



Cardiff  
Metropolitan  
University

Prifysgol  
Metropolitan  
Caerdydd

## 04.3

# GUIDANCE ON ASSESSMENT MARKING

# CARDIFF METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY

## GUIDANCE ON ASSESSMENT MARKING

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 This section is intended to provide guidance for academic staff and students in the use of the University's Generic Band Descriptors (GBDs). Specifically, it includes:
- 1.1.1 the main aims;
  - 1.1.2 the key principles underpinning the descriptors;
  - 1.1.3 commentary on the position of the descriptors within the overall learning, teaching and assessment process;
  - 1.1.4 commentary on the structure of the descriptors.
- 1.2 In the University, percentages are used to measure student attainment rather than grades and these marks are then grouped into bands. In appropriate cases, these bands may equate to degree classifications. Therefore, the term 'band descriptors' is used in the University rather than 'grade descriptors'. Nevertheless, the above QAA reference to grade descriptors also applies to the University's band descriptors.

### 2. Aims

- 2.1 The University's GBDs aim to:
- 2.1.1 promote greater consistency of marking across the University;
  - 2.1.2 build assessors' confidence in using the full range of marks from 0% to 100%;
  - 2.1.3 help assessors make fine distinctions, particularly in borderline cases;
  - 2.1.4 steer students in their understanding of what is required of them to gain a mark/degree classification.

### 3. Key principles

- 3.1 The GBDs have been aligned with the undergraduate and postgraduate qualification descriptors within the QAA Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) (*November 2014*).
- 3.2 The descriptors identify the standards required at Level 3, 4, 5 or 6 (undergraduate) and Level 7 (postgraduate).
- 3.3 The descriptors apply to all undergraduate or taught Master's degree programmes at the University and all types of assessment (for example, coursework and examinations) and therefore represent broad principles that are necessarily expressed in generic terms.

- 3.4 As generic descriptors, the GBDs should be used in conjunction with discipline-specific and/or assessment-specific descriptors that are developed within Schools and/or programmes. For consistency, discipline-specific and assessment-specific descriptors should be developed according to the principles underpinning the generic descriptors.
- 3.5 The GBDs are intended to be helpful for both staff *and* students. Therefore, the language used aims to be accessible, direct and avoid jargon so that both groups can understand the standards required in each band.
- 3.6 As far as possible, pass descriptors (40% and above for undergraduate and 50% and above for postgraduate) are expressed in positive terms.
- 3.7 Each descriptor expresses the characteristics of work in a particular percentage band and avoids indicating what the work is lacking in relation to the descriptor of a higher band.
- 3.8 The descriptors are intended to describe *general* characteristics within a particular % band. Students may sometimes produce work that demonstrates some characteristics of two, consecutive bands, in which case a 'best fit', professional judgement needs to be made by the marker.
- 3.9 Although the descriptors are couched in terms of summative judgements, nevertheless, it is intended that they are also used for formative assessment purposes. Students gaining a mark in a particular band will be aware of the expectations of the band immediately above. This can aid formative assessment feedback through the clear identification of areas for improvement and related target setting.

#### **4. The role of GBDs in learning, teaching and assessment**

- 4.1 The GBDs are part of a cycle of learning, teaching and assessment. Learning outcomes are set out in module descriptors and identify the knowledge, skills and understanding that students need to demonstrate at the end of the module. The curriculum design of content and learning and teaching activities, ensures that these learning outcomes are not only addressed but that opportunities are provided to enable their achievement at a high level.
- 4.2 In order to measure the extent to which students have achieved the learning outcomes, assessment tasks are then set. Assessment criteria are devised by programme teams to enable markers to measure the extent of student attainment and these are used by markers and moderators. In the case of undergraduate or Master's programmes, GBDs provide guidance for markers in deciding on the level of student attainment. Discipline-specific band descriptors are also used

(developed at programme or School level) to reflect the particular context of the assessed work (e.g. seminar presentation and management of a group discussion; production of a professional portfolio; exhibition of artwork; recording of an original musical composition etc.). Discipline-specific band descriptors, therefore, may supplement the GBDs.

- 4.3 As indicated at 3.9 above, as well as their obvious application for summative assessment, it is intended that the GBDs are used as a formative assessment tool. For this to be effective, it is essential that students receive and discuss the relationship of learning outcomes, assessment tasks, assessment criteria, discipline-specific band descriptors and GBDs at the beginning of each academic year. This enables students to be informed about expectations and standards and to have a full understanding of assessment feedback and target setting.

## **5. Structure of the descriptors.**

- 5.1 The descriptors are structured as follows:

5.1.1 Descriptors are provided in 10% bands ranging from 0% to 100%.

5.1.2 Percentage bands are mapped onto undergraduate or Master's award classifications (including fail).

5.1.3 Band descriptors comprise

- a statement that describes the overall level of attainment in that band;
- a series of five detailed descriptors that relate to: (i) knowledge and understanding; (ii) presentation and communication; (iii) analysis and discussion; (iv) research/scholarship; (v) structured argument and critical evaluation.

5.1.4 The two top bands within the first class category (undergraduate degrees) or Distinction Category (Master's degrees) (70%-79% and 80% to 100%) are supplemented by characteristics that are likely to be present in work at that level.

5.1.5 Zero will be awarded in cases where:

- i) no answer has been attempted;
- ii) an allegation of unfair practice has been substantiated by a Committee of Enquiry or Examination Board (including Fixed Penalty) and the original mark awarded has been cancelled.

The award of zero in either case is considered to be a fail.

In the case of (ii) above, if unfair practice is suspected at the marking stage, the marker(s) should award a mark as if it were the candidate's own work. If an allegation of unfair practice is subsequently substantiated, there has to be a mark to cancel, and the Committee of Enquiry or Examination Board will need to know

the magnitude of the original mark when determining further penalty to impose.

## **6. Simplified versions of the Grade Band Descriptors**

6.1 The generic Grade Band Descriptors are available to staff and students in simplified form at the below links:

**[Level 3 simplified Grade Band Descriptors \(Word\)](#)**

**[Level 4 simplified Grade Band Descriptors \(Word\)](#)**

**[Level 5 simplified Grade Band Descriptors \(Word\)](#)**

**[Level 6 simplified Grade Band Descriptors \(Word\)](#)**

**[Level 7 simplified Grade Band Descriptors \(Word\)](#)**

**TABLE A**  
**GENERIC LEVEL 3 BAND DESCRIPTORS**

Level 3	80%-100% (1 <sup>st</sup> Class +)	70%-79% (1 <sup>st</sup> )	60%-69% (2:1)	50%-59% (2:2)	40%-49% (3 <sup>rd</sup> )	30-39% (Narrow Fail)	1-29% (Clear Fail)
<b>Overall summary</b>	A full and detailed understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at an excellent level (80-89%) or outstanding and exceptional level (90-100%) and beyond level 3.	A full and detailed understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at a very good level.	A full understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at a good level.	A secure understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the associated learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at a satisfactory level.	A basic understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the associated learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at a threshold level.	Unsatisfactory overall. A partial understanding of the set task and an ability to have met some of the associated learning outcomes at a basic level. However, attainment is uneven with some learning outcomes not met and some assessment criteria are unaddressed.	Poor overall. Minimal understanding of the set task. Has partially met one or two learning outcomes, or no learning outcomes. Many assessment criteria are unaddressed.
<b>Knowledge &amp; Understanding</b>	Further to the 70%-79% band, work in the 80%-100% bands would extend beyond that expected at Level 3.	May demonstrate a detailed knowledge of the field of study relevant to the task. There is strong evidence of an ability to apply such knowledge. The student also demonstrates an ability to engage in confident discussion of basic concepts and displays an awareness of different perspectives or approaches. Independent thinking is also a feature of work at this level.	May demonstrate a detailed knowledge of the field of study relevant to the task. There is clear evidence of an ability to apply such knowledge. The discussion of basic concepts is often tackled successfully and there is evidence of independent thinking.	May demonstrate a sound knowledge of the field of study relevant to the task. Although there may be a tendency to rely on information received from elsewhere (e.g. programme materials), there is still some evidence of independent thinking. A few errors and/or misconceptions may be present, but these will not be in important areas	May demonstrate a basic knowledge of the field of study relevant to the task. Reproducing information received from elsewhere (e.g. programme materials) is a frequent feature of work at this level. Errors and misconceptions will be evident, but these are outweighed by the degree of knowledge and understanding demonstrated overall.	May demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the field of study relevant to the task. Factual inaccuracies, errors and misconceptions are evident in important areas and elements of the assessed work may be irrelevant to the task.	May demonstrate little knowledge and understanding of the field of study relevant to the task. Factual inaccuracies, errors and misconceptions are evident in many important areas and these outweigh the degree of knowledge and understanding demonstrated. Substantial elements of the assessed work may be irrelevant to the task.

