

Code of Practice on the Assessment of Students

First Edition
31 May 2012

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. General Principles	2
2.1 Equity and clarity in the assessment process	2
2.2 Objectivity in the assessment process	3
2.3 Independence in the assessment process	3
2.4 The rights and responsibilities of students	4
3. Examination Board Assessment Panel and Award Board	5
3.1 Examination Board Assessment Panels (EBAPs)	5
3.2 Examination Board Awards Board (EBAB)	5
4. Conduct of Assessment	6
4.1 Examinations	6
4.2 Other forms of assessment	6
4.3 Extensions and the consequences of late submission	6
4.4 Excessive length and penalties for failing to adhere to word limits	7
4.5 Mitigation	7
4.6 Assessment offences	7
4.7 Special needs assessment	7
4.8 Retention of items of assessment	7
5. Scheduling and volume of assessment	8
6. Marking	8
6.1 Assessment criteria and marking standards	8
6.2 Mechanisms for marking and for the moderation of marks	9
6.3 Evaluation and development of academic standards	10
6.4 Marking schemes and the aggregation of marks for student continuation and for determining student awards and award classifications	10
6.5 Failure and re-assessment	11
7. Feedback to students on performance	11
8. Staff development	12
9. Language assessment	12
10. Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements	12
11. Review of regulatory framework	12
APPENDIX 1	14
SAA-GE GENERIC ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND MARKING STANDARDS	14
Level 0	14

Level 1	15
Level 2	16
Level 3 (for reference purposes).....	17
Level 4	18
APPENDIX 2	19
GRADE DESCRIPTORS.....	19
Level 1	19
Level 2	21
Level 3	23

1. Introduction

1.1 This Code of Practice has been approved by the Academic Board and is based on the UK Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education's (QAA) Code of Practice for the Assurance of Academic Quality and Standards in Higher Education (Section 6). It complements other Codes of Practice for specific quality assurance activities including:

- Admissions

1.2 The Code of Practice applies equally to SAA-GE and its international partners.

1.3 SAA-GE endorses and adopts the following definition of assessment contained in Section 6 (page 4) of the QAA's Code of Practice:

“In higher education, ‘assessment’ describes any processes that appraise an individual’s knowledge, understanding, abilities and skills. There are many different forms of assessment, serving a variety of purpose. These include:

- Promoting student learning by providing the student with feedback, normally to help improve his/her performance
- Evaluating student knowledge, understanding, abilities and skills
- Providing a mark or grade that enables a student’s performance to be established. The mark or grade may also be used to make progress decisions
- Enabling the public (including employers) and higher education providers, to know that an individual has attained an appropriate level of achievement that reflects the academic standards set by the awarding institution and agreed UK norms, including the frameworks for higher education qualifications. This may include demonstrating fitness to practice or meeting other professional requirements.”

1.4 SAA-GE also endorses and adopts the following definitions of types of assessment from Section 6 (Appendix 2, pages 34-36) of the QAA's Codes of Practice:

- **Diagnostic assessment** is used to show a learner’s preparedness for a module or programme and identifies, for the learner and the teacher, any strengths and potential gaps in knowledge, understanding and skill expected at the start of the programme, or other possible problems. Particular strengths may lead to a formal consideration of accreditation of prior learning.
- **Formative assessment** has a developed purpose and is designed to help learners learn more effectively by giving them feedback on their performance and on how it can be improved and/or maintained. Reflective practice by students contributes to formative assessment.

- **Summative assessment** is used to indicate the extent of a learner's success in meeting the assessment criteria used to gauge the intended learning outcomes of a module or programme.

1.5 The Code of Practice is primarily concerned with summative assessment.

2. General Principles

2.1 Equity and clarity in the assessment process

2.1.1 In developing programmes leading to an SAA-GE award facilities are required to take full account of the QAA's Academic Infrastructure and, where applicable, the requirements of any professional, statutory or regulatory body (PSRB).

2.1.2 Assessment strategies for such programmes measure student achievement of approved learning outcomes for individual modules and do so in accordance with the following practices:

- A common set of regulations governing assessment is contained within SAA-GE's **Academic Regulations** which are published by SAA-GE and made available to students
- The **assessment methods** for a module are clearly stated in the Detailed Module Descriptor
- The assessment volume for a module is directly related to the credit volume for that module
- Assessment is criterion referenced not norm reference
- **Assessment criteria** inform the assessment process by providing academic staff with a link between academic standards as set at the level of the award (these are defined in Section 2 of the Academic Regulations) and academic standards at module level. Assessment criteria are written in a language that is both generic and general, reflecting the generic learning outcomes of SAA-GE's awards.
- **Marking standards**, comprising bands of marks, are used to distinguish between grades of student achievement in completing an item of assessment for a module.
- The determination of award classifications and other levels of overall student achievement are clearly defined in the Academic Regulations and cannot be altered by individuals or Examination Board (Awards).

2.1.3 The Academic Standards and Regulations Committee (ASRC) is informed by the outcomes of the annual monitoring and period review of SAA-GE's taught programmes.

2.1.4 In discharging the responsibility ASRC is informed by the outcomes of the annual monitoring and period review of SAA-GE's taught pathways.

2.2 Objectivity in the assessment process

2.2.1 In their delivery of programmes leading to an SAA-GE award at both undergraduate and postgraduate level, Faculties are required to ensure objectivity in the assessment process by adhering to the following key principles:

- All examination scripts are subject by **anonymous marking**
- All other items of assessment are subject to anonymous marking wherever possible. In cases where this not possible **double marking** is adopted
- The Major Project, as defined in the Academic Regulations, is subject to **unseen double marking**
- All items of assessment are subject to **internal moderation**
- The determination of award classifications and other levels of overall student achievement are based on a SAA-GE wide system of arithmetic calculation, as defined in the Academic Regulations, with no subjective element of discretion to alter marks or awards once these have been approved by the Examination Board Assessment Panel following a process of internal **moderation**.

2.2.2. The ASRC is responsible for:

- Publishing information on assessment which is accessible to all staff, students and External Examiners
- Keeping this information current, appropriate and accessible
- Ensuring that SAA-GE's policies on objectivity in assessment are implemented by Faculties and are consistently applied.

