69 | A good attempt made to engage with academic sources. Citations are present throughout the text and are mostly correct, though a few mistakes may be present with citing some more complex sources. Bibliography is present and mostly correct, though formatting errors may appear in places. |
| 70-79 | A very good attempt made to engage with academic sources. Citations are present throughout the text and used in the right context(s), and are almost completely correct (though one or two mistakes may appear). Bibliography is extensive and almost completely correct. |
| 80-89 | Excellent engagement with academic sources. Citations are common, used correctly, and almost completely accurate. Bibliography is correctly formatted and presented, with only few errors present. |
| 90-100 | Sophisticated engagement with academic sources. Citations are frequent, correctly-used, and almost completely accurate with only one or two errors at most. Bibliography is similarly almost-perfect (or perfect). |

## Presentations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Content, Knowledge and Understanding** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or very little evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of the presentation brief, the subject area, content, reading or research. Very poor scope and no ideas presented. Major inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 10-19 | Little evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of the presentation brief, the subject area, content, reading or research. Poor scope and very few ideas presented. Major inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 20-29 | Minimal evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of the presentation brief, the subject area, content, reading or research. Poor scope and minimal ideas presented. Significant inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 30-39 | Lacking evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of the presentation brief, the subject area, content, reading or research. Underdeveloped scope and limited ideas presented. Some pertinent content, but inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements present. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Some evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of the presentation brief, the subject area, content, reading or research. Partial or underdeveloped – but correct – scope and ideas. Some pertinent content, potentially mixed with some inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 50-59 | A basic factual or conceptual understanding of the presentation brief, the subject area, content, reading or research. Basic – but correct – scope and ideas present. Generally pertinent content, with potentially some inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 60-69 | A good factual or conceptual understanding of the presentation brief, the subject area, content, reading or research. Good scope and ideas present. Pertinent content, with potentially a little repetition and unnecessary statements, or slight overuse of introduction/conclusion. |
| 70-79 | A very good factual or conceptual understanding of the presentation brief, the subject area, content, reading or research. A comprehensive, and very good scope and ideas present. Unnecessary or repeated material almost completely eliminated. |
| 80-89 | An excellent factual or conceptual understanding of the presentation brief, the subject area, content, reading or research. Excellent, comprehensive scope and ideas presented. Entirely pertinent content, with no repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 90-100 | An exceptional factual or conceptual understanding of the presentation brief, the subject area, content, reading or research. Excellent, sophisticated scope and ideas present. Entirely pertinent content, with no repetition and unnecessary statements. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Analysis, Argument and Intellectual Skills** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or no evidence of analysis, argument or criticality in presentation. No evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, and no attempt to construct a critical argument. |
| 10-19 | Very little to no evidence of analysis, argument or criticality in presentation. Very little evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, and very little to no attempt to construct a critical argument. |
| 20-29 | Minimal evidence of analysis, argument or criticality in presentation. Minimal evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, and minimal attempt to construct a critical argument. |
| 30-39 | Lacking or underdeveloped analysis, argument or criticality in presentation. Some, but lacking, evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, but an underdeveloped attempt at using it to construct a critical argument. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level**. Limited, but some evidence of analysis, argument or criticality in presentation. Some developing evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with a minimal attempt to use it to construct a critical argument. |
| 50-59 | Satisfactory evidence of analysis, argument or criticality in presentation. Developing evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with a satisfactory, but perhaps underdeveloped attempt to use it to construct a critical argument. |
| 60-69 | Good evidence of analysis, argument or criticality in presentation. Clear evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with a good attempt to use it to construct a critical argument, which may have some flaws but which is nonetheless coherent. |
