

Assessment Criteria

	0-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-84	85-100
KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING	<p>Work that is currently well-below expectations for the current level, and requires significant improvement to reach an acceptable standard.</p> <p>Demonstrates an insufficient understanding of assigned material, with little evidence of relevant knowledge. There is little or no comprehension of subject material evidenced. The piece includes a significant number of factual errors / omissions and/or major confusions.</p> <p>No awareness of contexts relevant to subject material is demonstrated.</p> <p>No evidence of either wider reading (tutor suggested) or independent research.</p>	<p>Work that is currently below expectations for the current level, but approaching an acceptable standard.</p> <p>Demonstrates an insufficient understanding of assigned material, with some significant gaps in knowledge that prevent an adequate response to a given task.</p> <p>Comprehension of subject material is inconsistent, and includes a significant number of factual errors / omissions and/or major confusions.</p> <p>Limited or no awareness of contexts relevant to subject material. When addressed it is with a generalized understanding.</p> <p>Very little or no evidence of either wider reading (tutor suggested) or independent research.</p>	<p>Work that is of an acceptable standard for the current level.</p> <p>Demonstrates a generally basic understanding of assigned material, with areas of significant limitation, but sufficient to frame a supportable response to a given task. Relevant knowledge evidenced, but patchy and at a consistently descriptive and/or factual level. Ability to comprehend a majority of subject material, although a significant number of factual errors / omissions and/or minor confusions.</p> <p>Limited awareness of contexts relevant to subject material, often with a generalized understanding.</p> <p>Little or no evidence of either wider reading (tutor suggested) or independent research.</p>	<p>Work that is of a satisfactory to very satisfactory standard for the current level.</p> <p>Demonstrates a generally sound, but sometimes straightforward and basic, understanding of assigned material. Relevant knowledge evidenced, but often at a descriptive and/or factual level. Ability to comprehend subject material, although some factual errors / omissions and/or minor confusions.</p> <p>Some awareness of contexts relevant to subject material, and able to identify some relevant connections with assigned material.</p> <p>Limited evidence of either wider reading (tutor suggested) or independent research.</p>	<p>Work that is of a good to very good standard for the current level.</p> <p>Demonstrates a generally thorough understanding of assigned material. Relevant knowledge evidenced, occasionally at a descriptive and/or factual level, but with awareness of its significance / implications.</p> <p>Ability to comprehend subject material, with clarity and moments of insight, and few factual errors / omissions and/or minor confusions.</p> <p>A good awareness of contexts relevant to subject material, and able to discuss a range of relevant connections with assigned material. Some awareness of different perspectives or approaches.</p> <p>Some evidence of either wider reading (tutor suggested) and/or independent research.</p>	<p>Work that is of an excellent standard and exceeds expectations for the current level.</p> <p>Demonstrates a broad and thorough understanding of assigned material.</p> <p>Relevant knowledge deployed perceptively, with clear awareness of its significance / implications.</p> <p>Ability to comprehend subject material with clarity and insight, and very few or no factual errors / omissions and/or minor confusions.</p> <p>A thorough awareness of contexts relevant to subject material, and able to discuss a broad range of relevant connections with assigned material. Good awareness of different perspectives or approaches.</p> <p>Good evidence of either wider reading (tutor suggested) and/or independent research.</p>	<p>Outstanding work that well-exceeds expectations for the current level.</p> <p>Demonstrates an assured and thorough understanding of assigned material.</p> <p>Relevant knowledge deployed perceptively, with clear awareness of its significance / implications.</p> <p>Ability to comprehend subject material with flair, clarity and insight. No factual errors / omissions and/or confusions.</p> <p>An informed awareness of contexts relevant to subject material, and able to insightfully discuss a broad range of relevant connections with assigned material. Good awareness of different perspectives or approaches, including their significance and implications for the task at hand.</p> <p>Strong evidence of both wider reading (tutor suggested) and coherent independent research.</p>