2.3 Independence in the assessment process

2.3.1 In their delivery of programmes leading to an SAA-GE award at both undergraduate and postgraduate level are required to ensure independence in the assignment process by adhering to the following key principles:

- The assessment methods for individual modules are agreed through a module approval process which may include a subject specialist external to SAA-GE
- Approval of a student's assessment outcome for individual modules is made in accordance with agreed academic standards by a formally constituted Examination Board Assessment panel, attended by one or more External Examiners.

- The determination of a student's eligibility for an award is made by a formal constituted Examination Board (Awards)
 - Student appeals in relation to assessment processes are considered in accordance with the Academic Regulations
- 2.3.2 In relation to assessment process students have access to an appeals procedure. Information about this procedure is made available to students when they first register at SAA-GE.
- 2.3.3 Information about assessment offences and this procedure is made available to students when they first register at SAA-GE.
- 2.3.4 The Head of Programme submits an annual review to ASRC.

2.4 The rights and responsibilities of students

2.4.1 Students have the right to:

- Be informed about the basis for determining their award classification and/or their overall level of achievement on the pathway for which they are registered, as set out in the Academic Regulations.
- Be informed about the assessment methods and assessment criteria for the individual modules they are taking
- Be provided with teaching and/or tutorial guidance in preparation for the assessment of the programme for which they are registered and of the individual modules they are taking
- Be assessed and, where appropriate, be re-assessed in accordance with the Academic Regulations
- Request a review of an examiner's decision if there is evidence of any irregularity in the conduct of the assessment process or if a student's performance has been affected by personal circumstances which, for valid reasons, could not be notified to the examiners before the examiners' decision was taken, and to have that request formally considered by the body authorised to consider such requests (see Section 9 of the Academic Regulation for details)
- To provide the Examination Board Mitigation panel, in advance of the meeting and in writing, with any relevant information on personal circumstances which may have affected their academic performance
- Be consulted (but not necessarily individually) on any proposed changes to the regulations governing student continuation and assessment which relate to students currently registered on programmes to which those changes apply and which may directly affect individual students
- Seek redress through the appropriate channels if SAA-GE, without valid cause, has failed to provide the teaching and/or tutorial guidance specified in the Academic

Regulations for the programme or has failed to provide reasonable alternative arrangements or has failed to provide information on assessment processes, procedures and methods as required by the Code of Practice.

2.4.2 Students have the following responsibilities:

- To attend those taught elements of their programmes as may prescribed in the Student Handbook and/or Modules Guides, unless sickness or other valid circumstances pertain
- To participate in learning activities in those taught elements in an appropriate way
- To attend the prescribed examinations and to submit work for assessment in accordance with the Academic Regulations, without committing an assessment offence or otherwise seeking to gain unfair academic advantage

3. Examination Board Assessment Panel and Award Board

3.1 Examination Board Assessment Panels (EBAPs)

- 3.1.1 The constitution, quorum and terms of reference of EBAPs are set out in the Academic Regulations.
- 3.1.2 The Chair of the EBAP must **not** be the Head of Programme responsible for the modules under consideration
- 3.1.3 The role and responsibilities of External Examiners appointed by the EBAP is set out in the Code of Practice on External Examiners
- 3.1.4 EBAPs do not consider cases of mitigation, these are considered by the Examination Board Mitigation Panel (on behalf of the Examination Board Awards Board).

3.2 Examination Board Awards Board (EBAB)

- 3.2.1 The constitution, quorum and terms of reference of the EBAB is set out in the Academic Regulations.
- 3.2.2 The Chair of the EBAB is Head, Academic Programmes (or nominee).
- 3.2.3 The roles and responsibilities of External Examiners appointed to the EBAB are set out in the Code of Practice on External Examiners.

3.2.4 EBABs do not consider individual cases of mitigation. These are considered by the Examination Board Mitigation Panel on the EBABs behalf.

4. Conduct of Assessment

At initial registration all students are given a copy of the Undergraduate or Postgraduate Student Handbook (or access to the web version) and directed to the regulations governing assessment in the Academic Regulations. Collectively these documents provide students with full information on the conduct of SAA-GE's assessment process including the following:

4.1 Examinations

Examinations are conducted by invigilators in accordance with the following documents approved by the Academic Board:

- Regulations governing assessment within the Academic Regulations
- Rules for Invigilators
- Instructions for Candidates
- Arrangements for Students with special needs in assessment
- Rules for the Conduct of Examinations at locations outside of SAA-GE.

4.2 Other forms of assessment

The conduct of assessment methods other than formal examinations is in accordance with the appropriate regulations contained in the Academic Regulations and is published and explained to students in the appropriate Student Handbook and/or Module Guides. The submission of all work for assessment is at the sole discretion of the student.

4.3 Extensions and the consequences of late submission

A mark of zero is awarded for any assessment submitted after the published deadline unless an extension to the deadline has been approved for an individual student in advance of the deadline. In certain circumstances a short or long term extension to a published deadline may be agreed in advance as set out in the Academic Regulations.

4.4 Excessive length and penalties for failing to adhere to word limits

Failure to submit work for assessment which satisfies any constraints such as word limits incurs mark penalties, as set out in the Academic Regulations.

4.5 Mitigation

Mitigation is the process by which SAA-GE makes allowances for any matter or circumstance which may have seriously affected a student's performance in an assessment element(s). The process for considering a claim for mitigation is set out in the Academic Regulations.

4.6 Assessment offences

Any attempt by a student to gain unfair academic advantage during the assessment process is treated as a serious offence. The process for handling an alleged assessment offence is set out in the Academic Regulations.

4.7 Special needs assessment

The Academic Regulations permit the assessment methods for a particular module, as set out in the DMD to be varied, as appropriate, with the approval of the appropriate Head of Programme if a student is unable through disability or disposition to be assessed by those methods. Any such variation shall take full account of:

- The specific needs of the student
- The intended learning outcomes of the programme and/or module for which the student is registered/enrolled
- The need to ensure that the student is assessed on equal terms with other students.

4.8 Retention of items of assessment

Assessed work, once marked, is retained.

