

Appendix 1

University Performance Descriptors (updated September 2015) Levels 3 – 6 (pp1-3) Level 7 (pp4 & 5)

Note that these are generic descriptors which apply mainly, though not exclusively, to written academic work. The relevant performance descriptors for the appropriate level (as below) should appear in the module guide. Any further module-specific assessment criteria, such as number of words, should be clearly stated in the assignment brief.

The pass rate at levels 3 -6 = 40%

	L3	L4	L5	L6 (Graduate level)
90-100%	<p>Very detailed answers to all parts of the question / task. Extremely clearly structured and focused, demonstrating overall coherence and in-depth understanding. Clear evidence of a range of independently sourced material well applied in all contexts.</p> <p>No obvious errors in grammar as appropriate.</p>	<p>Focused and comprehensive engagement with the question, showing evidence of in-depth understanding of the issues. Extremely clearly structured and demonstrating a coherent argument throughout. Evidence of wide, independent reading.</p> <p>No obvious errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.</p>	<p>Exceptionally detailed and original response to the assignment, with critical use of independently sourced contextual material. Outstanding demonstration of linked understanding of relevant theory, concepts and models. Extremely well structured with high level of analysis.</p> <p>No obvious errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.</p>	<p>Exceptional level of analysis, showing deep critical engagement with a comprehensive range of contextual material. Demonstration of independent thought resulting in highly original or creative responses to the assignment. Provision of clear evidence of understanding of current scholarship and research based on an extensive range of relevant sources. Extreme clarity of structure demonstrating complete focus of argument.</p> <p>No obvious errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.</p>
80-89%	<p>Detailed answers to all parts of the question / task. Very clear, logical structure and focus, demonstrating overall coherence. Clear evidence of independently sourced material appropriately applied.</p> <p>Very few errors in grammar as appropriate.</p>	<p>Detailed response to all relevant parts of the question with evidence of clear understanding of the issues. Well structured with evidence of independent reading supporting the argument.</p> <p>Very few errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.</p>	<p>Very full, independent response to the assignment with totally relevant material which is well beyond any module input, demonstrating independent study. Excellent understanding and application of relevant theory, concepts and models. Very clear logical structure.</p> <p>Very few errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.</p>	<p>Excellent links between relevant ideas, theories and practice. Evidence of clearly independent scholarship and the ability to engage critically and analytically with a wide range of contextually relevant resource material. Demonstration of original insights, supported by extremely well structured overall argument.</p> <p>Very few errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.</p>

<p>70-79%</p>	<p>Full answers to all the parts of the question / task. Clear structure and focus. Evidence of material not covered in taught context and appropriately applied to given context.</p> <p>Few errors in grammar as appropriate.</p>	<p>Identification and very good understanding of issues in the assessment. Full answers to all questions/task. Very clear argument with relevant examples used to illustrate response. Clear evidence of reading outside the module list.</p> <p>Few errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.</p>	<p>Full response to the assignment with all content relevant and focused. Very good understanding of relevant theory, concepts and models. Application of appropriate theory to examples/practice, demonstrating a rigorous approach to a variety of ideas, contexts and frameworks.</p> <p>Few errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.</p>	<p>Very good links between a range of different ideas and theories. Places issues in a wider context. Evidence of clear understanding of a range of relevant theories and application of these appropriately. Independent ideas, well argued and supported.</p> <p>Few errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.</p>
<p>60-69%</p>	<p>All significant content accurate. All main points of question / task covered. Identifiable structure. Some evidence of material not directly covered in taught input.</p> <p>Some small repeated errors in grammar as appropriate</p>	<p>Good understanding of the issues. Engages directly with the question. Clear argument with good examples used to support it. All main points and important issues of the question/task covered. Some evidence of reading outside the module list</p> <p>Some small repeated errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate</p>	<p>Answers most if not all detailed aspects of the question. Content mainly relevant and accurate. Good knowledge and understanding of relevant theory and concepts and application of theoretical models. Evidence of a developing appreciation of contextual issues.</p> <p>Some small repeated errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate</p>	<p>Clear links between theory and practice. Good coverage of assignment issues. Full understanding of core issues. Evidenced level of understanding of appropriate theory and concepts.</p> <p>Some small repeated errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate</p>
<p>50-59%</p>	<p>Content generally accurate and relevant to the question / task. Reasonable breadth of taught material used. Evidence of structure.</p> <p>Some repeated errors in grammar as appropriate.</p>	<p>Generally sound understanding of basic concepts. Content relevant to the question/task. Competently deals with main issues. Reading based on main texts or materials, but not always fully utilised in supporting arguments.</p> <p>Some repeated errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.</p>	<p>Main issues addressed and solid attempt to answer question. Some relevant content applied. Sound knowledge and understanding of relevant theory and concepts and identification of main issues</p> <p>Some repeated errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.</p>	<p>Identifies main issues and relevant theory. Coverage of most of assignment issues. Competent application of relevant theory and states obvious links to practice.</p> <p>Some repeated errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.</p>
<p>40-49%</p> <p>40% Pass mark</p>	<p>Satisfactory evidence of understanding of basic concepts/issues and demonstration that the learning outcomes have been met. Limited use of the breadth of taught content. Some attempt at structure.</p>	<p>Satisfactory evidence of understanding of basic concepts/issues and demonstration that the learning outcomes have been met. Content broadly relevant but with limited or little application of theory. Almost totally descriptive.</p>	<p>Satisfactory attempt to address question/issues with some content relevant to assignment topic. Demonstration that the learning outcomes have been met. Material engages with relevant module materials, but largely repeats taught input and lacks development or personal interpretation. Some general understanding of topic</p>	<p>Demonstration that the learning outcomes have been met. Makes few links between theory and practice. Answers question in a very basic way. Describes relevant theory accurately, and some relevant ideas offered.</p> <p>Limited coherence of structure.</p>