Level 3	80%-100% (1 <sup>st</sup> Class +)	70%-79% (1 <sup>st</sup> )	60%-69% (2:1)	50%-59% (2:2)	40%-49% (3 <sup>rd</sup> )	30-39% (Narrow Fail)	1-29% (Clear Fail)
Presentation and communication	Further to the 70%-79% band, work in the 80%-100% bands would extend beyond that expected at Level 3.	<p>May demonstrate an ability to present, evaluate and interpret qualitative and quantitative data, in order to develop lines of argument and make sound judgements in accordance with basic theories and concepts of their subject(s) of study.</p> <p>The standard of presentation is high and the format appropriate. Key points are logically organised and in written work, the style is lucid. Arguments are well-defined and clearly articulated.</p>	<p>May demonstrate an ability to present, evaluate and interpret qualitative and quantitative data, in order to develop lines of argument and make sound judgements in accordance with basic theories and concepts of their subject(s) of study.</p> <p>Work is well presented and the format appropriate. Key points are appropriately organised and in written work, the writing style is fluent and arguments are well articulated.</p>	<p>May demonstrate some ability to present, evaluate and interpret qualitative and quantitative data, in order to develop lines of argument and make sound judgements in accordance with basic theories and concepts of their subject(s) of study.</p> <p>Overall, the structure and format of the work are appropriate. There may be occasional faults in the presentation of work but overall, these do not detract from the clarity of expression.</p>	<p>May demonstrate limited ability to present, evaluate and interpret qualitative and quantitative data, in order to develop lines of argument and make sound judgements in accordance with basic theories and concepts of their subject(s) of study. However, more success is achieved in describing and reporting factual information rather than communicating complex ideas.</p> <p>Generally, the work is appropriately structured although key points may not be logically sequenced. Although there will be faults in the presentation of work, the meaning is still clear.</p>	<p>May demonstrate limited ability to present, evaluate and interpret qualitative and quantitative data.</p> <p>Ideas may not be communicated clearly and present comprehension difficulties for the reader.</p> <p>If attempted, the presentation of arguments and more complex ideas may be confused and clumsily expressed.</p>	<p>May demonstrate little ability to present, evaluate and interpret qualitative and quantitative data.</p> <p>Frequent faults in the presentation of work and significant difficulties in its structure and organisation detract from the clarity and meaning overall. The writing style is often clumsy and inappropriate.</p>
Analysis & discussion	Further to the 70%-79% band, work in the 80%-100% bands would extend beyond that expected at Level 3.	May demonstrate an ability to select and use different approaches to solving well-defined, complex and non-routine problems related to their area of study by making use of appropriate techniques. The student is highly successful in presenting and commenting on outcomes.	May demonstrate an ability to select and use different approaches to solving well-defined, complex and non-routine problems related to their area of study by making use of appropriate techniques and has success in presenting and commenting on outcomes.	May demonstrate an ability to select and use different approaches to solving well-defined, complex and non-routine problems related to their area of study and generally has success in presenting and commenting on outcomes.	May demonstrate a limited ability to select and use different approaches to solving well-defined, complex and non-routine problems related to their area of study and has intermittent success in presenting and commenting on outcomes.	May demonstrate a limited ability to select and use different approaches to solving well-defined, complex and non-routine problems related to their area of study but outcomes may be naïve, simplistic and/or unconvincing.	May demonstrate little ability to select and use of different approaches to solving well-defined, complex and non-routine problems related to their area of study. Where such work has been attempted, outcomes may be inappropriate, or absent.

Level 3	80%-100% (1 <sup>st</sup> Class +)	70%-79% (1 <sup>st</sup> )	60%-69% (2:1)	50%-59% (2:2)	40%-49% (3 <sup>rd</sup> )	30-39% (Narrow Fail)	1-29% (Clear Fail)
<b>Research / scholarship</b>	Further to the 70%-79% band, work in the 80%-100% bands would extend beyond that expected at Level 3.	<p>May demonstrate an awareness of current research/advanced scholarship in the discipline. Use of scholarly reviews/primary sources and a breadth of individual reading and investigation, extending beyond the sources provided, is apparent.</p> <p>The referencing of literature and other sources is accurate and in line with academic conventions.</p> <p>A knowledge and understanding of research processes, techniques and methods is demonstrated along with an ability to apply research knowledge and skills successfully in appropriate contexts.</p>	<p>May demonstrate an awareness of current research/advanced scholarship in the discipline. Examples referred to indicate a breadth of individual reading and investigation that extend beyond the sources provided.</p> <p>The referencing of literature and other sources is almost always accurate.</p> <p>A basic knowledge of research processes is evident along with an ability to apply research skills and knowledge in the appropriate context.</p>	<p>May demonstrate some awareness of current research/advanced scholarship in the discipline. Examples of research/scholarship referred to in the work demonstrate some individual reading and investigation.</p> <p>Occasional errors may be present in the referencing of literature and other sources.</p> <p>Some knowledge of research processes is evident and the application of research skills and knowledge is generally successful, although there may be a reliance on tutor support</p>	<p>May demonstrate limited awareness of current research/advanced scholarship in the discipline. Examples of research/scholarship referred to in the work may indicate an over-reliance on programme materials rather than individual reading and investigation.</p> <p>There are errors in the referencing of literature and other sources.</p> <p>Some knowledge of research processes is evident, although the application of such knowledge is less secure.</p>	<p>May demonstrate limited or sporadic knowledge awareness of current research/advanced scholarship in the discipline. A restricted range of sources are used but overall, there is an over-reliance on programme materials with little evidence of individual reading and investigation.</p> <p>There are frequent errors in the referencing of literature and other sources.</p> <p>Although limited knowledge of research processes may be evident, nevertheless, the application of such knowledge is largely unsuccessful.</p>	<p>May demonstrate little knowledge of current research/scholarship in the discipline. Evidence of individual reading and investigation is negligible and the limited referencing of literature and other sources is frequently inaccurate.</p> <p>Very limited knowledge of research processes is apparent and there is a failure to apply this knowledge</p>
<b>Structured argument and critical evaluation</b>	Further to the 70%-79% band, work in the 80%-100% bands would extend beyond that expected at Level 3.	<p>May demonstrate an ability to communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably with structured arguments.</p> <p>Arguments are well developed and substantiated and there is recognition of the complexities of academic debate.</p> <p>Appropriate solutions are offered to problems and the effectiveness of the methods of resolution are reviewed.</p> <p>There is strong evidence that the student is able to reflect effectively on the student's own practice, with a full awareness of the implications for future development.</p>	<p>May demonstrate an ability to communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably.</p> <p>Arguments are clearly considered and substantiated and there is evidence of an ability to make appropriate judgements and to suggest solutions to problems. The effectiveness of the methods of resolution are reviewed.</p> <p>The student also demonstrates an ability to engage in reflective practice and to take account of personal evaluations planning for future development.</p>	<p>May demonstrate, at times, an ability to communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably, although there may be some over-reliance on description and factual presentation.</p> <p>Arguments are usually substantiated.</p> <p>There is some evidence of the student's ability to evaluate and reflect on the student's own practice, but reflections may lack insight and the implications for future development may be underestimated.</p>	<p>May demonstrate a limited ability to communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably. The balance within the work is likely to be in favour of description and factual presentation.</p> <p>Arguments are generally substantiated but may be under-developed.</p> <p>There is some evidence of the student's ability to evaluate and reflect on the student's own practice, although reflections may be limited and superficial with little consideration of their relevance for future development.</p>	<p>May demonstrate limited evidence of an ability to communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably. The work is largely descriptive and arguments, if attempted, are rarely substantiated.</p> <p>Self-evaluation and reflections on the student's own practice are extremely limited.</p>	<p>May demonstrate little evidence of an ability to communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably.</p> <p>Self-evaluation and reflections on the student's own practice are negligible or absent.</p>