5. Scheduling and volume of assessment

- 5.1 A module's volume of assessment directly relates to its credit volume, as set out in the Academic Regulations. The assessment workload normally approximates to one third of the total notional learning hours for the module as reflected in its approved credit rating.
- 5.2 Assessment is directly linked to student achievement of learning outcomes. Assessment criteria identify student achievement of generic learning outcomes in the broadest possible terms by correlating three key variables – level of learning, marking standards, and student achievement – in taxonomy of statements about assessment.
- 5.3 While the attainment of all learning outcomes must be evidenced by assessment, SAA-GE has developed policies to avoid assessment overload, including due consideration to the range of learning outcomes which can be reasonably be required for a given volume of credit.
- 5.4 Initial (i.e. first attempt) assessment is conducted during and/or at the end of a module and is not normally deferred.
- 5.5 Students are entitled to receive adequate notice of the form and timing of assessment for an individual module.

6. Marking

6.1 Assessment criteria and marking standards

- 6.1.1 Assessment criteria and marking standards are used to define and evaluate student achievement in the completion of assessed work for an individual module.
- 6.1.2 The Academic Board has defined the relationship between SAA-GE's generic assessment criteria and marking standards (see Appendix 1 for details). These are communicated to staff and students in University Publications, including this Code of Practice and the Undergraduate and Postgraduate Handbooks.
- 6.1.3 These generic criteria and standards are either used directly, or customised for individual assessment tasks, as appropriate, by the Head of Programme for use within the Faculty. They are communicated to staff and students in Module Guides and/or Student Handbooks.

6.2 Mechanisms for marking and for the moderation of marks

- 6.2.1 All examination scripts are subject to anonymous marking.
- 6.2.2 All other items of assessment are subject to anonymous marking where the method of assessment allows. If this is not possible for a particular item of assessment, the work submitted by all students is either subject to internal double marking or an alternative means of evidencing is provided to the Assessment Panel.
- 6.2.3 All major projects are subject to unseen double marking.
- 6.2.4 All items of assessment for a module are subject to internal moderation. For each assessment period, the sample for internal moderation in advance of meetings of the Assessment Panel comprises a minimum of 20 items or 20% (whichever is greater) of the assessed work for each assessment element contributing 20% or more of the overall assessment for a module.
- 6.2.5 The sample for each element covers the full range of marks, including failures and borderline cases (where such examples exist). The samples includes assessed work in partner institutions. Every location of delivery is represented within the sample. The minimum sample size may need to be exceeded to ensure effective external moderation (i.e. satisfying the minimum number of items of assessed work does not necessarily mean that all the criteria for a sample have been met). All samples are accompanied by a full schedule of all marks achieved by all students enrolled on the relevant module(s) for all assessment methods and for all locations of delivery.
- 6.2.6 The sample for each element covers the full range of marks, including failures and borderline cases (where such examples exist). The sample includes assessed work in partner institutions. Every location of delivery is represented within the sample. Assessed work for inclusion within the sample must include work which has been subject to internal moderation but may also include work which has not been internally moderated. The minimum sample size may need to be exceeded to ensure effective external moderation (i.e. satisfying the minimum number of items of assessed work does not necessarily mean that all the criteria for a sample have been met). All samples are accompanied by a full schedule of all marks achieved by all students enrolled on the relevant module(s) for all assessment methods and for all locations of delivery.

6.3 Evaluation and development of academic standards

- 6.3.1 Assessment Panels are responsible for confirming the appropriateness and academic standards of mark ranges. To discharge this responsibility they consider trends in assessment ranges over time and in assessment outcomes across the range of modules.
- 6.3.2 Examination Board are responsible for setting and maintaining the academic standard of the awards and, in certain cases, the classification of the awards.
- 6.3.3 An archive of sample marked scripts is maintained under the authority of the Assessment Panel to assist in the periodic evaluation of the maintenance and development of academic standards and in the staff development associated with this activity (see paragraph 4.8)

6.4 Marking schemes and the aggregation of marks for student continuation and for determining student awards and award classifications

- 6.4.1 **Marking schemes** are used at module level to inform the first marking and internal and external moderation of each item of assessment. Marking schemes identify the knowledge and skills which students must demonstrate to achieve the learning outcomes of the module, and are used to calculate the total mark to be awarded for an individual item of assessment. SAA-GE's generic assessment criteria are intended to advise the writing of marking schemes, ensuring that they are broadly comparable across SAA-GE.
- 6.4.2 SAA-GE's Academic Regulations define the basis on which marks for individual modules are aggregated when determining:
 - A student's continuation between levels of learning and years of study
 - A student's award classification and/or overall level of achievement for the pathway for which they are registered
- 6.4.3 The determination of award classifications and other levels of overall student achievement is based on an SAA-GE wide system of arithmetic calculation, as defined in the Academic Regulations. There is no subjective element of discretion to alter the marks of students whose overall aggregate mark places them within an award or award classification borderline. When determining an award classification the arithmetic mean is rounded to the nearest integer, as set out in the Academic Regulations.

6.5 Failure and re-assessment

- 6.5.1 In certain circumstances and within prescribed limits, as defined in the Academic Regulations, compensation is permitted for a failed module within an undergraduate programme.
- 6.5.2 Students who fail a module at the first attempt are permitted one further opportunity to pass the module subject to:
- The Academic Regulations governing compensation which apply only to undergraduates
 - The outcome of any claim for mitigating circumstances
 - The provisions of the Academic Regulations with regard to replacement and retake modules
- 6.5.3 If a student has failed a module, re-assessment after further attendance may be undertaken only when deemed necessary by the Assessment Panel in view of the subject area (e.g. laboratory work).
- 6.5.4 The module result for a student who passes a module at re-assessment is capped at 40%.

7. Feedback to students on performance

- 7.1 Students are entitled to receive feedback from markers on all assessed work. Such feedback is written or otherwise, as appropriate.
- 7.2 Written feedback is normally through completion of a cover sheet on which markers relate feedback to assessment criteria and learning outcomes.
- 7.3 Feedback to all assessed work is given to students within 10 working days of the submission deadline or the date of the examination, except for Major Projects where the deadline is 15 days. Such feedback clearly states, if applicable, that the mark awarded is unconfirmed and subject to internal and external moderation.
- 7.4 Details of the arrangements for the return of feedback on assessed work to students (except examination scripts which are not returned) are given by lecturer/Head of Programme.