APPLICATION AND ANALYSIS

<p>There is no sense of argument. Focus on the question is very weak, with frequent digression and largely irrelevant content/discussion.</p> <p>Analysis of material, when attempted, is generally incoherent. Analytic procedures and/or techniques are rarely used, and if they are it is with very little success.</p> <p>Interpretations are unsupported, with little or no reference to relevant evidence, and are generally based on significant errors in reasoning. Response to the task is insufficient (with little or no sense of awareness of task aims or guidelines).</p> <p>Critique and evaluation of alternative perspectives are absent (or highly misrepresentative).</p> <p>Quantitative work will contain significant errors, incorrect conclusions, and little or no evidence of how conclusions have been reached.</p>	<p>There is little sense of argument, and digression is common over the course of the piece. Focus on the question tends to be inconsistent, with significant irrelevant content/discussion.</p> <p>Analysis of material is often incoherent, and coherent moments are often formulaic. Analytic procedures and/or techniques are rarely used, and if they are it is with limited success.</p> <p>Interpretations are rarely supported with relevant evidence, and are often based on significant errors in reasoning. Response to the task is insufficient (with potential misreading of guidelines).</p> <p>Critique and evaluation of alternative perspectives are absent (or highly misrepresentative).</p> <p>Quantitative work will contain significant errors, and it will often be unclear how conclusions have been reached.</p>	<p>An argument is beginning to emerge, but may be patchy and disparate, with digression over the course of the piece. Focus on the question is straightforward, with some inconsistency and irrelevant content/discussion.</p> <p>Analysis of material is generally coherent, although is often formulaic. Analytic procedures and/or techniques are used with mixed success.</p> <p>Interpretations are often supported with relevant evidence, although there may be some errors in reasoning, and provide a basic response to the task within defined boundaries (e.g. by the tutor, course, and/or a simple reading of the task).</p> <p>Critique and evaluation of alternative perspectives are rare, and if present show basic responses.</p> <p>Quantitative work will be mostly correct, with some minor errors, and it may not always be clear how conclusions have been reached.</p>	<p>A line of argument is partially established, although there may be some digression over the course of the piece. Focus on the question is straightforward, but generally consistent and some irrelevant content/discussion.</p> <p>Analysis of material is generally coherent, although may sometimes be formulaic. Analytic procedures and/or techniques are used efficiently.</p> <p>Interpretations are generally supported with relevant evidence, and provide a sound but straightforward response to the task within defined boundaries (e.g. by the tutor, course, and/or a simple reading of the task).</p> <p>Critique and evaluation of alternative perspectives are limited, and where present tend to be relatively basic.</p> <p>Quantitative work will be largely correct, with few minor errors, and conclusions generally evidenced / explained appropriately.</p>	<p>A line of argument is clearly established, with little digression over the course of the piece. Focus on the question is generally consistent, with some appreciation for its complexity and little irrelevant content/discussion.</p> <p>Analysis of material is coherent, and rarely seems formulaic. Analytic procedures and/or techniques are used proficiently.</p> <p>Interpretations are consistently supported with relevant evidence, and provide a sound response to the task, including occasional independence of thought, within defined boundaries (e.g. by the tutor, course, and/or a proficient reading of the task).</p> <p>Critique and evaluation of alternative perspectives are fairly common, and tend to be simple but convincing.</p> <p>Quantitative work will be correct, and conclusions generally evidenced / explained appropriately.</p>	<p>A persuasive line of argument is clearly established, with very little digression over the course of the piece. Focus on the question is strong, with good appreciation for its complexity and very little irrelevant content/discussion.</p> <p>Analysis of material is coherent, and sometimes insightful. Analytic procedures and/or techniques are used proficiently, with some adaptation.</p> <p>Interpretations are consistently supported with relevant evidence, providing a critically engaged and astute response to the task, including some independence of thought. The work will go beyond, and/or reflect upon, the defined boundaries of the task.</p> <p>Critique and evaluation of alternative perspectives are common, and are often perceptive and convincing.</p> <p>Quantitative work will be correct and conclusions clearly evidenced / explained.</p>	<p>A persuasive and engaging line of argument is clearly established, with no digression. Focus on the question is very strong, with a nuanced appreciation for its complexity and no irrelevant content / discussion.</p> <p>Analysis of material is insightful and exhibits creativity. Analytic procedures and/or techniques are used and adapted, proficiently.</p> <p>Interpretations are consistently supported with relevant evidence, providing a critically engaged and astute response to the task, including significant independence of thought. The work will often go beyond, and/or reflect upon, the defined boundaries of the task.</p> <p>Critique and evaluation of alternative perspectives are common, and consistently perceptive and convincing.</p> <p>Quantitative work will be correct and conclusions clearly evidenced / explained.</p>
--	---	--	---	--	--	---

