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This tool contains an organised list of generic marking criteria that are organised across the common criterion areas usually assessed, and then organised into the different levels that appear across HE (with the exception of Level 8). For example, under ‘Level 3’, you will find generic marking criteria for the common criterion areas such as ‘content’ or ‘argument’, which are designed to help you write your own criteria for your assessments.
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# Generic Marking Criteria by Level

Below are listed some sample, generic marking criteria across each level, which have been organised by the common assessment **Criterion Areas** that are also present in the **Generic Rubric Template** available in the Assessment and Feedback Toolkit. Use these to *construct your own* assessment criteria and/or grade descriptor statements for use in your assessments and rubrics, according to your discipline and the assessment methodology. These should be specific to the learning outcomes of your course. Please note, these *generic* grade descriptors can only provide you with a *broadly-based guidance* for writing your own. They should be used in conjunction with the assessment type descriptors to create bespoke grade descriptors for your specific module.

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

This resource has been adapted from [the University of Exeter’s generic marking criteria](http://as.exeter.ac.uk/academic-policy-standards/tqa-manual/lts/genericassessment/) alongside the Quality Assurance Agency’s (QAA) Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ).

## Level 3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Content, Knowledge and Understanding** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or very little evidence of factual or conceptual comprehension or understanding of the content, subject, reading or research. |
| 10-19 | Little evidence of factual or conceptual comprehension or understanding of the content, subject, reading or research. |
| 20-29 | Largely insufficient evidence of factual or conceptual comprehension or understanding of the content, subject, reading or research, but potentially some reproduction of content or information discussed in class. |
| 30-39 | Insufficient evidence of factual or conceptual comprehension or understanding of the content, subject, reading or research. Content is mostly reproduction of that discussed or explored in class. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Evidence of a basic level of conceptual comprehension or understanding of the content, subject, reading or research, relative to the level. Mostly use of content explored in class, but evidence of appropriateness in its use. |
| 50-59 | Evidence of a sufficient level of conceptual comprehension or understanding of the content, subject, reading or research, relative to the level. Basic or developing engagement with reading, which may be limited to set readings but at higher levels may go beyond. |
| 60-69 | Evidence of a sound level of conceptual comprehension or understanding of the content, subject, reading or research, relative to the level. Good engagement with a wide set of reading, which may go beyond the set texts. |
| 70-79 | Evidence of an extensive level of conceptual comprehension or understanding of the content, subject, reading or research, relative to the level. Strong engagement with reading, which goes beyond the set texts. |
| 80-89 | Evidence of a very broad, comprehensive level of conceptual comprehension or understanding of the content, subject, reading or research, relative to the level. Extensive engagement with reading, which goes beyond the set texts. |
| 90-100 | Evidence of a detailed, exceptional and comprehensive level of conceptual comprehension or understanding of the content, subject, reading or research, relative to the level. Extensive engagement with reading, which goes beyond the set texts. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Analysis, Argument and Intellectual Skills** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or no evidence of analysis, and unsubstantiated opinions. |
| 10-19 | Submission is entirely or almost entirely descriptive, with little to no evidence of any analysis. Has accepted information at face value, and present unsubstantiated opinions. |
| 20-29 | Submission is almost entirely descriptive, with little evidence of any analysis. Has mostly accepted information at face value, and presents almost completely unsubstantiated opinions. |
| 30-39 | Submission is mostly descriptive, with little evidence of any analysis. Has mostly accepted information at face value, and presents mostly unsubstantiated opinions. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Submission is largely descriptive, but there is evidence of analysis and evaluation in places. Some evidence of criticality, but information is largely accepted at face value, and most opinions are unsubstantiated.Lack of development of an argument. |
| 50-59 | Submission is mostly descriptive, but with a developing analytical aspect that uses simple logic. An attempt at constructing an argument, which may be flawed but which is nonetheless established. |
| 60-69 | Submission makes a good attempt to analyse information, relative to the level. Good construction of an argument which is substantiated by evidence, and which can potentially be convincing in places. |
| 70-79 | Very strong analysis and construction of an argument using predefined techniques and approaches. Ideas and information are collated and categorised effectively, in a way that is appropriate to this level, to form a coherent argument. Developing evidence of criticality. |
| 80-89 | Excellent analysis and construction of an argument for this level. Ideas and information are collated and categorised effectively, in a way that is appropriate to this level, to form a coherent argument. Established evidence of criticality. |
| 90-100 | Exceptional analysis and construction of an argument for this level. Ideas and information are collated and categorised effectively, in a way that is appropriate to this level, to form a coherent and sustained argument. Evidence of criticality that may be beyond this level. |