8. Staff development

- 8.1 All academic and administrative staff associated with assessment receive copies of this Code of Practice, and the regulations governing assessment contained in SAA-GE's Academic Regulations.
- 8.2 All members of academic staff associated with the management of the curriculum and/or assessment processes are strongly encouraged by the Head of Programme to attend appropriate and relevant staff development events.
- 8.3 All members of administrative staff associated with the management of the curriculum and/or assessment process are strongly encouraged to attend appropriate and relevant staff development events.

9. Language assessment

- 9.1 All taught programmes leading to an SAA-GE award are delivered and assessed in English.

10. Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements

- 10.1 SAA-GE Programme Specification Form (PSF) is used to define the structure and content of all programmes leading to an SAA-GE award. The PSF recognises the PSRB from which professional recognition or accreditation of the pathway has been, or will be sought.
- 10.2 The Student Handbook for the programme ensures that any PSRB requirements (e.g. those modules which must be taken and passed) for progression towards a professional qualification are made clear to students.

11. Review of regulatory framework

- 11.1 This Code of Practice is reviewed every 3 years (or more regularly if necessary) by the ASRC. The Committee submits to the Academic Board any recommendations for revision.
- 11.2 Students are normally governed by those Academic Regulations in force at the point of their initial registration with SAA-GE. If the Academic Board determines that a change of regulation should apply to students already registered for a programme leading to an SAA-GE award, SAA-GE formally advises those students in writing of the changes and the effective dates, particularly if the changes relate to the assessment process.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

SAA-GE GENERIC ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND MARKING STANDARDS

Level 0

Generic Learning Outcomes (Academic Regulations Section 2)	Assessment criteria by level	Marking standards (by mark band)					
		70%+	60-69%	50-59%	40-49%	30-39%	1-29%
	Characteristics of student achievement per mark band	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves a marginal pass in the module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Fails marginally to achieve module outcome/s related to this GLO. Eligible for compensation.	Fails to achieve module outcome/s related to this GLO and is not eligible for compensation.
Knowledge and Understanding	Level 0 (Access) prepares students to function effectively at HE Level 1. Criteria for assessment at level 0 reflect the preparatory nature of these modules. Students are expected to demonstrate the acquisition of generic learning skills appropriate for self-managed learning in an HE context. Students are expected to demonstrate that they have acquired the underpinning discipline specific skills, knowledge and understanding necessary to undertake a programme of higher education.	Excellent information base and understanding of ethical issues	Good information base covering all major/ethical issues	Satisfactory information base covering most major issues and their ethical dimension	Basic information base; limited understanding of major/ethical issues of the discipline	Limited information base; limited understanding of discipline and its ethical dimension	Inadequate information base; lack of understanding of discipline and its ethical dimension
Intellectual (thinking), Practical, Affective and Transferable Skills	Level 0 (Access) prepares students to function effectively at HE Level 1. Criteria for assessment at level 0 reflect the preparatory nature of these modules. Students are expected to demonstrate the acquisition of generic learning skills appropriate for self-managed learning in an HE context. Students are expected to demonstrate that they have acquired the underpinning discipline specific skills, knowledge and understanding necessary to undertake a programme of higher education.	Excellent management of learning resources. Contributes well to teams. Structured and largely accurate expression. Very good academic/ intellectual skills and practical professional skills.	Good management of learning resources. Expression is structured and mainly accurate. Good academic/ intellectual skills and team/ practical professional skills.	Satisfactory use of learning resources. Expression shows some lack of structure and/or accuracy. Acceptable but undistinguished skills set. Satisfactory team/ practical/ professional skills.	Basic use of learning resources with significant lack of structure and/or accuracy in expression. Some issues with academic/ intellectual skills. Basic team/ practical/ professional skills.	Limited use of learning resources with little contribution to team work. Weak academic/ intellectual skills and difficulty in expression. Insecure practical/ professional skills.	Inadequate use of learning resources. Major problems with structure and accuracy in expression. Very weak academic/ intellectual skills, team/ practical/ professional skills.

Level 1

Generic Learning Outcomes (Academic Regulations Section 2)	Assessment criteria by level	Marking standards (by mark band)					
		70%+	60-69%	50-59%	40-49%	30-39%	1-29%
	Characteristics of student achievement per mark band	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves a marginal pass in the module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Fails marginally to achieve module outcome/s related to this GLO. Eligible for compensation.	Fails to achieve module outcome/s related to this GLO and is not eligible for compensation.
Knowledge and Understanding	Level 1 introduces students to HE. Students are expected to demonstrate relevant skills and competencies; to be articulate in expressing ideas orally; and to be coherent in terms of written or other media. Forms of expression at this level may be descriptive or imitative, but students are expected to demonstrate an increasing understanding of the theoretical background of their study and analytic competence to explore it, as well as its relationship, where appropriate, to particular skills. Students are expected to develop an awareness of strengths and weaknesses in their skill sets.	Excellent information base, exploring and analysing the discipline, its theory and ethical issues with considerable originality.	Good information base, explores and analyses the discipline, its theory and ethical issues with some originality.	Satisfactory information base, that begins to explore and analyse the discipline, its theory and ethical issues but is still mainly imitative.	Basic information base; omissions in understanding of major/ethical issues. Largely imitative.	Limited information base; limited understanding of discipline and its ethical dimension	Inadequate information base; lack of understanding of discipline and its ethical dimension. Wholly imitative.
Intellectual (thinking), Practical, Affective and Transferable Skills	Level 1 introduces students to HE. Students are expected to demonstrate relevant skills and competencies; to be articulate in expressing ideas orally; and to be coherent in terms of written or other media. Forms of expression at this level may be descriptive or imitative, but students are expected to demonstrate an increasing understanding of the theoretical background of their study and analytic competence to explore it, as well as its relationship, where appropriate, to particular skills. Students are expected to develop an awareness of strengths and weaknesses in their skill sets.	Excellent management of learning resources. Complemented by self-direction/ exploration. Structured/ accurate expression. Very good academic/ intellectual and team/ practical/ professional skills.	Good management of learning resources with some self-direction. Structured and mainly accurate expression. Good academic/ intellectual skills and team/ practical professional skills.	Satisfactory use of learning resources and input to team work. Expression shows some lack of structure and/or accuracy. Acceptable academic/ intellectual skills and satisfactory practical/ professional skills.	Basic use of learning resources with no self-direction. Some input to team work. Some difficulty with structure and accuracy in expression. Some issues with academic/ intellectual skills and developing practical/ professional skills.	Limited use of learning resources. No self-direction, little contribution to team work. Weak academic/ intellectual skills and difficulty in expression. Weak academic skills. Practical/ professional skills not yet secure.	Inadequate use of learning resources. Failure to contribute to team work. Major problems with structure and accuracy in expression. Very weak academic/ intellectual skills, team/ practical/ professional skills.