**TABLE B**  
**GENERIC LEVEL 4 BAND DESCRIPTORS**

Level 4	80%-100% (1 <sup>st</sup> Class +)	70%-79% (1 <sup>st</sup> )	60%-69% (2:1)	50%-59% (2:2)	40%-49% (3 <sup>rd</sup> )	30-39% (Narrow Fail)	1-29% (Clear Fail)
<b>Overall summary</b>	A full and detailed understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at an excellent level (80-89%) or outstanding and exceptional level (90-100%) and beyond level 4.	A full and detailed understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at a very good level.	A full understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at a good level.	A secure understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the associated learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at a satisfactory level.	A basic understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the associated learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at a threshold level.	Unsatisfactory overall. A partial understanding of the set task and an ability to have met some of the associated learning outcomes at a basic level. However, attainment is uneven with some learning outcomes not met and some assessment criteria unaddressed.	Poor overall. Minimal understanding of the set task and will partially have met one or two learning outcomes or none. Many assessment criteria are unaddressed.
<b>Knowledge &amp; Understanding</b>	Further to the 70%-79% band, work in the 80%-100% bands would extend beyond that expected at Level 4.	May demonstrate a detailed knowledge of the underlying aspects of the field of study relevant to the task. There is strong evidence of an ability to apply such knowledge. The student also demonstrates an ability to engage in confident discussion of basic concepts and an awareness of the limitations and/or ambiguity of disciplinary knowledge. Independent thinking and original insights are also features of work at this level.	May demonstrate a detailed knowledge of the underlying aspects of the field of study relevant to the task. There is clear evidence of an ability to apply such knowledge and, in some contexts, to extend and transform it. The discussion of basic concepts is often tackled successfully and there is evidence of independent thinking.	May demonstrate a sound knowledge of the underlying aspects of the field of study relevant to the task. Although there may be a tendency to rely on information received from elsewhere (e.g. programme materials), there is still some evidence of independent thinking. A few errors and/or misconceptions may be present, but these will not be in important areas	May demonstrate a basic knowledge of the underlying aspects of the field of study relevant to the task. Reproducing information received from elsewhere (e.g. programme materials) is a frequent feature of work at this level. Errors and misconceptions will be evident, but these are outweighed by the degree of knowledge and understanding demonstrated overall.	May demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the underlying aspects of the field of study relevant to the task. Factual inaccuracies, errors and misconceptions are evident in important areas and elements of the assessed work may be irrelevant to the task.	May demonstrate little knowledge and understanding of the underlying aspects of the field of study relevant to the task. Factual inaccuracies, errors and misconceptions are evident in many important areas and these outweigh the degree of knowledge and understanding demonstrated. Substantial elements of the assessed work may be irrelevant to the task.

Level 4	80%-100% (1 <sup>st</sup> Class +)	70%-79% (1 <sup>st</sup> )	60%-69% (2:1)	50%-59% (2:2)	40%-49% (3 <sup>rd</sup> )	30-39% (Narrow Fail)	1-29% (Clear Fail)
Presentation and communication	Further to the 70%-79% band, work in the 80%-100% bands would extend beyond that expected at Level 4.	May demonstrate an ability to present, evaluate and interpret qualitative and quantitative data, in order to develop lines of argument and make sound judgements in accordance with basic theories and concepts of their subject(s) of study.  The standard of presentation is high and the format appropriate. Key points are logically organised and in written work, the style is lucid. Arguments are well-defined and clearly articulated, structured and coherent.	May demonstrate an ability to present, evaluate and interpret qualitative and quantitative data, in order to develop lines of argument and make sound judgements in accordance with basic theories and concepts of their subject(s) of study.  Work is well presented and the format appropriate. Key points are appropriately organised and in written work, the writing style is fluent and arguments are well articulated, structured and coherent.	May demonstrate some ability to present, evaluate and interpret qualitative and quantitative data, in order to develop lines of argument and make sound judgements in accordance with basic theories and concepts of their subject(s) of study.  Overall, the structure and format of the work are appropriate. There may be occasional faults in the presentation of work but overall, these do not detract from the clarity of expression.	May demonstrate limited ability to present, evaluate and interpret qualitative and quantitative data, in order to develop lines of argument and make sound judgements in accordance with basic theories and concepts of their subject(s) of study. However, more success is achieved in describing and reporting factual information rather than communicating complex ideas.  Generally, the work is appropriately structured although key points may not be logically sequenced. Although there will be faults in the presentation of work, the meaning is still clear.	May demonstrate limited ability to present, evaluate and interpret qualitative and quantitative data.  Ideas may not be communicated clearly and present comprehension difficulties for the reader.  If attempted, the presentation of arguments and more complex ideas may be confused and clumsily expressed.	May demonstrate little ability to present, evaluate and interpret qualitative and quantitative data.  Frequent faults in the presentation of work and significant difficulties in its structure and organisation detract from the clarity and meaning overall. The writing style is often clumsy and inappropriate.
Analysis & discussion	Further to the 70%-79% band, work in the 80%-100% bands would extend beyond that expected at Level 4.	May demonstrate an ability to evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving well-defined, complex and non-routine problems related to their area of study. The student is highly successful in presenting and commenting on outcomes and is able to comment perceptively and with some insight on the relationship between theory and practice.	May demonstrate an ability to evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving well-defined, complex and non-routine problems related to their area of study by making use of appropriate techniques and has considerable success in presenting and commenting on outcomes. There is some linkage between theory and practice.	May demonstrate an ability to evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving well-defined, complex and non-routine problems related to their area of study and generally has success in presenting and commenting on outcomes.	May demonstrate a limited ability to evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving well-defined, complex and non-routine problems related to their area of study and has intermittent success in presenting and commenting on outcomes.	May demonstrate a limited ability to evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving well-defined, complex and non-routine problems related to their area of study but outcomes may be naïve, simplistic and/or unconvincing.	May demonstrate little ability to evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving well-defined, complex and non-routine problems related to their area of study. Where such work has been attempted, outcomes may be inappropriate, or absent.