	Several repeated errors in grammar as appropriate.	Several repeated errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.	theory and concepts. Lacks coherence. Several repeated errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.	Several repeated errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.
30-39% Compensatable Fail	Some learning outcomes and / or assessment criteria not met. Repetition of taught content with minimal attempt to focus on the given question or issue. Little evidence of structure. Evidence of sufficient grasp of learning outcomes to suggest that the student will be able to retrieve the module on resubmission.	Some learning outcomes and / or assessment criteria not met. Superficial treatment of issues. Some is relevant to topic set. Material merely repeats taught input. Lacks understanding of basic theory or concepts. Possible use of extensive quoted passages. Evidence of sufficient grasp of learning outcomes to suggest that the student will be able to retrieve the module on resubmission.	Some learning outcomes and / or assessment criteria not met. Questions not answered fully. Content not wholly relevant. Little or no evidence of understanding of relevant theory. Very repetitive of taught input – no development or application. The use of extensive quoted passages evident. Evidence of sufficient grasp of learning outcomes to suggest that the student will be able to retrieve the module on resubmission.	Some learning outcomes and / or assessment criteria not met. Inadequate content with issues not addressed; insufficient evidence of understanding of relevant theory and concepts and only partial understanding shown. Very limited application of theory. Use of extensive quoted passages is evident. Evidence of sufficient grasp of learning outcomes to suggest that the student will be able to retrieve the module on resubmission.
20-29% Fail	No learning outcomes fully met. Little evidence of attempts to engage with module materials.	No learning outcomes fully met. Little evidence of attempts to engage with module materials.	No learning outcomes fully met. Little attempt to engage with the module materials or ideas.	No learning outcomes fully met. No demonstration of adequate knowledge or understanding of key concepts or theories. There is no recognition of the complexity of the subject.
10-19% Fail	Little attempt to engage with assignment brief and has not met learning outcomes. Inadequate demonstration of knowledge or understanding of key concepts, theories or practice.	Little attempt to engage with assignment brief and has not met learning outcomes. Inadequate demonstration of knowledge or understanding of key concepts, theories or practice.	Little attempt to engage with assignment brief and has not met learning outcomes. Inadequate demonstration of knowledge or understanding of key concepts, theories or practice.	Little attempt to engage with assignment brief and has not met learning outcomes. Inadequate demonstration of knowledge or understanding of key concepts, theories or practice.
0-9% Fail	No real attempt to address the assignment brief or learning outcomes	No real attempt to address the assignment brief or learning outcomes	No real attempt to address the assignment brief or learning outcomes	No real attempt to address the assignment brief or learning outcomes.