Level 2

Generic Learning Outcomes (Academic Regulations Section 2)	Assessment criteria by level	Marking standards (by mark band)					
		70%+	60-69%	50-59%	40-49%	30-39%	1-29%
	Characteristics of student achievement per mark band	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves a marginal pass in the module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Fails marginally to achieve module outcome/s related to this GLO.	Fails to achieve module outcome/s related to this GLO and is not eligible for compensation.
Knowledge and Understanding	Level 2 reflects continuing development from Level 1. At this level students are not fully autonomous but are able to take responsibility for their own learning with some direction. Students are expected to locate an increasingly detailed theoretical knowledge of the discipline within a more general intellectual context, and to demonstrate this through forms of expression which go beyond the merely descriptive or imitative. Students are expected to demonstrate analytical competence in terms both of problem identification and resolution, and to develop their skills sets as required.	Excellent knowledge base, exploring and analysing the discipline, its theory and ethical issues with considerable originality and autonomy.	Good knowledge base, explores and analyses the discipline, its theory and ethical issues with some originality, detail and autonomy.	Satisfactory knowledge base, that begins to explore and analyse the theory and ethical issues of the discipline.	Basic knowledge base with some omissions and/or lack of theory of discipline and its ethical dimension.	Limited knowledge base; limited understanding of discipline and its ethical dimension	Inadequate knowledge base; lack of understanding of discipline and its ethical dimension.
Intellectual (thinking), Practical, Affective and Transferable Skills	Level 2 reflects continuing development from Level 1. At this level students are not fully autonomous but are able to take responsibility for their own learning with some direction. Students are expected to locate an increasingly detailed theoretical knowledge of the discipline within a more general intellectual context, and to demonstrate this through forms of expression which go beyond the merely descriptive or imitative. Students are expected to demonstrate analytical competence in terms both of problem identification and resolution, and to develop their skills sets as required.	Excellent management of learning resources, with a degree of autonomy/ exploration that may exceed the brief. Structured/ accurate expression. Very good academic/ intellectual and team/ practical/ professional skills.	Good management of learning resources with consistent self-direction. Structured and mainly accurate expression. Good academic/ intellectual skills and team/ practical professional skills.	Satisfactory use of learning resources. Acceptable structure/ accuracy in expression. Acceptable level of academic/ intellectual skills, going beyond description at times. Satisfactory team/ practical/ professional skills. Inconsistent self-direction.	Basic use of learning resources with no self-direction. Some input to team work. Some difficulty with academic/ intellectual skills. Largely imitative and descriptive. Some difficulty with structure and accuracy in expression, but developing practical/ professional skills.	Limited use of learning resources, working towards self-direction. General difficulty with structure and accuracy in expression. Weak academic/ intellectual skills. Still mainly imitative and descriptive. Team/ practical/ professional skills are not yet secure.	Inadequate use of learning resources. Major problems with structure and accuracy in expression. Very weak academic/ intellectual skills. Wholly imitative and descriptive. Very weak team/ practical/ professional skills. No ability to direct own learning.

Level 3 (for reference purposes)

Generic Learning Outcomes (Academic Regulations Section 2)	Assessment criteria by level	Marking standards (by mark band)					
		70%+	60-69%	50-59%	40-49%	30-39%	1-29%
	Characteristics of student achievement per mark band	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves a marginal pass in the module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Fails marginally to achieve module outcome/s related to this GLO.	Fails to achieve module outcome/s related to this GLO and is not eligible for compensation.
Knowledge and Understanding	Level 3 is characterised by an expectation of students' increasing autonomy in relation to their study and developing skill set. Students are expected to demonstrate problem solving skills, both theoretical and practical. This is supported by an understanding of appropriate theory; creativity of expression and thought based on individual judgement; and the ability to seek out, invoke, analyse and evaluate competing theories or methods of working in a critically constructive and open manner. Output is articulate, coherent and skilled in the appropriate medium, with some students producing original or innovative work in their specialisms.	Excellent knowledge base, that supports analysis, evaluation and problem solving in theory/ practice/ ethics of discipline with considerable originality.	Good knowledge base that supports analysis, evaluation and problem solving in theory/ practice/ ethics of discipline with some originality.	Satisfactory knowledge base, that that supports some analysis, evaluation and problem solving in theory/ practice/ ethics of discipline.	Basic knowledge base with some omissions at the level of theory/ ethical issues. Restricted ability to discuss and/or solve problems in discipline.	Limited knowledge base; limited understanding of discipline/ ethical issues. Difficulty with theory an problem solving in discipline.	Inadequate knowledge base; lack of understanding of discipline/ ethical issues. Unable to discuss theory or solve problems in discipline.
Intellectual (thinking), Practical, Affective and Transferable Skills	Level 3 is characterised by an expectation of students' increasing autonomy in relation to their study and developing skill set. Students are expected to demonstrate problem solving skills, both theoretical and practical. This is supported by an understanding of appropriate theory; creativity of expression and thought based on individual judgement; and the ability to seek out, invoke, analyse and evaluate competing theories or methods of working in a critically constructive and open manner. Output is articulate, coherent and skilled in the appropriate medium, with some students producing original or innovative work in their specialisms.	Excellent management of learning resources, with a degree of autonomy/ research that may exceed the assessment brief. Structured and creative expression. Very good academic/ intellectual and team/ practical/ professional problem-solving skills.	Good management of learning resources with consistent self-directed research . Structured and accurate expression. Good academic/ intellectual skills and team/ professional problem solving skills.	Satisfactory use of learning resources. Some autonomy is research but inconsistent. Structured and mainly accurate expression. Acceptable level of academic/ intellectual skills, going beyond description at times. Satisfactory team/ practical/ professional problem solving skills.	Basic use of learning resources with little autonomy. Some difficulties with academic/ intellectual skills. . Some difficulty with structure and accuracy in expression, but evidence of developing team/ practical/ professional problem solving skills.	Limited use of learning resources. Unable to work autonomously. Little input into teams. Weak academic/ intellectual skills. Still mainly descriptive. General difficulty with structure/ accuracy of expression. Practical/ professional problem solving skills are not yet secure.	Inadequate use of learning resources. Failure to contribute to team work. Major problems with structure/ accuracy in expression. Very weak academic/ intellectual skills and team/ practical/ professional skills. No ability to direct own learning.