Level 4	80%-100% (1 <sup>st</sup> Class +)	70%-79% (1 <sup>st</sup> )	60%-69% (2:1)	50%-59% (2:2)	40%-49% (3 <sup>rd</sup> )	30-39% (Narrow Fail)	1-29% (Clear Fail)
<b>Research / scholarship</b>	Further to the 70%-79% band, work in the 80%-100% bands would extend beyond that expected at Level 4.	<p>May demonstrate an awareness of current research/advanced scholarship in the discipline. The use of scholarly reviews/primary sources is confident and a breadth and depth of individual reading and investigation, extending beyond the sources provided, is apparent.</p> <p>The referencing of literature and other sources is accurate and in line with academic conventions.</p> <p>A knowledge and understanding of research processes, techniques and methods is demonstrated along with an ability to apply research knowledge and skills successfully in appropriate contexts.</p>	<p>May demonstrate an awareness of current research/advanced scholarship in the discipline. Examples referred to indicate a breadth and depth of individual reading and investigation that extend beyond the sources provided.</p> <p>The referencing of literature and other sources is almost always accurate.</p> <p>A secure knowledge of research processes is evident, along with an ability to apply research skills and knowledge in the appropriate context.</p>	<p>May demonstrate some awareness of current research/advanced scholarship in the discipline. Examples of research/scholarship referred to in the work demonstrate individual reading and investigation.</p> <p>Occasional errors may be present in the referencing of literature and other sources.</p> <p>Some knowledge of research processes is evident and the application of research skills and knowledge is generally successful, although there may be a reliance on tutor support</p>	<p>May demonstrate limited awareness of current research/advanced scholarship in the discipline. Examples of research/scholarship referred to in the work may indicate an over-reliance on programme materials rather than individual reading and investigation.</p> <p>There are errors in the referencing of literature and other sources.</p> <p>Some knowledge of research processes is evident although the application of such knowledge is less secure.</p>	<p>May demonstrate limited or sporadic knowledge awareness of current research/advanced scholarship in the discipline. A restricted range of sources are used but overall, there is an over-reliance on programme materials with little evidence of individual reading and investigation.</p> <p>There are frequent errors in the referencing of literature and other sources.</p> <p>Although limited knowledge of research processes may be evident, nevertheless, the application of such knowledge is largely unsuccessful.</p>	<p>May demonstrate little knowledge of current research/scholarship in the discipline. Evidence of individual reading and investigation is negligible and the limited referencing of literature and other sources is frequently inaccurate.</p> <p>Very limited knowledge of research processes is apparent and there is a failure to apply this knowledge</p>

Level 4	80%-100% (1 <sup>st</sup> Class +)	70%-79% (1 <sup>st</sup> )	60%-69% (2:1)	50%-59% (2:2)	40%-49% (3 <sup>rd</sup> )	30-39% (Narrow Fail)	1-29% (Clear Fail)
Structured argument and critical evaluation	Further to the 70%-79% band, work in the 80%-100% bands would extend beyond that expected at Level 4.	<p>May demonstrate an ability to communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably with structured and coherent arguments.</p> <p>Arguments are well developed, sustained and substantiated. Where relevant, basic assumptions are challenged and there is recognition of the complexities of academic debate.</p> <p>Appropriate solutions are offered to problems and there is review of their effectiveness and appropriateness.</p> <p>There is strong evidence that the student is able to reflect effectively on her/his own practice.</p> <p>Critical evaluation of the student's own work and/or professional practice is highly perceptive and there is a full awareness of the implications for future development.</p>	<p>May demonstrate an ability to communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably.</p> <p>Arguments are clearly considered and substantiated and there is evidence of an ability to make appropriate judgements and to suggest solutions to problems and review their effectiveness and appropriateness.</p> <p>The student also demonstrates an ability to engage in reflective practice and to take account of personal evaluations, planning for future development.</p>	<p>May demonstrate, at times, an ability to communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably, although there may be some over-reliance on description and factual presentation.</p> <p>Arguments are usually substantiated.</p> <p>There is some evidence of the student's ability to evaluate and reflect on the student's own practice. own practice but reflections may lack insight and the implications for future development may be underestimated.</p>	<p>May demonstrate a limited ability to communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably. The balance within the work is likely to be in favour of description and factual presentation.</p> <p>Arguments are generally substantiated but may be under-developed.</p> <p>There is some evidence of the student's ability to evaluate and reflect on the student's own practice. although reflections may be limited and superficial, with little consideration of their relevance for future development.</p>	<p>May demonstrate limited evidence of an ability to communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably. The work is largely descriptive and arguments, if attempted, are rarely substantiated.</p> <p>Self-evaluation and reflections on the student's own practice are extremely limited.</p>	<p>May demonstrate little evidence of an ability to communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably.</p> <p>Self-evaluation and reflections on the student's own practice are negligible or absent.</p>

**TABLE C**

**GENERIC LEVEL 5 BAND DESCRIPTORS**

Level 5	80%-100% (1 <sup>st</sup> Class +)	70%-79% (1 <sup>st</sup> )	60%-69% (2:1)	50%-59% (2:2)	40%-49% (3 <sup>rd</sup> )	30-39% (Narrow Fail)	1-29% (Clear Fail)
<b>Overall summary</b>	A full and detailed understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at an excellent level (80-89%) or outstanding and exceptional level (90-100%) and beyond level 5.	A full and detailed understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at a very good level.	A full understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at a good level.	A secure understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the associated learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at a satisfactory level.	A basic understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the associated learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at a threshold level.	Unsatisfactory overall. A partial understanding of the set task and an ability to have met some of the associated learning outcomes at a basic level. Attainment is uneven with some learning outcomes not met and some assessment criteria unaddressed.	Poor overall. Minimal understanding of the set task and will partially have met one or two learning outcomes, or none. Many assessment criteria are unaddressed.
<b>Knowledge &amp; Understanding</b>	Further to the 70%-79% band, work in the 80%-100% bands would extend beyond that expected at Level 5.	Demonstrates a detailed knowledge and critical understanding of underlying concepts and principles of the field of study relevant to the task. There is strong evidence of an ability to extend, transform and apply such knowledge. The student also demonstrates an ability to engage in confident discussion of complex concepts and to recognise the limitations and/or ambiguity of disciplinary knowledge. Independent thinking and original insights are also features of work at this level.	Demonstrates a detailed knowledge and critical understanding of underlying concepts and principles of the field of study relevant to the task. There is good evidence of an ability to extend, transform and apply such knowledge. The discussion of complex concepts is often tackled successfully and there is evidence of independent thinking.	Demonstrates a sound knowledge and critical understanding of underlying concepts and principles of the field of study relevant to the task. There is evidence of an ability to extend, transform and apply such knowledge. Although there may be a tendency to reproduce information received from elsewhere (e.g. programme materials), there is still some evidence of independent thinking. A few errors and/or misconceptions may be present, but these will not be in important areas.	Demonstrates a basic knowledge and critical understanding of underlying concepts and principles of the field of study relevant to the task. There is some evidence of an ability to extend, transform and apply such knowledge. Reproducing information received from elsewhere (e.g. programme materials) is a frequent feature of work at this level. Errors and misconceptions will be evident, but these are outweighed by the degree of knowledge and understanding demonstrated overall.	Demonstrates limited knowledge and critical understanding of underlying concepts and principles of the field of study relevant to the task. There is insufficient evidence of an ability to extend, transform and apply such knowledge. Factual inaccuracies, errors and misconceptions are evident in important areas and elements of the assessed work may be irrelevant to the task.	Demonstrates little knowledge and critical understanding of underlying concepts and principles of the field of study relevant to the task. There is little evidence of an ability to extend, transform and apply such knowledge. Factual inaccuracies, errors and misconceptions are evident in many important areas and these outweigh the degree of knowledge and understanding demonstrated. Substantial elements of the assessed work may be irrelevant to the task.