| 70-79 | Very good evidence of analysis, argument or criticality in presentation. Clear evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with very strong use of this knowledge to construct a critical argument, which has minimal flaws and which is likely to be convincing. |
| 80-89 | Excellent evidence of analysis, argument or criticality in presentation. Very strong evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with excellent use of this knowledge to construct a critical argument, which has minimal flaws and which is convincing. |
| 90-100 | Comprehensive and sophisticated evidence of analysis, argument or criticality in presentation. Excellent evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with sophisticated use of this knowledge to construct a critical argument, which has almost no flaws and which is convincing. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Range, Breadth and Application of Research and Resources** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or no evidence of any ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the content of the presentation. |
| 10-19 | Little to no evidence of any ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the content of the presentation. |
| 20-29 | Limited evidence of ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the content of the presentation. |
| 30-39 | Minimal evidence of ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the content of the presentation. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Shows some established evidence of sourcing wider literature, organising it, and applying and relating it to the content of the presentation from a limited selection of sources. Engagement with a text may not be meaningful to the content, but the process of doing so is established. |
| 50-59 | A reasonable attempt to source relevant wider literature from a range of sources, organising it, examining it, and applying it to the presentation. Engagement with wider material is likely to be correct and in some ways meaningful, but largely surface-level. |
| 60-69 | A good, competent attempt to source relevant wider literature from a range of sources, organising it, examining it, and applying it to the presentation. Engagement with wider material is likely to be correct and accurate, with mostly meaningful exploration of their relevance and facets. |
| 70-79 | A very good sourcing of relevant wider literature from a range of sources, organising it, examining it, and applying it to the presentation. Engagement with wider material is likely to be correct and accurate, with meaningful exploration of their relevance and facets. |
| 80-89 | Excellent sourcing of relevant wider literature from a range of sources, organising it, examining it, and applying it to the presentation. Engagement with wider material is correct, accurate and meaningfully explores their different facets and perspectives. |
| 90-100 | Exceptional sourcing of relevant wider literature from a range of sources, organising it, examining it, and applying it to the presentation. Engagement with wider material is wholly correct, accurate and meaningfully explores their different facets and perspectives. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Communication, Organisation and Presentation** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or completely unstructured and/or incoherent. Seriously deficient in quantity and quality of presentation, with very poor verbal communication skills and very poor answers to questions. Highly unsatisfactory visual aids and timekeeping. No transferable skills demonstrated. |
| 10-19 | Largely unstructured and/or incoherent. Seriously deficient in quantity and quality of presentation, with poor verbal communication skills and poor answers to questions. Unsatisfactory visual aids and timekeeping. Very few transferable skills demonstrated. |
| 20-29 | Mostly unstructured and/or incoherent. Deficient in quantity and quality of presentation, with underdeveloped verbal communication skills and poor answers to questions. Mostly unsatisfactory visual aids and timekeeping. Few transferable skills demonstrated. |
| 30-39 | Weak presentation structure and potentially incoherent in delivery. Underdeveloped in quantity and quality of presentation, with some underdeveloped verbal communication skills and unsatisfactory answers to questions. Underdeveloped visual aids and timekeeping, but with some attempts evident. Some, but relatively few, transferable skills demonstrated. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Inconsistent, but developing, presentation structure. Potentially problematic in delivery. Underdeveloped in both quantity and quality, but with some verbal communication skills and some satisfactory answers to questions present. Underdeveloped visual aids and timekeeping, but with some attempts at both in evidence. Some, but relatively few, transferable skills demonstrated. |
| 50-59 | Developing and largely adequate presentation structure, and largely acceptable delivery with some underdeveloped aspects. Adequate quantity and quality of presentation, with largely satisfactory verbal communication skills and satisfactory answers to questions. Adequate visual aids and timekeeping, but with potentially some gaps or mistiming. Some transferable skills demonstrated. |
| 60-69 | Good presentation structure, and good delivery, potentially with minimal underdeveloped aspects that could be improved in future. Good quantity and quality of presentation, with good verbal communication skills and good answers to questions. Good visual aids and timekeeping, but with potentially minimal gaps or mistiming. Transferable skills demonstrated. |