Level 4

Generic Learning Outcomes (Academic Regulations Section 2)	Assessment criteria by level	Marking standards (by mark band)					
		70%+	60-69%	50-59%	40-49%	30-39%	1-29%
	Characteristics of student achievement per mark band	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves a marginal pass in the module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Fails marginally to achieve module outcome/s related to this GLO.	Fails to achieve module outcome/s related to this GLO and is not eligible for compensation.
Knowledge and Understanding	Level 4 is characterised by an expectation of students' expertise in their specialism. Students are semi-autonomous, demonstrating independence in the negotiation of assessment tasks (including major projects) and the ability to evaluate, challenge, modify and develop theory and practice. Students are expected to demonstrate an ability to isolate and focus on the significant features of problems and to offer synthetic and coherent solutions, with some students producing original or innovative work in their specialisms that is worthy of publication or public display.	DISTINCTION As MERIT but showing independence of thought, a high level of intellectual rigour and consistency.	MERIT Good analysis of key issues/ concepts/ ethics. Development of conceptual structures and argument making consistent use of scholarly conventions.	CREDIT Satisfactory knowledge of key issues/ concepts/ ethics in discipline. Descriptive in parts but some ability to synthesise scholarship and argument. Minor lapses in use of scholarly conventions.	PASS Basic knowledge of key issues/ concepts/ ethics in discipline. Largely descriptive, with restricted synthesis of existing scholarship and little argument. Use of scholarly conventions inconsistent.	Limited knowledge base, understanding of or research skills in discipline.	Inadequate knowledge base; lack of understanding of key issues and/or research skills in discipline.
Intellectual (thinking), Practical, Affective and Transferable Skills	Level 4 is characterised by an expectation of students' expertise in their specialism. Students are semi-autonomous, demonstrating independence in the negotiation of assessment tasks (including major projects) and the ability to evaluate, challenge, modify and develop theory and practice. Students are expected to demonstrate an ability to isolate and focus on the significant features of problems and to offer synthetic and coherent solutions, with some students producing original or innovative work in their specialisms that is worthy of publication or public display.	DISTINCTION As MERIT but excellent research skills, independence of thought, a high level intellectual rigour and consistently excellent expressive/ professional skills and considerable creativity and originality. Excellent academic/ intellectual skills, and considerable creativity and originality.	MERIT Good analysis of key issues/ concepts and ethics. Development of conceptual structures and argument, making consistent use of scholarly conventions.	CREDIT Satisfactory knowledge of key issues/ concepts/ ethics in discipline. Descriptive in parts but some ability to synthesise scholarship and argument. Minor lapses in use of scholarly conventions.	PASS Basic knowledge of key issues/ concepts/ ethics in discipline. Largely descriptive, with restricted synthesis of existing scholarship and little argument. Use of scholarly conventions inconsistent.	Limited research skills impede use of learning resources and problem solving. Major problems with structure/ accuracy in expression. Team/ practical/ professional problem solving skills are not yet secure. Weak academic/ intellectual skills. Inconsistent use of scholarly conventions	Inadequate research skills prevent use of learning resources and problem solving. Major problems with structure/ accuracy in expression. Very weak team/ practical/ professional skills. Very weak academic/ intellectual skills. Inconsistent use of scholarly conventions

APPENDIX 2

GRADE DESCRIPTORS

Level 1

WRITTEN WORK

High Distinction (80+%)	An outstanding clearly articulated piece of writing. The work is written in a creative and imaginative manner, and combines extensive reflection with a wide range of literature sources. The work demonstrates an excellent appreciation of the requirements of the task and has combined literature and presentation skills to a high level.
Low Distinction (70%+)	A well written, focused and refined piece of work. Ideas are presented logically and coherently. There is some evidence of a personal perspective. Draws upon a good range of relevant literature, explicitly referenced, and other appropriate resources. Uses information to develop a relevant argument.
Merit (60%-69%)	Well-selected content. Ideas structured around the given topic. A good range of resource material has been considered. A line of argument is beginning to be developed, supported by explicit references to authorities. Ideas are logically presented and easy to follow.
Credit (50%-59%)	Content is appropriate and presented clearly and concisely. A range of relevant resource material is used to support the case presented. Material is well assembled and collated, but is often derivative.
Pass (40%-49%)	Presents a limited amount of content which has some relevance to the topic, but which is not focused. Has only a limited range of resource material and this is used mostly in a derivative way.
Low FAIL (39%- 21%)	Some content which, whilst not closely relevant to the theme, does have some relevance. Isolated pieces of information, highly dependent on a very limited range of resource material. Often confused and muddled.
High Fail (0-20%)	The content has little or no relevance to the requirements of the task. There are no/minimal referenced sources and the ideas are presented in a fragmented and incoherent manner.