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

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

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

## Level 4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Content, Knowledge and Understanding** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or major gaps in knowledge and understanding, with significant inaccuracies in content and no grasp of the subject. |
| 10-19 | Major gaps in knowledge and understanding, with only slight attempts to engage with subject material. Major inaccuracies in submission, with little grasp of the subject. |
| 20-29 | Significant gaps in knowledge and understanding, with a minimal attempt to engage with subject material. Major inaccuracies in submission, with minimal grasp of the subject. |
| 30-39 | Gaps in knowledge and largely superficial understanding, but some attempt to engage with the subject material. Some inaccuracies in submission, with some elements missing and inaccuracies present. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Broadly accurate knowledge and understanding of the material. Some elements missing from submission and flaws evident, but an attempt nonetheless. |
| 50-59 | Sound or routine knowledge of the subject content, with evidence of understanding of the main concepts and key theories relevant to the assessment. Some flaws may be evident. |
| 60-69 | Good, consistent knowledge and understanding of the material, the main concepts and key theories relevant to the assessment, relative to this level. |
| 70-79 | Detailed knowledge and understanding of the material, the main concepts and key theories relevant to the assessment, relative to this level. |
| 80-89 | Highly detailed knowledge and understanding of the material, the main concepts and key theories relevant to this assessment, relative to this level. Beginning to demonstrate an awareness of the limitations of the knowledge base. |
| 90-100 | Excellent knowledge and understanding of the material, the main concepts and key theories relevant to this assessment, relative to this level. Demonstrates an awareness of the limitations of the knowledge base. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Analysis, Argument and Intellectual Skills** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or almost entirely missing. Any material offered is descriptive with no conclusions or arguments formed. |
| 10-19 | Almost wholly descriptive, no analysis or argument offered. Views or findings are illogical or contradictory, and unsubstantiated generalisations are common throughout. |
| 20-29 | Substantially descriptive, with little analysis or argument offered. Views or findings are often illogical or contradictory, and unsubstantiated generalisations are present throughout. |
| 30-39 | Mostly descriptive, with only scant analysis or argument offered. Slight evidence offered to back up generalisations, but for the most part opinions are offered without source. Conclusions are generalised and lack validity. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Some awareness of issues. Some sense of an emerging argument, but not always completely coherent. Some evidence is presented to support theories or views, but this is not always consistent. Relevant conclusions are sometimes drawn. |
| 50-59 | Issues identified within given areas. An emerging awareness of the different perspectives, and evidence of the ability to use evidence to support a coherent, if broad, argument. Conclusions are generally valid, if broad. |
| 60-69 | Good evidence of analytical ability and argument construction, with clear evidence of alternative perspectives. Generally logical points, coherently expressed, well-organised, and relevantly supported. |
| 70-79 | Very good analysis. Perceptive and persuasive points made within the given area. Open acknowledgement of other perspectives. Arguments are well-articulated and logically developed with a range of evidence. Strong conclusions. |
| 80-89 | Excellent analysis throughout. Highly perceptive and persuasive points made within the given area. Explicit acknowledgement of other perspectives. Arguments are well-articulated and logically developed with a range of evidence. Strong conclusions. |
| 90-100 | Exceptional analysis throughout. Highly perceptive and persuasive points made into a balanced, articulate argument. Highly selective with evidence presented, drawn from relevant research. Convincing conclusions. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Range, Breadth and Application of Research and Resources** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or no evidence of any ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the submission or to practice. |
| 10-19 | Little evidence of an ability to source and relate wider literature to the submission. Views are unsupported and non-authoritative. |
| 20-29 | Largely indiscriminate use of sources, where they appear. Views are largely unsupported and non-authoritative. |
| 30-39 | Minimal sources present, used indiscriminately for the most part where present, but may be some attempts to engage with material. Largely unsupported and non-authoritative views. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Some evidence of wider reading, with mostly superficial linking to given texts. Wider reading is likely to be drawn from set reading lists. |
| 50-59 | Some knowledge of literature beyond the core texts. Literature is used accurately, but mostly descriptively. |
| 60-69 | Appropriate knowledge of the field to support presented views. Research-informed literature is integrated into the work effectively. |
| 70-79 | Critical engagement with appropriate literature, and knowledge of research-informed literature is embedded into the work. |
| 80-89 | Critical engagement with a wide range of appropriate literature, and knowledge of research-informed literature is embedded into the work throughout. |
| 90-100 | Exceptionally wide-range of relevant literature is used to critically inform the argument, balance the discussion and/or inform problem solving. |