| 70-79 | Very good presentation structure, and very strong delivery, with minimal underdeveloped aspects. Very good quantity and quality of presentation, with very strong verbal communication skills and strong, considered answers to questions. High quality visual aids and excellent timekeeping, with minimal gaps or mistiming. Numerous transferable skills demonstrated. |
| 80-89 | Excellent presentation structure, and very strong delivery, with almost no underdeveloped aspects. Very good quantity and quality of presentation, with excellent verbal communication skills and strong, considered answers to questions. High quality visual aids and excellent timekeeping, with minimal gaps or mistiming. Numerous transferable skills demonstrated. |
| 90-100 | Exceptional presentation structure, and excellent delivery, with no underdeveloped aspects. Excellent quantity and quality of presentation, with exceptional verbal communication skills and strong, highly considered and sophisticated answers to questions. High quality visual aids and excellent timekeeping, with no gaps or mistiming. Numerous transferable skills demonstrated. |

## Posters

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Content, Knowledge and Understanding** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or very little evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of the topic, the subject area, content, reading or research. Very poor scope and no ideas presented. Major inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 10-19 | Little evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of the topic, the subject area, content, reading or research. Poor scope and very few ideas presented. Major inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 20-29 | Minimal evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of the topic, the subject area, content, reading or research. Poor scope and minimal ideas presented. Significant inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 30-39 | Lacking evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of the topic, the subject area, content, reading or research. Underdeveloped scope and limited ideas presented. Some pertinent content, but inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements present. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Some evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of the topic, the subject area, content, reading or research. Partial or underdeveloped – but correct – scope and ideas. Some pertinent content, potentially mixed with some inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 50-59 | A basic factual or conceptual understanding of the topic, the subject area, content, reading or research. Basic – but correct – scope and ideas present. Generally pertinent content, with potentially some inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 60-69 | A good factual or conceptual understanding of the topic, the subject area, content, reading or research. Good scope and ideas present. Pertinent content, with potentially a little repetition and unnecessary statements, or slight overuse of introduction/conclusion. |
| 70-79 | A very good factual or conceptual understanding of the topic, the subject area, content, reading or research. A comprehensive, and very good scope and ideas present. Unnecessary or repeated material almost completely eliminated. |
| 80-89 | An excellent factual or conceptual understanding of the topic, the subject area, content, reading or research. Excellent, comprehensive scope and ideas presented. Entirely pertinent content, with no repetition and unnecessary statements. |
| 90-100 | An exceptional factual or conceptual understanding of the topic, the subject area, content, reading or research. Excellent, sophisticated scope and ideas present. Entirely pertinent content, with no repetition and unnecessary statements. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Analysis, Argument and Intellectual Skills** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or no evidence of analysis, argument or criticality. No evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, and no attempt to construct a coherent argument. |
| 10-19 | Very little to no evidence of analysis, argument or criticality. Very little evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, and very little to no attempt to construct a coherent argument. |
| 20-29 | Minimal evidence of analysis, argument or criticality. Minimal evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, and minimal attempt to construct a coherent argument. |
| 30-39 | Lacking or underdeveloped analysis, argument or criticality. Some, but lacking, evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, but an underdeveloped attempt at using it to construct a coherent argument. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level**. Limited, but some evidence of analysis, argument or criticality. Some developing evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with a minimal attempt to use it to construct a coherent argument. |
| 50-59 | Satisfactory evidence of analysis, argument or criticality in presentation. Developing evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with a satisfactory, but perhaps underdeveloped attempt to use it to construct a coherent argument. |
| 60-69 | Good evidence of analysis, argument or criticality. Clear evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with a good attempt to use it to construct an argument, which may have some flaws but which is nonetheless coherent. |
| 70-79 | Very good evidence of analysis, argument or criticality. Clear evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with very strong use of this knowledge to construct an argument, which has minimal flaws and which is likely to be convincing. |