PRESENTATIONS

High Distinction (80+%)	The work shows outstanding interpretation of the task. The presentation is creative, imaginative and extends well beyond the requirements of the task. The session demonstrates an excellent appreciation of the needs of specific client groups.
Low Distinction (70%+)	All the elements listed below, plus: a distinctive presentation, which shows creativity, leadership, innovation and confidence with the subject matter. There is extensive evidence of the ability to modify and adapt the presentation as required.
Merit (60%-69%)	The presentation has strong structure, clearly presented ideas, evidence of development and progression. There is strong evidence of self confidence, examples of secure knowledge and understanding.
Credit (50%-59%)	There is clear evidence of preparation and development of the activity. Equipment and resource materials are of a good quality and some thought has been given to self-presentation.
Pass (40%-49%)	An attempt has been made to select material that is appropriate to the initial activity. There are identifiable objectives to the presentation however these are only adequately explored. There is an acceptable standard of self-presentation and preparation, however tasks and activities are superficially explained rather than enhanced within the activity.
Low FAIL (39%- 21%)	There is inadequate planning and attention to detail. The presentation is lacking in structure (no clear beginning, middle or end). There is a lack of dynamic interaction with others. Ideas and themes are inadequately explored. The use of support materials is poor in quality and the activity lacks attention to detail and preparation.
High Fail (0-20%)	There is no/minimal planning and awareness of the nature of the task. The presentation has a poor structure and lacks any appreciation of the requirements of the task or the specific client group. There is minimal and/or poor use of available equipment and resources.

EXAMINATION

High Distinction (80%+)	An outstanding and clearly articulated response to the task. The ideas are presented in an imaginative and coherent manner that extends well beyond the requirements of the task. The response draws upon extensive and referenced sources, and utilises these in an imaginative manner.
Low Distinction (70%+)	A well-written and structured response. Ideas are presented logically and coherently. There is evidence of a personal perspective, within a given context. The response draws upon a good range of relevant literature that is referenced. Uses information to develop a relevant argument.
Merit (60%-69%)	Well-selected content. The responses are structured around the given topic, and a range of literature and resource materials have been utilised. A line of argument is beginning to be developed, supported by references and or relevant contexts. Ideas are logically presented and easy to follow.
Credit (50%-59%)	Content is appropriate and presented clearly and concisely. A range of relevant materials is used to support the case presented. Material is well assembled and collated, but is often derivative.
Pass (40%-49%)	The response presents a limited amount of content, which has some relevance to the topic, but which is not focused. Has only a limited range of knowledge and understanding of the material, and this is used mostly in a derivative way.
Low FAIL (39%-21%)	Some content which, whilst not closely relevant to the theme, does have some relevance. Isolated pieces of information, highly dependent on a very limited range of materials. Often confused, very weak in structure and muddled.
High Fail (0-20%)	There is no/minimal content which fails to address the requirements of the task. The ideas are fragmented and lack coherence. There is no evidence of referenced sources to support the discussion.

Level 2

WRITTEN WORK

High Distinction (80+%)	An outstanding piece of analytical writing. The work is written in a creative and evaluative manner, and demonstrates extensive reflection with a wide range of literature sources. The work demonstrates an excellent analysis of the requirements of the task and has combined literature and presentation skills to a high level. The work is of publishable quality.
Low Distinction (70%+)	A coherent and well-developed piece of work in which content is well structured to support a personal argument securely grounded in the work of relevant authorities. There is evidence of extensive background research and a good range of sources, have been utilised. Differing viewpoints are recognised, and there is an attempt to judge the significance of these for the proposed personal perspective. Where relevant, there is good application to the practical situation.
Merit (60%-69%)	There is good variety of content and differing opinions are recognised; there is some attempt to point to strengths and weaknesses in relation to the proposed topic. Good ranges of resources, including people where relevant, have been consulted. A sound line of argument has been established and this has the beginnings of a personal perspective. Content is well structured to answer the chosen question, ideas are analysed rather than merely stated.
Credit (50%-59%)	An appropriate selection of content, which shows that a variety of resource materials have been consulted. There is some attempt to compare and contrast differing viewpoints. The piece is becoming more analytic than descriptive. A line of argument has begun to be developed and there is some attempt to use material rather than it being merely derivative. There may, where appropriate, be sound application to a practical situation.
Pass (40%-49%)	Content has some relevance to the given topic, but tends to describe rather than analyse. A limited range of resources has been consulted and there is little evidence that these have been used to support a particular viewpoint. Ideas are stated rather than being developed into a line of argument.
Low FAIL (39%-21%)	Some fragmentary and superficial information but which does have relevance to the chosen topic. Resources consulted are few and material selected from them is very derivative; often confused and muddled.
High Fail (0-20%)	Content is very thin, &/or irrelevant. The whole is often muddled and confused. Few resources have been consulted, and/or the whole is almost derivative.

PRESENTATIONS

High Distinction (80+%)	The work shows outstanding interpretation and analysis of the task. The session is evaluative, imaginative and extends well beyond the requirements of the task. The presentation demonstrates an excellent appreciation of the needs of specific client groups, and integrates these innovatively.
Low Distinction (70%+)	All the elements listed below, plus: a clear and distinctive session which shows inventiveness, self confidence and individuality
Merit (60%-69%)	Appropriate and varied use of relevant language; strong structure; clearly presented ideas with evidence of development and progression. Effective use of equipment and resource materials. Good self-presentation and confidence in the subject matter.
Credit (50%-59%)	There is a good choice and use of materials that are appropriate to the original objective of the session. The session shows variation, development and progression. There is a structure in place but it is not fully utilised. There is evidence of some confidence in the subject matter and presentation of self.
Pass (40%-49%)	An attempt has been made to select materials and tasks that are appropriate to the initial objectives of the activity. There are identifiable presentation points, however these are repeated rather than varied or developed. There is an acceptable standard of planning and preparation, however the activity appears inadequately rehearsed.
Low FAIL (39%- 21%)	There is a lack of clarity in the use of equipment and resources The structure of the session is poor. There is a lack of dynamic variation; leadership, confidence and ideas are insufficiently explored.
High Fail (0-20%)	There is no/minimal planning, analysis or evaluation of the task. The presentation has a poor structure and lacks any knowledge and/or appreciation of the requirements of the task. There is minimal and/or poor use of available equipment and resources.