Level 5	80%-100% (1 <sup>st</sup> Class +)	70%-79% (1 <sup>st</sup> )	60%-69% (2:1)	50%-59% (2:2)	40%-49% (3 <sup>rd</sup> )	30-39% (Narrow Fail)	1-29% (Clear Fail)
<b>Presentation and communication</b>	Further to the 70%-79% band, work in the 80%-100% bands would extend beyond that expected at Level 5.	Demonstrates an ability to communicate information, arguments and analysis in a coherent and succinct manner in a range of situations.  The standard of presentation is high and the format appropriate.  Key points are logically organised and in written work, the style is lucid and mature. Arguments are well-defined and clearly articulated, structured and coherent.	Demonstrates an ability to communicate information, arguments and analysis in a coherent and succinct manner in a range of situations.  Work is well presented and the format appropriate.  Key points are appropriately organised and in written work, the writing style is fluent and arguments are well articulated, structured and coherent.	Demonstrates a satisfactory ability to communicate information, arguments and analysis in a coherent and succinct manner in a range of situations.  Overall, the structure and format of the work are appropriate. There may be occasional faults in the presentation of work. These do not detract from the clarity of expression.	Demonstrates a basic ability to communicate information, arguments and analysis in a coherent and succinct manner in a range of situations. However, more success is achieved in describing and reporting factual information, rather than communicating complex ideas.  Generally, the work is appropriately structured although key points may not be logically sequenced. Although there will be faults in the presentation of work, the meaning is still clear.	Demonstrates a limited ability to communicate some basic concepts, arguments and analysis in a range of situations. If attempted, the presentation of arguments and more complex ideas may be confused and clumsily expressed.	Demonstrates little ability to communicate some basic concepts, arguments and analysis in a range of situations. Frequent faults in the presentation of work and significant difficulties in its structure and organisation detract from the clarity and meaning overall. The writing style is often clumsy and inappropriate.
<b>Analysis &amp; discussion</b>	Demonstrates the ability to design and undertake their own research or advanced scholarship, applying relevant techniques and methods appropriately.  Further to the 70%-79% band, work in the 80%-100% bands would extend beyond that expected at Level 5.	Demonstrates an ability to undertake analysis of qualitative and quantitative data by making very good use of a range of established techniques. The student is highly successful in presenting, synthesising and commenting on outcomes and is able to comment perceptively and with insight on the relationship between theory and practice and the impact of the limits of their knowledge on the analysis of their findings.	Demonstrates an ability to undertake analysis of qualitative and quantitative data by making good use of a range of established techniques. The student is considerably successful in presenting, synthesising and commenting on outcomes and is able to comment perceptively and with insight on the relationship between theory and practice and the impact of the limits of their knowledge on the analysis of their findings.	Demonstrates an ability to undertake analysis of qualitative and quantitative data by making use of a range of established techniques and generally has success in presenting and commenting on outcomes. Awareness of the limits of their knowledge and their impact.	Demonstrates an ability to undertake analysis of qualitative and quantitative data by making basic use of a range of established techniques and has intermittent success in presenting and commenting on outcomes. Some awareness of the limits of their knowledge and their impact.	Is likely to have attempted to undertake analysis of qualitative and quantitative data relevant to the task/discipline but outcomes may be naïve, simplistic and/or unconvincing.	Demonstrates little evidence of being able to undertake analysis of qualitative and quantitative data relevant to the task/discipline. Where such work has been attempted, outcomes may be inappropriate, or absent.

Level 5	80%-100% (1 <sup>st</sup> Class +)	70%-79% (1 <sup>st</sup> )	60%-69% (2:1)	50%-59% (2:2)	40%-49% (3 <sup>rd</sup> )	30-39% (Narrow Fail)	1-29% (Clear Fail)
<b>Research / scholarship</b>	<p>In written coursework, reference citations extend significantly beyond the main body of reading normally expected in the discipline/field of study. In examinations, a substantial range of reference citations are included.</p> <p>Further to the 70%-79% band, work in the 80%-100% bands would extend beyond that expected at Level 5.</p>	<p>Demonstrates a detailed and thorough knowledge of current research/advanced scholarship in the discipline. The use of scholarly reviews/primary sources is confident and a breadth and depth of individual reading and investigation, extending beyond the sources provided, is apparent.</p> <p>The referencing of literature and other sources is accurate and in line with academic conventions.</p> <p>A thorough knowledge and understanding of research processes, techniques and methods is demonstrated along with an ability to apply research knowledge and skills successfully in appropriate contexts.</p>	<p>Demonstrates a good knowledge of current research/scholarship in the discipline. Examples referred to indicate a breadth and depth of individual reading and investigation that extend beyond the sources provided.</p> <p>The referencing of literature and other sources is almost always accurate.</p> <p>A secure knowledge of research processes is evident along with an ability to apply research skills and knowledge in the appropriate context.</p>	<p>Demonstrates a satisfactory knowledge of current research/scholarship in the discipline and shows an ability to discuss its implications. Examples of research/scholarship referred to in the work demonstrate individual reading and investigation.</p> <p>Occasional errors may be present in the referencing of literature and other sources.</p> <p>Some knowledge of research processes is evident and the application of research skills and knowledge is generally successful, although there may be a reliance on tutor support.</p>	<p>Demonstrates basic knowledge of current research/scholarship in the discipline and demonstrates an ability to provide limited comment and/or discussion of its implications. Examples of research/scholarship referred to in the work may indicate an over-reliance on programme materials rather than individual reading and investigation.</p> <p>There are errors in the referencing of literature and other sources.</p> <p>Some knowledge of research processes is evident although the application of such knowledge is less secure.</p>	<p>Demonstrates limited or sporadic knowledge of current research/scholarship in the discipline. A restricted range of sources are used but overall, there is an over-reliance on programme materials with little evidence of individual reading and investigation.</p> <p>There are frequent errors in the referencing of literature and other sources.</p> <p>Although limited knowledge of research processes may be evident, nevertheless, the application of such knowledge is largely unsuccessful.</p>	<p>Demonstrates little knowledge of current research/scholarship in the discipline. Evidence of individual reading and investigation is negligible and the limited referencing of literature and other sources is frequently inaccurate.</p> <p>Very limited knowledge of research processes is apparent and there is a failure to apply this knowledge.</p>

Level 5	80%-100% (1 <sup>st</sup> Class +)	70%-79% (1 <sup>st</sup> )	60%-69% (2:1)	50%-59% (2:2)	40%-49% (3 <sup>rd</sup> )	30-39% (Narrow Fail)	1-29% (Clear Fail)
<b>Structured argument and critical evaluation</b>	<p>Important insights are offered that are informed by critical evaluation of current research/scholarship/professional practice.</p> <p>Further to the 70%-79% band, work in the 80%-100% bands would extend beyond that expected at Level 5.</p>	<p>Demonstrates an ability to solve broadly defined, complex problems and to engage in critical understanding of principles in the field of study. Arguments are well developed, sustained and substantiated. Where relevant, assumptions are challenged and there is clear recognition of the complexities of academic debate. Appropriate and sometimes innovative solutions are offered to problems, evaluating different approaches to solving problems.</p> <p>There is strong evidence that the student is able to reflect effectively on the student's own practice. Critical evaluation of the student's own work and/or professional practice is highly perceptive and there is a full awareness of the implications for future development.</p>	<p>Demonstrates an ability to solve broadly defined, complex problems and to engage in critical understanding of principles in the field of study. Arguments are clearly considered and substantiated and there is evidence of an ability to make appropriate judgements and to suggest solutions to problems, evaluating different approaches to solving problems.</p> <p>The student also demonstrates an ability to engage in reflective practice and to take account of personal evaluations when planning for future development.</p>	<p>Demonstrates a satisfactory ability to solve broadly defined, complex problems and to engage in critical understanding of principles in the field of study, although there may be some over-reliance on description and factual presentation. Arguments are usually substantiated.</p> <p>There is some evidence of the student's ability to evaluate and reflect on the student's own practice, but reflections may lack insight and the implications for future development may be underestimated.</p>	<p>Demonstrates a basic ability to solve broadly defined, complex problems and to engage in critical understanding of principles in the field of study. Although some critical reflection is evident, the balance within the work is likely to be in favour of description and factual presentation. Arguments are generally substantiated but may be under-developed.</p> <p>There is some evidence of the student's ability to evaluate and reflect on the student's own practice, although reflections may be limited and superficial with little consideration of their relevance for future development.</p>	<p>Demonstrates little evidence of ability to solve broadly defined, complex problems and to engage in critical understanding of principles in the field of study. The work is largely descriptive and arguments, if attempted, are rarely substantiated.</p> <p>Self-evaluation and reflections on the student's own practice are extremely limited.</p>	<p>Demonstrates little ability to describe and report but very little evidence is available to indicate an ability to solve broadly defined, complex problems and engage in critical understanding.</p> <p>Self-evaluation and reflections on the student's own practice are negligible or absent.</p>