| 80-89 | Excellent evidence of analysis, argument or criticality. Very strong evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with excellent use of this knowledge to construct a critical argument, which has minimal flaws and which is convincing. |
| 90-100 | Comprehensive and sophisticated evidence of analysis, argument or criticality. Excellent evidence of wider knowledge of the field or subject matter, with sophisticated use of this knowledge to construct a critical argument, which has almost no flaws and which is convincing. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Range, Breadth and Application of Research and Resources** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or no evidence of any ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the content of the poster. |
| 10-19 | Little to no evidence of any ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the content of the poster. |
| 20-29 | Limited evidence of ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the content of the poster. |
| 30-39 | Minimal evidence of ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the content of the poster. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Shows some established evidence of sourcing wider literature, organising it, and applying and relating it to the content of the poster from a limited selection of sources. Engagement with a text may not be meaningful to the content, but the process of doing so is established. |
| 50-59 | A reasonable attempt to source relevant wider literature from a range of sources, organising it, examining it, and applying it to the poster. Engagement with wider material is likely to be correct and in some ways meaningful, but largely surface-level. |
| 60-69 | A good, competent attempt to source relevant wider literature from a range of sources, organising it, examining it, and applying it to the poster. Engagement with wider material is likely to be correct and accurate, with mostly meaningful exploration of their relevance and facets. |
| 70-79 | A very good sourcing of relevant wider literature from a range of sources, organising it, examining it, and applying it to the poster. Engagement with wider material is likely to be correct and accurate, with meaningful exploration of their relevance and facets. |
| 80-89 | Excellent sourcing of relevant wider literature from a range of sources, organising it, examining it, and applying it to the poster. Engagement with wider material is correct, accurate and meaningfully explores their different facets and perspectives. |
| 90-100 | Exceptional sourcing of relevant wider literature from a range of sources, organising it, examining it, and applying it to the poster. Engagement with wider material is wholly correct, accurate and meaningfully explores their different facets and perspectives. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Communication, Organisation and Presentation** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or completely unstructured and/or incoherent, with no links between sections and very poor spelling, punctuation and grammar. Seriously deficient in quantity and quality of visual aids. No transferable skills demonstrated. |
| 10-19 | Structure is extremely weak and/or incoherent, with almost no links between poster sections and poor spelling, punctuation and grammar. Very deficient in quality and quantity of visual aids. Very few transferable skills demonstrated. |
| 20-29 | Structure is mostly weak and/or incoherent, with very few coherent links between sections and spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax errors common throughout. Some attempt at evidencing some transferable skills. |
| 30-39 | Structure is weak or undeveloped, but logic can be deciphered if looked at closely. Mostly incoherent, though some attempts to present relevant information are in evidence, and some links between sections are attempted. Visual aids are lacking in quality and quantity. Some attempt at evidencing transferable skills. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Structure is largely inconsistent and lacking in sequential or relevant development, but it is clear that an attempt to do so has been made. Mistakes in spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax are common. Visual aids lack quality and quantity, but an effort has been made. Some attempt at evidencing transferable skills. |
| 50-59 | Structure lacks coherence and mistakes in presentation, spelling, punctuation, grammar and syntax are relatively common, but submission does demonstrate some logical coherence and there is adequate quality and quantity of visual aids. Some transferable skills are evidenced. |
| 60-69 | Structure has coherence and language used is relevant and mature. There is a logical progression to the poster between sections, and relatively few mistakes in spelling, grammar, punctuation, syntax and presentation. Visual aids are of a good quality throughout. Submission clearly evidences transferable skills for employment contexts. |
| 70-79 | A well-organised poster with clear, logical progression through sections towards an argument. There are few mistakes in spelling, punctuation, grammar, syntax and presentation. Visual aids are of a very strong quality. Demonstrates evidence of multiple transferable skills for employment contexts. |
| 80-89 | A very well-organised poster with clear, logical progression through the sections towards an argument. There are almost no mistakes in spelling, punctuation, grammar, syntax and presentation. Visual aids are of a very strong quality. Demonstrates evidence of multiple transferable skills for employment contexts. |