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

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

## Level 5

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Content, Knowledge and Understanding** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or major gaps in knowledge and understanding, with significant inaccuracies in content and no grasp of the subject. |
| 10-19 | Major gaps in knowledge with substantial inaccuracies in content and little grasp of the subject. |
| 20-29 | Significant gaps in knowledge and mostly superficial understanding of the content and the subject. |
| 30-39 | Gaps in knowledge and mostly superficial understanding of the content and subject discipline. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Some knowledge and understanding of the material, particularly focused on well-established principles of the area of study and how those principles have developed. |
| 50-59 | Broad knowledge and understanding of content and material, mostly focused on well-established principles of the area of study and how those principles have developed. |
| 60-69 | Good to very good knowledge and understanding of content and material, with strong knowledge of the well-established principles of the discipline and how they have developed. |
| 70-79 | Very good knowledge and understanding of content and material and of the main concepts/theories at this level. Developing awareness of the limitations of knowledge and how this influences responses and interpretations of that knowledge. |
| 80-89 | Excellent knowledge and understanding of content and material and of the main concepts/theories at this level. Good awareness of the limitations of knowledge and how this influences responses and interpretations of that knowledge. |
| 90-100 | Exceptional knowledge and understanding of content and material and of the main concepts/theories at this level. Very good awareness of the limitations of knowledge and how this influences responses and interpretations of that knowledge. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Analysis, Argument and Intellectual Skills** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or almost entirely missing. Completely unsubstantiated generalisations, made without any use of credible evidence. Lack of logic leading to a lack of supportable conclusion. Lack of analysis or relevance. |
| 10-19 | Almost entirely unsubstantiated generalisations, with irrelevant or contradictory findings. Scant evidence presented, and conclusions lack validity. Minimal to no analysis. |
| 20-29 | Mostly unsubstantiated generalisations, with irrelevant or contradictory findings. Scant evidence presented, and conclusions frequently lack validity. Minimal analysis. |
| 30-39 | Significantly unsubstantiated generalisations, often with irrelevant or contradictory findings but with some attempts to construct an argument (although this may be based on scant evidence). Conclusions may lack validity. Underdeveloped analysis. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Some awareness of main issues. Argument present and structured effectively, but with gaps or weaknesses present. Evidence provided to support argument, but not always consistent. Some relevant conclusions. |
| 50-59 | Issues identified and critically analysed within the given parameters. Evidence used effectively to support an overall argument. Ability to apply concepts and principles outside of the area of study. Generally sound conclusions. |
| 60-69 | Good level of analysis and synthesis. Issues clearly identified and critically analysed within the given parameters. Evidence used effectively to support a clear overall argument. Ability to apply concepts and principles outside of the area of study. Valid conclusions. |
| 70-79 | Very good level of analysis and synthesis, with a logically-developed argument. Issues clearly identified and critically analysed within the given parameters. Evidence used effectively to support the clear overall argument. Ability to apply concepts and principles outside of the area of study. Strong conclusions. |
| 80-89 | Excellent level of analysis and synthesis, with a logically-developed argument. Issues clearly identified and critically analysed. Evidence used very effectively to support the clear overall argument. Ability to apply concepts and principles outside of the area of study. Persuasive conclusions. |
| 90-100 | Exceptional level of analysis and synthesis, with a logically-developed argument. Issues clearly identified and critically analysed throughout. Evidence used very effectively to support the clear overall argument. Ability to apply concepts and principles outside of the area of study. Sophisticated and convincing conclusions. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Range, Breadth and Application of Research and Resources** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or no evidence of any ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the submission or to practice. |
| 10-19 | Little evidence of an ability to source and relate wider literature to the submission. Views are unsupported and non-authoritative. |
| 20-29 | Largely indiscriminate use of sources, where they appear. Views are largely unsupported and non-authoritative. |
| 30-39 | Minimal sources present, used indiscriminately for the most part where present, but may be some attempts to engage with material. Largely unsupported and non-authoritative views. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Some evidence of wider reading, with mostly superficial linking to given texts. Wider reading is likely to be drawn from set reading lists. |
| 50-59 | Some knowledge of literature beyond the core texts. Literature is used accurately, but mostly descriptively. |
| 60-69 | Appropriate knowledge of the field to support presented views. Research-informed literature is integrated into the work effectively. |
| 70-79 | Critical engagement with appropriate literature, and knowledge of research-informed literature is embedded into the work. |
| 80-89 | Critical engagement with a wide range of appropriate literature, and knowledge of research-informed literature is embedded into the work throughout. |
| 90-100 | Exceptionally wide-range of relevant literature is used to critically inform the argument, balance the discussion and/or inform problem solving. |