**TABLE D**

**GENERIC LEVEL 6 BAND DESCRIPTORS**

Level 6	80%-100% (1 <sup>st</sup> Class +)	70%-79% (1 <sup>st</sup> )	60%-69% (2:1)	50%-59% (2:2)	40%-49% (3 <sup>rd</sup> )	30-39% (Narrow Fail)	1-29% (Clear Fail)
<b>Overall summary</b>	<p>A full and detailed understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at an excellent level (80-89%) or outstanding and exceptional level (90-100%) and beyond level 6.</p> <p>Work is of a standard deemed to be worthy of publication/manufacture /public exhibition/public performance</p>	<p>A full and detailed understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at a very good level.</p>	<p>A full understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at a good level.</p>	<p>A secure understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the associated learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at a satisfactory level.</p>	<p>A basic understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the associated learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at a threshold level.</p>	<p>Unsatisfactory overall. A partial understanding of the set task and an ability to have met some of the associated learning outcomes at a basic level. However, attainment is uneven with some learning outcomes not met and some assessment criteria unaddressed.</p>	<p>Poor overall. Minimal understanding of the set task and will partially have met one or two learning outcomes. Many assessment criteria are unaddressed.</p>
<b>Knowledge &amp; Understanding</b>	<p>Further to the 70%-79% band, work in the 80%-100% bands would extend beyond that expected at Level 6.</p> <p>Demonstrates exceptional knowledge and systematic understanding.</p>	<p>A detailed knowledge and systematic understanding of key aspects of the field of study relevant to the task. There is strong evidence of an ability to extend, transform and apply such knowledge. The student also demonstrates an ability to engage in confident discussion of complex concepts and to recognise the limitations and/or ambiguity of disciplinary knowledge. Independent thinking and original insights and self-management of learning are also features of work at this level.</p>	<p>A detailed knowledge and thorough understanding of key aspects of the field of study relevant to the task. There is clear evidence of an ability to apply such knowledge and, in some contexts, to extend and transform it. The discussion of complex concepts is often tackled successfully and there is evidence of independent thinking and self-management of learning.</p>	<p>A sound knowledge and understanding of most key aspects of the field of study relevant to the task and there is some evidence of an ability to apply such knowledge. Although there may be a tendency to reproduce information received from elsewhere (e.g. programme materials), there is still some evidence of independent thinking. A few errors and/or misconceptions may be present, but these will not be in important areas. Evidence of self-management of learning.</p>	<p>A basic knowledge and understanding of many aspects of the field of study relevant to the task. Reproducing information received from elsewhere (e.g. programme materials) is a frequent feature of work at this level. Errors and misconceptions will be evident, but these are outweighed by the degree of knowledge and understanding demonstrated overall. Evidence of self-management of learning.</p>	<p>Limited knowledge and understanding of the field of study relevant to the task. Factual inaccuracies, errors and misconceptions are evident in important areas and elements of the assessed work may be irrelevant to the task.</p>	<p>Little knowledge and understanding of the field of study relevant to the task. Factual inaccuracies, errors and misconceptions are evident in many important areas and these outweigh the degree of knowledge and understanding demonstrated. Substantial elements of the assessed work may be irrelevant to the task.</p>

Level 6	80%-100% (1 <sup>st</sup> Class +)	70%-79% (1 <sup>st</sup> )	60%-69% (2:1)	50%-59% (2:2)	40%-49% (3 <sup>rd</sup> )	30-39% (Narrow Fail)	1-29% (Clear Fail)
<b>Presentation and communication</b>	<p>Further to the 70%-79% band, work in the 80%-100% bands would extend beyond that expected at Level 6.</p> <p>The standard of presentation attains the professional standards expected for the discipline.</p>	<p>An ability to communicate information, complex ideas and concepts in a coherent and succinct manner in a range of situations.</p> <p>The standard of presentation is high and the format appropriate.</p> <p>Key points are logically organised and in written work, the style is lucid and mature. Arguments are well-defined and clearly articulated.</p>	<p>An ability to communicate information, ideas and concepts clearly and succinctly in a range of situations.</p> <p>Work is well presented and the format appropriate.</p> <p>Key points are appropriately organised and in written work, the writing style is fluent and arguments are well articulated.</p>	<p>Demonstrates a satisfactory ability to communicate information, ideas, concepts and arguments successfully in a range of situations.</p> <p>Overall, the structure and format of the work are appropriate.</p> <p>There may be occasional faults in the presentation of work but overall, these do not detract from the clarity of expression.</p>	<p>Some ability to communicate information, ideas, concepts and arguments in a range of situations. However, more success is achieved in describing and reporting factual information rather than communicating complex ideas.</p> <p>Generally, the work is appropriately structured although key points may not be logically sequenced. Although there will be faults in the presentation of work, the meaning is still clear.</p>	<p>Limited ability to communicate simple concepts and/or factual information in a range of situations. However, faults in the presentation of work and in its structure and organisation mar the clarity of expression. If attempted, the presentation of arguments and more complex ideas may be confused and clumsily expressed.</p>	<p>Little ability to communicate simple concepts and/or factual information. Frequent faults in the presentation of work and significant difficulties in its structure and organisation detract from the clarity and meaning overall. The writing style is often clumsy and inappropriate.</p>
<b>Analysis &amp; discussion</b>	<p>The student demonstrates the ability to design and undertake their own research or advanced scholarship, applying relevant techniques and methods appropriately.</p>	<p>An ability to undertake detailed analysis and critical enquiry of qualitative and quantitative data relevant to the task/discipline by making very good use of a number of appropriate techniques. The student is highly successful in presenting, synthesising and commenting on outcomes and is able to comment perceptively and with insight on the relationship between theory and practice and the impact of uncertainty, assumptions and the limits of their knowledge on their findings.</p>	<p>An ability to undertake detailed analysis and critical enquiry relevant to the task/discipline by making use of appropriate techniques and has considerable success in presenting, synthesising and commenting on outcomes. There is some linkage between theory and practice and awareness of the impact of uncertainty, assumptions and the limits of their knowledge.</p>	<p>An ability to utilise some techniques to undertake analysis and enquiry relevant to the task/discipline and generally has success in presenting and commenting on outcomes, with an awareness of uncertainty, assumptions and the limits of their knowledge.</p>	<p>An ability to undertake some limited analysis and enquiry relevant to the task/discipline and has intermittent success in presenting, synthesising and commenting on outcomes with an awareness of uncertainty, assumptions and the limits of their knowledge.</p>	<p>Likely to have attempted some enquiry and analysis of qualitative and quantitative data relevant to the task/discipline, but outcomes may be naïve, simplistic and/or unconvincing.</p>	<p>Little evidence of being able to undertake enquiry and analysis of qualitative and quantitative data relevant to the task/discipline. Where such work has been attempted, outcomes may be inappropriate, or absent.</p>