| 90-100 | An exceptionally well-organised poster with clear, logical progression through the sections towards an argument. Next to no mistakes in spelling, punctuation, grammar, syntax and presentation. Excellent quality of visual aids. Demonstrates a broad range of transferable skills for employment contexts. |

## Portfolio-Based Assessments/Logs/Reflections

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Content, Knowledge and Understanding** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or the inclusion of materials and evidence that are completely inadequate, insufficient, and which does not evidence any knowledge of the required subject or disciplinary content. |
| 10-19 | Materials and evidence submitted are almost entirely inadequate and insufficient, and which does not evidence knowledge of the required subject or disciplinary content. |
| 20-29 | Materials and evidence submitted is mostly inadequate and insufficient, and which largely does not evidence knowledge of the required subject or disciplinary content. |
| 30-39 | Materials and evidence submitted are patchy, largely inadequate and/or insufficient, and which may, in some places, evidence minimal knowledge of the required subject or disciplinary content. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Materials and evidence submitted are developing and reasonably comprehensive, but potentially inadequate and/or insufficient in some places. Material largely evidences some basic knowledge of the required subject or disciplinary content. |
| 50-59 | Materials and evidence submitted are adequate and reasonably comprehensive, but with some potential gaps where more could have been included. Material evidences satisfactory knowledge of the required subject or disciplinary content. |
| 60-69 | Materials and evidence submitted are good and comprehensive, with some potential minor gaps where more could perhaps have been included. Material evidences good, well-rounded knowledge of the required subject or disciplinary content. |
| 70-79 | Materials and evidence submitted are very good and comprehensive, with only very minor gaps where more could perhaps have been included. Material evidences very good, well-rounded knowledge of the required subject or disciplinary content. |
| 80-89 | Materials and evidence submitted are excellent and comprehensive, with minimal to no gaps. Material evidences excellent, well-rounded knowledge of the required subject or disciplinary content. |
| 90-100 | Materials and evidence submitted is exceptionally well-selected and comprehensive, with no gaps. Material evidences excellent, well-rounded knowledge of the required subject or disciplinary content. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Analysis, Argument and Intellectual Skills** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or submission evidences no critical skills, construction of an argument and/or no attempt at reflection on the required content or topic. |
| 10-19 | Submission evidences nearly no critical skills, construction of an argument and/or almost no attempt at reflection on the required content or topic. |
| 20-29 | Submission evidences very few critical skills, minimal construction of an argument and/or makes a very meagre attempt at reflection on the required content or topic. |
| 30-39 | Submission evidences few critical skills, an inadequate construction of an argument, and/or makes only a loose and inadequate attempt at reflection on the required content or topic. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Submission evidences minimal, but developing critical skills. There is an inadequate, but attempted, construction of an argument, and/or a definite attempt at reflection on the required content or topic. |
| 50-59 | Submission evidences satisfactory critical skills. There is an adequate construction of an argument, and/or a satisfactory attempt at reflection on the required content or topic. |
| 60-69 | Submission evidences good, well-established critical skills. There is good construction of an argument, and/or a good, reasonable attempt at reflection on the required content or topic. |
| 70-79 | Submission evidences very good, well-entrenched critical skills. There is very good construction of an argument, and/or a very good attempt at reflection on the required content or topic. |
| 80-89 | Submission evidences excellent, well-entrenched critical skills. There is excellent construction of an argument, and/or an excellent attempt at reflection on the required content or topic. |
| 90-100 | Submission evidences exceptional, well-entrenched critical skills. There is exceptional construction of a sophisticated argument, and/or an excellent attempt at reflection on the required content or topic. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Range, Breadth and Application of Research and Resources** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or no evidence of any ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the submission. |
| 10-19 | Little to no evidence of any ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the submission. |
| 20-29 | Limited evidence of ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the submission. |
| 30-39 | Minimal evidence of ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the submission. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Shows some established evidence of sourcing, applying and relating wider literature to the submission from a limited selection of sources. Engagement with a text may not be meaningful to the content, but the process of doing so is established. |
| 50-59 | A reasonable attempt to source, examine and apply relevant literature from a range of sources to the submission. Engagement with texts is likely to be correct and in some ways meaningful, but largely surface-level. |