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

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

## Level 6

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Content, Knowledge and Understanding** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or almost wholly missing any knowledge and understanding of material at this level. Substantial inaccuracies. |
| 10-19 | Major gaps in knowledge missing almost all knowledge and understanding of material. Substantial inaccuracies. |
| 20-29 | Substantial gaps in knowledge and understanding of material at this level. Significant inaccuracies. |
| 30-39 | Significant gaps in knowledge and understanding of material at this level, with superficial presentation of content only. Inaccuracies in content common throughout. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Evidence ofunderstanding of key aspects of the field of study, with coherent knowledge and at least partially informed by current research within the subject discipline. |
| 50-59 | Good, systematic understanding and knowledge of the field of study in line with the subject level benchmarks. Partially informed, at least, by current research within the subject discipline. |
| 60-69 | Very good understanding of the field of study in line with the subject level benchmarks. Evidence of coherent knowledge that is informed by current research within the subject discipline. |
| 70-79 | Excellent knowledge and understanding of the main concepts and theories of the subject discipline. Clear knowledge that is informed by current research within the subject discipline, and evidence of a developing awareness of the limitations of the knowledge base. |
| 80-89 | Highly detailed knowledge and understanding of the main concepts and theories of the subject discipline. Excellent knowledge that is informed by current research within the subject discipline, and evidence of a good awareness of the limitations of the knowledge base. |
| 90-100 | Sophisticated, highly-detailed knowledge and understanding of the main concepts and theories of the subject discipline. Exceptional knowledge that is informed by current research within the subject discipline, and evidence of a very strong awareness of the limitations of the knowledge base. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Analysis, Argument and Intellectual Skills** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or presentation of little more than unsubstantiated generalisations that are made without use of any credible evidence. Lack of logic in argument, leading to unsupportable or absent conclusions. No attempt to analyse, synthesise, or evaluate. |
| 10-19 | Scant presentation of mostly unsubstantiated generalisations that are made with minimal to no credible evidence. Lack of logic in argument, leading to almost wholly unsupportable or absent conclusions. Bare attempt to analyse, synthesise, or evaluate. |
| 20-29 | Some, but minimal, presentation of largely unsubstantiated generalisations that are made with minimal credible evidence. Lack of coherent logic in argument, leading to largely unsupportable or absent conclusions. Minimal attempt to analyse, synthesise, or evaluate. |
| 30-39 | Developing, but still weak, presentation of mostly descriptive generalisations that are made with little credible evidence. Lack of logic in argument that leads to largely irrelevant conclusions, though an attempt to do so may present. Little attempt to analyse, synthesise, or evaluate. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Evidence of some logical or analytical thinking, and some attempts to synthesise an argument, but with significant weaknesses. Evidence to support findings is present, but it is not consistently interpreted. Ability to form a conclusion is developing, but insubstantial. |
| 50-59 | Evidence of logical thinking, as well as analysis and synthesis. Evidence of the ability to analyse new and/or abstract data and situations with minimal to no guidance. Emerging awareness of different perspectives or interpretations, the ability to use evidence to support a developing argument, and conclusions made are valid, if basic in places. |
| 60-69 | Good, sound evidence of analytical thinking, synthesis and/or evaluation, with the ability to explore new, abstract or complex data to construct a valid argument. Ability to articulate and arrive at a convincing conclusion. Evidence of a good ability to select, review and incorporate evidence into the argument. |
| 70-79 | Excellent, sound evidence of analytical thinking, synthesis and/or evaluation, with the ability to explore new, abstract or complex data to construct a highly logical, valid and convincing argument. Excellent ability to articulate and arrive at a convincing conclusion. Evidence of an excellent ability to judiciously select, review and incorporate evidence into the argument. |
| 80-89 | Sophisticated analysis, synthesis and/or evaluation of evidence, with the clear ability to explore new, abstract or complex data to construct a highly logical, valid and convincing argument. Excellent ability to articulate and arrive at a convincing conclusion. Evidence of an excellent ability to judiciously select, review and incorporate evidence into the argument. |
| 90-100 | Exceptional work, with highly sophisticated analysis, synthesis and/or evaluation of evidence, with the clear ability to explore new, abstract or complex data to construct a highly logical, valid and convincing argument consisting of independently-constructed thought. Excellent ability to articulate and arrive at a convincing conclusion. Evidence of an excellent ability to judiciously select, review and incorporate evidence into the argument. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Range, Breadth and Application of Research and Resources** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or no evidence of any ability to source and relate wider literature or research to the submission or to practice. |
| 10-19 | Little evidence of an ability to source and relate wider literature to the submission. Views are unsupported and non-authoritative. |
| 20-29 | Largely indiscriminate use of sources, where they appear. Views are largely unsupported and non-authoritative. |
| 30-39 | Minimal sources present, used indiscriminately for the most part where present, but may be some attempts to engage with material. Largely unsupported and non-authoritative views. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Some evidence of wider reading, with mostly superficial linking to given texts. Wider reading is likely to be drawn from set reading lists. |
| 50-59 | Some knowledge of literature beyond the core texts. Literature is used accurately, but mostly descriptively. |
| 60-69 | Appropriate knowledge of the field to support presented views. Research-informed literature is integrated into the work effectively. |
| 70-79 | Critical engagement with appropriate literature, and knowledge of research-informed literature is embedded into the work. |
| 80-89 | Critical engagement with a wide range of appropriate literature, and knowledge of research-informed literature is embedded into the work throughout. |
| 90-100 | Exceptionally wide-range of relevant literature is used to critically inform the argument, balance the discussion and/or inform problem solving. |