Level 6	80%-100% (1 <sup>st</sup> Class +)	70%-79% (1 <sup>st</sup> )	60%-69% (2:1)	50%-59% (2:2)	40%-49% (3 <sup>rd</sup> )	30-39% (Narrow Fail)	1-29% (Clear Fail)
<b>Research / scholarship</b>	<p>In written coursework, reference citations extend significantly beyond the main body of reading normally expected in the discipline/field of study. In examinations, a substantial range of reference citations are included.</p>	<p>A detailed, thorough knowledge and systematic understanding of current research/advanced scholarship in the discipline. The use of scholarly reviews/primary sources is confident and a breadth and depth of individual reading and investigation, extending beyond the sources provided, is apparent.</p> <p>The referencing of literature and other sources is accurate and in line with academic conventions.</p> <p>A thorough knowledge and understanding of research processes, techniques and methods is demonstrated along with an ability to determine, refine, adapt and use research knowledge and skills successfully in appropriate contexts.</p>	<p>A thorough knowledge and understanding of current research/scholarship in the discipline. Examples referred to indicate a breadth and depth of individual reading and investigation that extend beyond the sources provided.</p> <p>The referencing of literature and other sources is almost always accurate.</p> <p>A secure knowledge of research processes is evident along with an ability to determine, refine, adapt and use research skills and knowledge in the appropriate context.</p>	<p>A sound knowledge and understanding of current research/scholarship in the discipline and shows an ability to discuss its implications. Examples of research/scholarship referred to in the work demonstrate individual reading and investigation.</p> <p>Occasional errors may be present in the referencing of literature and other sources.</p> <p>Some knowledge of research processes is evident and the application of research skills and knowledge is generally successful, although there may be a reliance on tutor support.</p>	<p>Some knowledge and understanding of current research/scholarship in the discipline and demonstrates an ability to provide limited comment and/or discussion of its implications. Examples of research/scholarship referred to in the work may indicate an over-reliance on programme materials rather than individual reading and investigation.</p> <p>There are errors in the referencing of literature and other sources.</p> <p>Some knowledge of research processes is evident although the application of such knowledge is less secure.</p>	<p>Limited or sporadic knowledge and understanding of current research/scholarship in the discipline. A restricted range of sources are used but overall, there is an over-reliance on programme materials with little evidence of individual reading and investigation.</p> <p>There are frequent errors in the referencing of literature and other sources.</p> <p>Although limited knowledge of research processes may be evident, nevertheless, the application of such knowledge is largely unsuccessful.</p>	<p>Little knowledge and understanding of current research/scholarship in the discipline. Evidence of individual reading and investigation is negligible.</p> <p>Limited referencing of literature and other sources is frequently inaccurate.</p> <p>Very limited knowledge of research processes is apparent and there is a failure to apply this knowledge.</p>

Level 6	80%-100% (1 <sup>st</sup> Class +)	70%-79% (1 <sup>st</sup> )	60%-69% (2:1)	50%-59% (2:2)	40%-49% (3 <sup>rd</sup> )	30-39% (Narrow Fail)	1-29% (Clear Fail)
Structured argument and critical evaluation	<p>Work may challenge the boundaries of knowledge within the discipline/field of study and is informed by innovative and/or creative thinking.</p> <p>New insights are offered that are informed by critical evaluation of current research/ scholarship/ professional practice.</p>	<p>An ability to engage in critical evaluation of concepts/arguments/data and to make appropriate and informed judgements. Arguments are well developed, sustained and substantiated. Where relevant, assumptions are challenged and there is clear recognition of the complexities of academic debate.</p> <p>Appropriate and sometimes innovative solutions are offered to problems that have limited definition and multiple interacting factors. There is strong evidence that the student is able to reflect effectively on the student's own practice.</p> <p>Critical evaluation of the student's own work and/or professional practice is highly perceptive and there is a full awareness of the implications for future development</p>	<p>An ability to engage in critical evaluation and reflection. Arguments are clearly considered and substantiated and there is evidence of an ability to make appropriate judgements and to suggest solutions to problems that have limited definition and multiple interacting factors.</p> <p>The student also demonstrates an ability to engage in reflective practice and to take account of personal evaluations when planning for future development</p>	<p>An ability to critically evaluate and reflect although there may be some over-reliance on description and factual presentation. Arguments are usually substantiated.</p> <p>There is some evidence of the student's ability to evaluate and reflect on the student's own practice but reflections may lack insight and the implications for future development may be underestimated</p>	<p>A limited ability to critically evaluate and reflect. Although some critical reflection is evident, the balance within the work is likely to be in favour of description and factual presentation. Arguments are generally substantiated but may be under-developed.</p> <p>There is some evidence of the student's ability to evaluate and reflect on the student's own practice. Reflections may be limited and superficial, with little consideration of their relevance for future development</p>	<p>Limited evidence of critical evaluation and reflection. The work is largely descriptive and arguments if attempted, are rarely substantiated.</p> <p>Self-evaluation and reflections on the student's own practice are extremely limited.</p>	<p>Little ability to describe and report. Very little evidence is available to indicate an ability to engage in critical evaluation and reflection.</p> <p>Self-evaluation and reflections on the student's own practice are negligible or absent.</p>

**TABLE E**  
**GENERIC LEVEL 7 BAND DESCRIPTORS**

Level 7	80%-100% (Distinction+)	70%-79% (Distinction)	60%-69% (Merit)	50%-59% (Pass)	40%-49% (Narrow Fail)	20-39% (Clear Fail)	1-19%
<b>Overall summary</b>	<p>A full and detailed understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at an excellent level (80-89%) or outstanding and exceptional level (90-100%) and beyond level 7.</p> <p>Work is of a standard deemed worthy of publication/manufacture/public exhibition/public performance.</p>	<p>A full and detailed understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at a very good level.</p>	<p>A full understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at a good level.</p>	<p>A basic but secure understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the associated learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at a threshold level.</p>	<p>A partial understanding of the set task and an ability to have met the associated learning outcomes and address the assessment criteria at a limited and insufficient level. Unsatisfactory overall. However, attainment is uneven with some learning outcomes not met and some assessment criteria unaddressed.</p>	<p>Unsatisfactory overall. A minimal understanding of the set task and an ability to have met some of the associated learning outcomes at a basic level. However, attainment is uneven with many assessment criteria unaddressed.</p>	<p>Very poor, incomplete and/or irrelevant. Demonstrates a serious lack of comprehension and/or engagement with the set task. May have misunderstood the set task. No learning outcomes are met in full, although there may be minimal attainment in one or two areas.</p>
<b>Knowledge &amp; Understanding</b>	<p>Further to the 70%-79% band, academic work in the 80%-100% bands is beyond the expectation of that expected at level 7.</p> <p>Demonstrates exceptional mastery of a complex and specialist area of knowledge.</p>	<p>Demonstrates mastery of a complex and specialised area of knowledge. There is strong evidence of an ability to extend, transform and apply such knowledge. The student also demonstrates an ability to engage in sophisticated discussion of complex concepts and to recognise the limitations and/or ambiguity of disciplinary knowledge. Independent thinking and action. Original insights are also features of work at this level.</p>	<p>Demonstrates mastery of a complex and specialised area of knowledge. There is clear evidence of an ability to apply such knowledge within familiar contexts, to extend and transform it. The discussion of complex concepts is often tackled successfully and there is some evidence of independent thinking and action.</p>	<p>Demonstrates mastery of a complex and specialised area of knowledge, but is frequently descriptive and based on given sources. There is limited evidence of independent thinking and action.</p>	<p>Limited knowledge and understanding of the field of study relevant to the task. Factual inaccuracies, errors and misconceptions are evident in important areas and elements of the assessed work may be irrelevant to the task.</p>	<p>Little knowledge and understanding of the field of study relevant to the task. Factual inaccuracies, errors and misconceptions are evident in many important areas and these outweigh the degree of knowledge and understanding demonstrated. Substantial elements of the assessed work may be irrelevant to the task.</p>	<p>Work may be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• short</li> <li>• irrelevant</li> <li>• contain serious/numerous errors and misunderstandings</li> <li>• no evidence of analysis, synthesis, critical evaluation and reflection</li> <li>• no reference/minimal reference to external sources</li> <li>• very poor presentation and inappropriate format</li> <li>• very poor communication of information and ideas</li> </ul>