| 60-69 | A good attempt to source, examine and apply relevant literature from a range of sources to the submission. Engagement with texts is likely to be correct and accurate, with mostly meaningful exploration of their relevance and facets. |
| 70-79 | A very good attempt to source, examine and apply relevant literature from a wide range of sources appropriate to this level of study. Engagement with texts is likely to be correct and accurate, with meaningful exploration of their relevance and facets. |
| 80-89 | An excellent attempt to source, examine and apply relevant literature from a wide range of sources appropriate to this level of study. Engagement with texts is correct, accurate and meaningfully explores their different facets and perspectives. |
| 90-100 | An exceptional attempt to source, examine and apply relevant literature from a wide range of sources appropriate to this level of study. Engagement with texts is correct, accurate and meaningfully explores their different facets and perspectives. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Communication, Organisation and Presentation** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or completely unstructured and/or incoherent. Seriously deficient in quantity and quality of submission. No transferable skills demonstrated. |
| 10-19 | Structure is extremely weak and/or incoherent, with serious spelling, grammar and punctuation errors. Very few transferable skills demonstrated. |
| 20-29 | Structure is mostly weak and/or incoherent, with spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax errors common throughout. Some attempt at evidencing some transferable skills. |
| 30-39 | Structure is weak or immature, but logic can be deciphered if looked at closely. Mostly incoherent, though some attempts to present relevant information are in evidence. Some attempt at evidencing transferable skills. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Structure is largely inconsistent and lacking in sequential development, but it is clear that an attempt to do so has been made. Mistakes in spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax are common. Some attempt at evidencing transferable skills. |
| 50-59 | Structure lacks coherence and mistakes in presentation, spelling, punctuation, grammar and syntax are relatively common, but submission does demonstrate some qualities. Some transferable skills are evidenced. |
| 60-69 | Structure has coherence and language used is relevant and mature. There is a logical progression to the argument, and relatively few mistakes in spelling, grammar, punctuation, syntax and presentation. Submission clearly evidences transferable skills for employment contexts. |
| 70-79 | A well-organised submission with clear, logical progression towards an argument. There are few mistakes in spelling, punctuation, grammar, syntax and presentation. Demonstrates evidence of multiple transferable skills for employment contexts. |
| 80-89 | A very well-organised submission with clear, logical progression towards an argument. There are almost no mistakes in spelling, punctuation, grammar, syntax and presentation. Demonstrates evidence of multiple transferable skills for employment contexts. |
| 90-100 | An exceptionally well-organised submission with clear, logical progression towards an argument. Next to no mistakes in spelling, punctuation, grammar, syntax and presentation. Demonstrates a broad range of transferable skills for employment contexts. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Referencing and Source Acknowledgement** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or no citations/bibliography present. |
| 10-19 | Minimal engagement with academic sources, few citations/skeletal bibliography at best, which pays little to no attention to the conventions of academic referencing styles. |
| 20-29 | Little to no engagement with academic sources, very few (incorrect) citations/marginal bibliography that pays little to no attention to the conventions of academic referencing styles. |
| 30-39 | Below average engagement with academic sources, few citations that are incorrect and a marginal bibliography that pays minimal attention to the conventions of academic referencing styles, but which may have made an attempt to do so. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Some attempts made to engage with academic sources, though still likely to be few citations/and a marginal bibliography that only pays some attention to the conventions of academic referencing styles. |
| 50-59 | A developing attempt made to engage with academic sources. Citations are present in the text and are largely correct, though some mistakes may be present. Bibliography is present and largely correct, though some formatting errors may appear. |
| 60-69 | A good attempt made to engage with academic sources. Citations are present throughout the text and are mostly correct, though a few mistakes may be present with citing some more complex sources. Bibliography is present and mostly correct, though formatting errors may appear in places. |
| 70-79 | A very good attempt made to engage with academic sources. Citations are present throughout the text and used in the right context(s), and are almost completely correct (though one or two mistakes may appear). Bibliography is extensive and almost completely correct. |
| 80-89 | Excellent engagement with academic sources. Citations are common, used correctly, and almost completely accurate. Bibliography is correctly formatted and presented, with only few errors present. |
| 90-100 | Sophisticated engagement with academic sources. Citations are frequent, correctly-used, and almost completely accurate with only one or two errors at most. Bibliography is similarly almost-perfect (or perfect). |