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

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

## Level 7

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Content, Knowledge and Understanding** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or submission demonstrates almost no knowledge or understanding of the field. Little to no evidence of knowledge base, and any material present simply reproduces knowledge without evidence of understanding. |
| 10-19 | Demonstrates very little knowledge or understanding of the field. Scant evidence of knowledge base, and any material almost wholly reproduces knowledge without evidence of understanding. |
| 20-29 | Demonstrates only scant knowledge or understanding of the field. Little evidence of knowledge base, and material largely reproduces knowledge with little evidence of understanding. |
| 30-39 | Demonstrates little knowledge or understanding of the field. Minimal, though some, evidence of knowledge base. Material largely reproduces knowledge without evidence of understanding. |
| 40-49 | Demonstrates knowledge of the field, with awareness of current research, but with significant weaknesses. Lacks knowledge and understanding of key areas. |
| 50-59 | **Threshold level.** Demonstrates sound knowledge of the field within a specialised field of study or context. Demonstrates understanding of current theoretical and methodological approaches and how these affect the way the knowledge base is interpreted. |
| 60-69 | Work that has a well-defined focus, with systematic knowledge, understanding and critical awareness of the field and its current issues. Provides new insights into the discipline, much of which is either at or informed by the forefront of the academic discipline, field, or area of professional practice. |
| 70-79 | Work of an excellent standard, that reflects very detailed knowledge and understanding of the field. Excellent mastery of a complex and specialised area of knowledge and skills, with very strong knowledge of problems, insights or developments in the field or discipline. |
| 80-89 | Work of an outstanding standard, that reflects very detailed knowledge and understanding of the field, and that is very often of publishable quality. Sophisticated mastery of a complex and specialised area of knowledge and skills, with excellent knowledge of problems, insights or developments in the field or discipline and how to move the discipline forwards. |
| 90-100 | Work of an exceptional standard, that reflects highly sophisticated, detailed and outstanding knowledge and understanding of the field. This work is almost always of publishable quality and reflects doctoral-level ability. Sophisticated mastery of a complex and specialised area of knowledge and skills, with excellent knowledge of problems, insights or developments in the field or discipline and how to move the discipline forwards. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Analysis, Argument and Intellectual Skills** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or next to no critical or analytical ability. |
| 10-19 | Poor, inconsistent analysis and little evidence of an argument or conclusion. |
| 20-29 | Scant, largely inconsistent analysis and only slight evidence of the development of an argument or formation of a conclusion. |
| 30-39 | Inconsistent analysis and minimal evidence of the development of an argument or formation of a conclusion, though an attempt may be made to do so. |
| 40-49 | Some appropriate analysis, but with significant inconsistencies that affect the soundness and quality of the argument or conclusion presented. Demonstrates very limited critical ability, though it is in evidence. |
| 50-59 | **Threshold level.** Provides evidence of relevant and sound analysis in the area of specialism. Some evidence of the ability to critically evaluate material and analyse complex issues and make appropriate judgements. |
| 60-69 | Good evidence of relevant and sound analysis and is, where appropriate, able to propose new hypotheses based on the analysis conducted. Evidence of managing complex issues in systematic and creative ways, making informed judgements in the absence of complete data. |
| 70-79 | Excellent analysis and evaluation of material, methodology and approach to material and, where appropriate, proposes new ideas or hypotheses. Evidence of effectively managing complex issues in systematic and creative ways, making sound and informed judgements in the absence of complete data. |
| 80-89 | Almost certainly work of publishable quality. Outstanding analysis and evaluation of material, methodology and approach to material and, where appropriate, proposes new ideas or hypotheses. Evidence of excellent management of complex issues in systematic and creative ways, making sound and informed judgements in the absence of complete data. |