University Performance Descriptors – Level 7 (updated September 2015)

Note that these are generic descriptors which apply mainly, though not exclusively, to written academic work. The relevant performance descriptors for the appropriate level (as below) should appear in the module guide. Any further module-specific assessment criteria, such as number of words, should be clearly stated in the assignment brief.

The pass rate at Masters Level = 50%

	L7 (Masters Level)
90-100%	<p>This work is outstanding and is of a standard which could be considered for future publication in a professional journal. The work demonstrates engagement in a focused academic debate which presents a range of evidence underpinning a deep understanding of all the issues studied and a totally justified position. The work demonstrates a high level of originality with challenges to current theory and/or practice and specific, focused examples of contestability. There is evidence of a high level of synthesis of theoretical exemplars, underpinning principles and practical interpretation.</p> <p>No obvious errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.</p>
80-89%	<p>The work is of an excellent standard and has the potential for future publication in a professional context. The work demonstrates engagement in an academic debate which presents clear evidence of a considered understanding of the professional issues studied, the approach adopted and the position taken. The work enhances current theory and/or practice and displays a range of examples of contestability. There is evidence of clear synthesis of theoretical issues and practice. A critical analysis of theoretical models and/or practical applications has resulted in a distinct level of originality.</p> <p>Very few errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.</p>
70-79%	<p>There is evidence of analysis and critique of concepts, models of key authors, rival theories, and major debates together with some evidence of synthesis. The work fully considers the complexity of the context in which it is situated and the impinging external factors; it takes cognisance of differing perspectives and interpretations and recognises dilemmas. Ideas are presented in a succinct manner and conclusions are well reasoned. The work shows an ability to critique the underlying assumptions upon which current views are based and to challenge received opinion.</p> <p>Few errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.</p>

<p>60-69%</p>	<p>The work demonstrates a capacity to express views based on sound argument and solid evidence in an articulate and concise way, and, where relevant, to put forward and make use of criteria for the judgement of theories and issues. There is evidence of effective engagement in a critical dialogue relating to professional practice, a clearly presented overview of an area of concern, and a comparative review of key authors, rival theories and major debates. The work demonstrates a willingness to question and to explore issues and to synthesise theoretical perspectives and practical application within a given professional context.</p> <p>Some small repeated errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate</p>
<p>50-59%</p> <p>50% Pass mark</p>	<p>The structure and focus are evident and relevant to the assignment task. There is evidence of engagement with pertinent issues. Key authors and major debates are clearly presented and there is evidence of suitable basic reading. The work explores and analyses issues, but is not strong on presenting synthesis or evaluations. The work is mainly descriptive, but has achieved all the learning outcomes.</p> <p>Some repeated errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.</p>
<p>40-49%</p> <p>Fail</p>	<p>Whilst some of the characteristics of a pass have been demonstrated, the work does not address each of the outcomes for the specified assessment task. There may be little evidence of an ability to apply the principles of the module to a wider context. The work may be an overly descriptive account demonstrating only minimal interpretation, and very limited evidence of analysis, synthesis or evaluation. No counterarguments or alternative frames of reference are generated or considered.</p> <p>There is evidence of sufficient grasp of the module's learning outcomes to suggest that the participant will be able to retrieve the module on resubmission.</p>
<p>30-39%</p> <p>Fail</p>	<p>The work has failed to address the outcomes of the module. There are fundamental misconceptions of the basis of the module. The work is mainly descriptive and shows little or no understanding of relevant theory.</p> <p>There is insufficient evidence to suggest that the author will be able to retrieve the assignment without retaking the module.</p>
<p>20-29%</p> <p>Fail</p>	<p>This work shows little or no understanding of relevant theory. There is little reference to appropriate literature and no evidence of independent thought or criticality. Overall the work is unduly descriptive and presents only a superficial grasp of the essential issues.</p>
<p>10-19%</p> <p>Fail</p>	<p>This work is not coherent and shows severe faults in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate. It includes unsubstantiated statements or assertions. It is unstructured and extremely badly presented. It is totally descriptive and lacks any attempt at analysis.</p>
<p>0-9%</p> <p>Fail</p>	<p>No real attempt to address assignment brief or learning outcomes.</p>