CLARITY, STRUCTURE AND EXPRESSION

Little or no structure can be discerned in written work. Arguments and ideas can be followed only with significant difficulty, and often not at all.

Standard of language is poor with significant confusion. There is little or no technical terminology (which, when used, is generally used incorrectly). There are a large number of errors in composition. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are often incorrect, with a number of errors (including consistent errors).

Meaning is often unclear, with many instances of vagueness.

Presentation is of an unacceptable standard and clarity. Little or no attempt is made at referencing, and where it is there are a large number of errors.

A simple structure can be discerned in written work, but it often becomes disorganized. Arguments and ideas can be followed only with difficulty (sometimes significant).

Standard of language is very basic with some confusion. There is little or no technical terminology (which, when used, is often used incorrectly). There may be a large number of errors in composition. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are often incorrect, with a number of minor errors (including consistent errors).

Meaning is often unclear, with several instances of inconsistency or vagueness.

Presentation is of a borderline unacceptable standard and clarity. Little or no attempt is made at using a single referencing system, and where it is there are a large number of errors (including consistent errors and/or confusion between systems).

Written work has a simple structure that occasionally becomes disorganized. It mostly allows arguments and ideas to be followed, although sometimes with difficulty (occasionally significant).

Standard of language is basic but generally competent, with little technical terminology (which, when used, is mostly appropriate). There may be a number of minor errors in composition. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are mostly correct, with a number of minor errors (including some consistent errors).

Meaning is mostly clear, with several instances of inconsistency or vagueness.

Presentation is of a barely acceptable standard and clarity. An attempt at referencing using a single system is made, although this has a number of minor errors (including, potentially, some consistent errors and/or confusion between systems).

Written work has a simple structure, but is efficiently organized. It allows arguments and ideas to be followed, although sometimes with a little difficulty.

Standard of language is basic but competent, with some technical terminology generally used appropriately. There may be some minor errors in composition. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are generally correct, with some minor errors (including, potentially, some consistent errors).

Meaning is generally clear, with some moments of inconsistency or vagueness.

Presentation is of an acceptable standard and clarity. Referencing is generally correct for the relevant system, with some minor errors (including, potentially, some consistent errors and/or occasional confusion between systems).

Written work has a clear structure, and is well-organized with an emerging sense of flow. It allows arguments and ideas to be followed, although there may be occasional confusion.

Standard of language is good, with some appropriate technical terminology used consistently. There may be an occasional minor error in composition. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are almost entirely correct, with few minor errors.

Meaning is almost always clear, with few moments of inconsistency or vagueness.

Presentation is of a good standard and clarity. Referencing is mostly correct for the relevant system, with occasional minor errors (including, potentially, some consistent errors and/or occasional confusion between systems).

Written work has a clear structure, and is very well-organized with a good sense of flow. It supports the development of arguments and ideas, with little or no confusion.

Standard of language is very good, with a range of appropriate technical terminology used consistently. There are very few or no minor errors in composition. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are almost entirely correct.

Meaning is clear, with very few moments of inconsistency or vagueness.

Presentation is of a very good standard and clarity. Referencing is generally correct for the relevant system, with only very occasional minor errors.

Written work has a clear structure, with astute organization of material combined with a compelling sense of flow. It supports the development of arguments and ideas, enabling points to be made in stronger ways, with no signs of confusion.

Standard of language is excellent, with a good range of appropriate technical terminology used consistently and signs of an emerging rhetorical and/or descriptive flair.

There are very few or no minor errors in composition. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are almost entirely correct.

Meaning is consistently clear, with little sense of vagueness or imprecision. Presentation is of an exemplary standard and clarity. Referencing is consistently correct for the relevant system.