| 90-100 | Work of publishable quality. Exceptional analysis and evaluation of material, methodology and approach to material and, where appropriate, proposes new ideas or hypotheses. Evidence of outstanding management of complex issues in systematic and creative ways, making sound and informed judgements in the absence of complete data. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Range, Breadth and Application of Research and Resources** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or submission demonstrates little or no skill in selected techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship. Lacks any understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge. Failure to evidence or discuss/apply appropriate examples of literature relating to current research and advanced scholarship in the field. |
| 10-19 | Demonstrates little in selected techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship. Lacks understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge. Failure to evidence or discuss/apply appropriate examples of literature relating to current research and advanced scholarship in the field. |
| 20-29 | Scant evidence of selected techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship. Minimal understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge. Largely failure to evidence or discuss/apply appropriate examples of literature relating to current research and advanced scholarship in the field. |
| 30-39 | Minimal, but at least some evidence of selected techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship. Underdeveloped understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge. Evidence of discussion/application of appropriate examples of literature relating to current research and advanced scholarship in the field is mostly lacking. |
| 40-49 | Demonstrates some skill in selected techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship, but with significant areas of weakness. Largely lacks sufficient understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge. Can evidence and discuss/apply examples of literature relating to current research but lacks any kind of critical engagement. |
| 50-59 | **Threshold level.** Demonstrates understanding of and skills in selected techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship. Shows some originality in the application of knowledge, and some understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline.  Critically evaluates examples of literature relating to current research and advanced scholarship in the field. |
| 60-69 | Displays a comprehensive understanding of and skills in techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship. Shows originality in the application of knowledge, together with a good understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline. Critically evaluates a range of literature relating to current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline. |
| 70-79 | Employs advanced skills to conduct research and, where appropriate, advanced technical or professional activity, accepting accountability for related decision making. Displays an excellent grasp of techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship. Shows originality in application of knowledge, and excellent understanding of how established techniques of enquiry create and interpret knowledge in the discipline. Critically evaluates, with excellent insight, a range of literature relating to current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline. |
| 80-89 | This work is often of publishable quality. Employs advanced skills to conduct research and, where appropriate, advanced technical or professional activity, accepting accountability for related decision making. Displays an exceptional grasp of techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship. Shows originality in application of knowledge, and outstanding understanding of how established techniques of enquiry create and interpret knowledge in the discipline. Critically evaluates, with excellent insight, a range of literature relating to current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline. |
| 90-100 | This work is almost always of publishable quality and suggests doctoral-level ability. Employs highly-advanced skills to conduct research and, where appropriate, advanced technical or professional activity, accepting accountability for related decision making. Displays an outstanding grasp of techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship. Shows originality in application of knowledge, and excellent understanding of how established techniques of enquiry create and interpret knowledge in the discipline. Critically evaluates, with exceptional insight, a range of literature relating to current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline. |

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

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