Level 7	80%-100% (Distinction+)	70%-79% (Distinction)	60%-69% (Merit)	50%-59% (Pass)	40%-49% (Narrow Fail)	20-39% (Clear Fail)	1-19%
<b>Presentation and communication</b>	<p>Further to the 70% – 79% band, academic work in the 80% - 100% provides consistently convincing and succinct arguments in all areas.</p> <p>The standard of presentation shows an enhanced ability to communicate using an eloquent and professional style.</p>	<p>An ability to communicate information, complex ideas, results of research and concepts in a coherent and succinct manner, in a range of situations.</p> <p>The standard of presentation is high and the format appropriate.</p> <p>Key points are logically organised and in written work, the style is lucid and mature. Arguments are well-defined and clearly articulated.</p>	<p>An ability to communicate information, results of research, ideas and concepts clearly and succinctly in a range of situations.</p> <p>Work is well presented and the format appropriate.</p> <p>Key points are appropriately organised, fluently conveyed and are well articulated.</p>	<p>Satisfactory ability to communicate information, results of research, ideas, concepts and arguments satisfactorily in familiar situations.</p> <p>Some aspects of the task lack academic rigour and rely on describing and reporting factual information rather than communicating complex ideas.</p> <p>Generally, the work is appropriately structured but may not always be coherent.</p>	<p>An ability to communicate some simple concepts and/or factual information. Ideas may not be communicated clearly and present comprehension difficulties for the reader.</p> <p>If attempted, the presentation of arguments and more complex ideas may be confused and clumsily expressed.</p>	<p>Limited ability to communicate simple concepts and/or factual information.</p> <p>Frequent faults in the presentation of work and significant difficulties in its structure and organisation detract from the clarity and meaning overall.</p> <p>The writing style is often clumsy and inappropriate.</p>	
<b>Analysis &amp; discussion</b>	<p>The students demonstrates the ability to design and undertake their own extensive and independent inquiry applying advanced concepts, methods or techniques consistently to solve problems in unfamiliar contexts.</p>	<p>An ability to conduct research or advanced technical or professional activity, undertake detailed analysis and critical enquiry relevant to the task/discipline and expertise in highly specialised and advanced technical, professional and/or research skills, by making excellent use of a number of appropriate techniques. The student is highly successful in presenting, synthesising and commenting on research process and outcomes and is able to comment perceptively and with insight on the relationship between theory and practice.</p>	<p>An ability to conduct research or advanced technical or professional activity, undertake some detailed analysis and critical enquiry relevant to the task/discipline and expertise in highly specialised and advanced technical, professional and/or research skills, by making use of appropriate techniques and has considerable success in presenting and commenting on research process and outcomes. There is some linkage between theory and practice</p>	<p>An ability to conduct research or advanced technical or professional activity and undertake some limited analysis and enquiry relevant to the task/discipline and expertise in highly specialised and advanced technical, professional and/or research skills and has some success in presenting and commenting on research process and outcomes.</p>	<p>Likely to have attempted some enquiry and analysis relevant to the task/discipline but research process and outcomes may be naïve, simplistic and/or unconvincing.</p>	<p>Little evidence of being able to undertake enquiry and analysis relevant to the task/discipline. Where such work has been attempted, research process and outcomes may be inappropriate, or absent.</p>	

Level 7	80%-100% (Distinction+)	70%-79% (Distinction)	60%-69% (Merit)	50%-59% (Pass)	40%-49% (Narrow Fail)	20-39% (Clear Fail)	1-19%
<b>Research / scholarship</b>	<p>Exceptional breadth and depth of knowledge and understanding evidenced by the student's own independent insight and critical awareness of relevant literature at the forefront of the discipline.</p> <p>In written coursework, reference citations extend significantly beyond the main body of reading normally expected in the discipline/field of study. In examinations a substantial range of reference citations are included.</p>	<p>A detailed and thorough knowledge and understanding of current research/advanced scholarship in the discipline. The use of scholarly reviews/primary sources is sophisticated and a breadth and depth of individual reading and investigation extending beyond the sources provided, is apparent.</p> <p>The referencing of literature and other sources is accurate and in line with academic conventions.</p> <p>A thorough knowledge and understanding of research processes, techniques and methods, is demonstrated along with an ability to design and apply appropriate research methodologies. Can apply research knowledge and skills successfully in appropriate contexts.</p>	<p>A thorough knowledge and understanding of current research/scholarship in the discipline. Examples referred to indicate a breadth and depth of individual reading and investigation that extends beyond the sources provided.</p> <p>The referencing of literature and other sources is almost always accurate.</p> <p>A secure knowledge of research processes is evident along with an ability to design and apply appropriate research methodologies. Can apply research skills and knowledge in appropriate contexts.</p>	<p>Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of current research/scholarship in the discipline and an ability to provide some comment and/or discussion of its implications. Examples of research/scholarship referred to in the work may indicate an over-reliance on given sources to advance work/direct arguments, rather than individual reading and investigation.</p>	<p>Limited or sporadic knowledge and understanding of current research/scholarship in the discipline. A restricted range of sources are used, but overall there is an over-reliance on programme materials with little evidence of individual reading and investigation.</p> <p>There are frequent errors in the referencing of literature and other sources.</p> <p>Inconsistent application of academic conventions.</p> <p>Although limited knowledge of research processes may be evident, nevertheless, the application of such knowledge is largely unsuccessful.</p>	<p>Little knowledge and understanding of current research/scholarship in the discipline. Evidence of individual reading and investigation is negligible and the limited referencing of literature and other sources is frequently inaccurate.</p> <p>Very limited knowledge of research processes is apparent and there is a failure to apply this knowledge.</p>	

Level 7	80%-100% (Distinction+)	70%-79% (Distinction)	60%-69% (Merit)	50%-59% (Pass)	40%-49% (Narrow Fail)	20-39% (Clear Fail)	1-19%
<b>Structured argument and critical evaluation</b>	<p>Work may challenge the boundaries of knowledge within the discipline/field of study and is informed by innovative and/or creative thinking.</p> <p>New insights are offered that are informed by critical evaluation of current research/ scholarship/ professional practice.</p>	<p>An ability to engage in critical evaluation of concepts/arguments/data and to make appropriate and informed judgements where there are many interacting factors. Arguments are well developed, sustained and substantiated. Where relevant, assumptions are challenged and there is clear recognition of the complexities of academic debate.</p> <p>Appropriate and sometimes innovative solutions are offered to problems.</p> <p>There is strong evidence that the student is able to reflect effectively on their own practice.</p> <p>Critical evaluation of the student's own work and/or professional practice is highly perceptive and there is a full awareness of the implications for future development.</p>	<p>An ability to engage in critical evaluation and reflection. Arguments are clearly considered and substantiated and there is evidence of an ability to make appropriate judgements where there are many interacting factors and to suggest solutions to problems.</p> <p>The student also demonstrates an ability to engage in reflective practice and to take account of personal evaluations when planning for future development.</p>	<p>A limited ability to critically evaluate and reflect. Although some critical reflection is evident, the balance within the work is likely to be in favour of description and factual presentation. Arguments are generally substantiated but may be under-developed.</p> <p>There is some evidence of the student's ability to evaluate and reflect on their own practice although reflections may be limited and superficial with little consideration of their relevance for future development.</p>	<p>Little evidence of critical evaluation and reflection. The work is largely descriptive and arguments, if attempted, are rarely substantiated. Self-evaluation and reflections on the student's own practice are extremely limited.</p>	<p>Some ability to describe and report but very little evidence is available to indicate an ability to engage in critical evaluation and reflection.</p> <p>Self-evaluation and reflections on the student's own practice are negligible or absent.</p>	