EXAMINATION

High Distinction (80%+)	An outstanding and clearly articulated analysis of the task. The ideas are presented in an imaginative, coherent and evaluative manner that extends well beyond the requirements of the task. The response draws upon extensive and referenced sources, and interprets these in an imaginative manner.
Low Distinction (70%+)	A coherent response in which content is well structured and supports a personal argument securely. There is evidence of extensive background research and a good range of sources, have been analysed and debated. Differing viewpoints are recognised, and there is an attempt to judge the significance of these. Where relevant, there is good application to the practical situation
Merit (60%-69%)	There is good variety of content and differing opinions are recognised. There is some attempt to point to strengths and weaknesses in relation to the question. A good range of resources, including people where relevant, has been utilised. A good line of argument has been established. Content is well structured to answer the chosen question, ideas are analysed and evaluated rather than merely stated.
Credit (50%-59%)	An appropriate selection of content. There is some attempt to compare and contrast differing viewpoints. The piece is becoming more analytic than descriptive. A line of argument has begun to be developed and there is some attempt to use material rather than it being merely derivative.
Pass (40%-49%)	The response is fragmented and only superficial information is utilised. Sources are very limited, and material is very derivative; often confused and muddled.
Low FAIL (39%-21%)	Content is thin, and/or irrelevant. The response is muddled & confused. Few if any resources have been consulted.
High Fail (0-20%)	There is no/minimal content which fails to analyse and address the requirements of the task. The ideas are fragmented and lack any evaluation and are incoherent. There is no evidence of referenced sources to support the discussion

Level 3

WRITTEN WORK

High Distinction (80%+)	An outstanding piece of critical writing. The work is creative, well articulated and demonstrates extensive critical synthesis. The literature sources are drawn from an extensive range of resources. The work demonstrates an excellent critique of the requirements of the task and combines imaginative interpretation of the task. The work is of publishable quality
Low Distinction (70%+)	A well written, clearly focused and refined piece of work. Ideas are critically evaluated and presented logically and coherently. There is strong evidence of a good range of relevant literature, explicitly referenced and synthesised within the discussion.
Merit (60%-69%)	Well-selected content, which has been structured around the given topic. A good range of resource materials have been critiqued. A line of argument has been developed that demonstrates critical thinking, independence and originality Ideas are logically presented and easy to follow
Credit (50%-59%)	Content is appropriate and presented clearly and concisely. There is a range of relevant resource material, which is analysed, rather than critically evaluated in light of alternative theories and or perspectives. Material is well assembled and collated.
Pass (40%-49%)	Presents a limited amount of content, which has some relevance to the topic but which is not focused, and lacking any depth of evaluation. Limited ranges of resource materials are used which tend to be more descriptive than evaluative.
Low FAIL (39%-21%)	Some content which, whilst not closely relevant to the question, does have some relevance. Isolated pieces of information, highly dependent on very limited range of resource materials. Often confused and muddled.
High Fail (0-20%)	Very little content, little or no evidence of analysis, evaluation or critical interpretation. Materials; ideas and concepts are incoherent or irrelevant

PRESENTATIONS

High Distinction (80%+)	The work shows outstanding critical interpretation of the task. The presentation is creative, imaginative and synthesises the requirements of the task to a high standard. The session demonstrates an excellent critical appreciation of the needs of specific client groups.
Low Distinction (70%+)	All the elements listed below, plus: a clearly distinctive presentation, which shows inventiveness, creativity, individuality and the ability to utilise a diverse range of materials.
Merit (60%-69%)	Appropriate and varied use of equipment, resource materials and or technical language, knowledge and understanding. The session has a strong structure, clearly presented ideas and with evidence of development, progression and a self-confidence.
Credit (50%-59%)	An attempt has been made to use modify and adapt materials as required during the presentation. Planning and preparation is of a good quality and can be seen to enhance the overall style of delivery. The activity is where appropriate safe, but lacks some innovation, and ingenuity.
Pass (40%-49%)	There are identifiable tasks and activities that are repeated rather than varied, developed or progressed. There is an attempt to demonstrate leadership and confidence, however this appears largely superficial. There is an acceptable standard of planning and recognition of safety where relevant.
Low FAIL (39%-21%)	There is a lack of clarity in the use of equipment, resource materials and self-presentation. Ideas are insufficiently explored and provide no interest to the activity. The activity appears to have been under prepared, and elements of safe practice may be questioned.
High Fail (0-20%)	There is no/minimal critical appreciation, planning and awareness of the nature of the task. The presentation has a poor structure and lacks any synthesis of the requirements of the task or the specific client group. There is minimal and/or poor use of available equipment and resources.

EXAMINATION

High Distinction (80%+)	An outstanding and clearly critiqued response to the task. The ideas are presented in an imaginative and synthesised manner that extends well beyond the requirements of the task. The response draws upon extensive and well-ordered referenced sources, and utilises these in an imaginative manner.
Low 1st CLASS (70%+)	A well written, focused and refined response. Ideas are critically evaluated and presented logically and coherently. There is strong evidence of a range of relevant literature that is synthesised within the discussion.
2:1 (60%-69%)	Well-selected content, which has been structured around the given question. A good range of relevant sources materials have been critiqued. A line of argument has been developed that demonstrates critical thinking and independence. Ideas are logically presented and easy to follow
2:2 (50%-59%)	Content is appropriate and presented clearly and concisely. There is evidence of relevant literature sources, which are analysed, rather than critically evaluated Material is well assembled.
THIRD (40%-49%)	Presents a limited amount of content which has some relevance to the question, but which lacks any depth of evaluation. Limited ranges of referenced sources are utilised, which tend to be more descriptive than evaluative.
Low FAIL (39%-21%)	Some content which, whilst not closely relevant to the question, does have some relevance. Isolated pieces of information, highly dependent on very limited range of materials. Often confused and muddled
High Fail (0-20%)	There is no/minimal content which fails to critically analyse and address the requirements of the task. The ideas are fragmented or incoherent and lack any synthesis of ideas There is no evidence of referenced sources to support the discussion.