

Masters assessment criteria and grade descriptors

Policy number/version		5.1.3.1/V01
Section		ASSESSMENT AND INTEGRITY
Type		Academic policy
Date of creation		September 2017
Date of last revision		September 2018
Date of approval of current version		26 August 2019
Post/section with responsibility for implementation and monitoring		Board of Studies
Approved by		University Council
Policy review	Latest review by	Head of Institutional Effectiveness
	Latest review date	January 2022
	Review outcome	No changes
	Next review date	September 2022
Cross reference/related documents:		1.0 Policies and procedures manual 5.1.3 Assessment (Masters)

1.0 Rationale and principles which this policy seeks to uphold

- 1.1 The University wishes to make transparent the criteria to be applied in different methods of assessment of student performance.
- 1.2 The University wishes to make transparent the standards of performance indicated by numerical and letter grades.

2.0 Scope

- 2.1 Applies to methods of assessments used within Master's Degree programmes

3.0 Definitions

- 3.1 Assessment criteria are elements of performance that will be examined.
- 3.2 Different methods of assessment will contain different elements of performance.
- 3.3 Grades equate to relative standards of performance, and these standards can be described.
- 3.4 Descriptions of standards will relate to the element of performance.

4.0 Policy

- 4.1 Student performance will be assessed according to criteria.
- 4.2 Criteria will relate to the method of assessment used.
- 4.3 Grades will be awarded relative to standards of performance described for each criteria.
- 4.4 All Masters programmes will refer to the descriptions contained herein.

4.5 Forms of Assessment, Criteria, and Standards

Grade	Assessment Type			
	Written Examination	Practical and Oral Work	Reports and Prose	Research Process
A: 70 – 100%	<p>Able to analyse critically, with arguments soundly based, and fully supported by relevant facts.</p> <p>Able to apply correct methods to problem-solving tasks.</p> <p>Evidence of an original or creative approach.</p> <p>Questions answered accurately and with insight</p> <p>Demonstrates a well-informed knowledge of the topic and a clear mastery of relevant skills.</p> <p>Logical and well-organised flow of content, clearly expressed</p>	<p>Very well prepared</p> <p>Displays a systematic and carefully planned approach</p> <p>Demonstrates a clear understanding of the material and methodology</p> <p>Demonstrates ability to perform as required (independent, active and participative in a group)</p> <p>Excellent presentation</p> <p>Demonstrates accurate and fluent analysis of the topic or problem.</p> <p>Answers questions thoughtfully, accurately, with creativity and originality.</p> <p>Demonstrates ability to reach valid/relevant conclusions</p> <p>Demonstrates ability to define logical extensions of the work</p>	<p>A full systematic and accurate account of the assignment</p> <p>Exceptionally well organised and clearly presented</p> <p>A very clear record of the aims and methods of the work</p> <p>Data manipulation and analysis carried out thoroughly and correctly</p> <p>Critical and/or comparative comments on all observations, with no unexplained observations or unjustified claims and speculations</p> <p>Considerable evidence of extended reading and original or innovative thinking</p>	<p>Evidence is analysed in systematic and principled manner</p> <p>Demonstrates thorough understanding of application of theory to evidence</p> <p>Demonstrates insightful and original views</p> <p>Comprehensive coverage and critical discussion and awareness of significant literature in the chosen area</p> <p>Demonstrates high level of ability to select and use literature to substantiate argument.</p>
B: 60 – 69%	<p>Good attempt at critical analysis</p> <p>Arguments well supported by relevant facts</p> <p>Able to apply correct methods to problem-solving tasks</p> <p>Some evidence of an original or creative approach.</p> <p>Questions answered accurately,</p> <p>Demonstrates a good knowledge of the topic</p>	<p>Well prepared</p> <p>Displays a systematic and well planned approach</p> <p>A good understanding of the material and methodology</p> <p>Able to work appropriately (with independence or useful participation in groups)</p> <p>Good presentation</p> <p>Demonstrates a reasonably accurate</p>	<p>A mostly systematic and accurate account of the assignment</p> <p>Well organised and clearly presented.</p> <p>A clear record of the aims and methods of the work</p> <p>Data manipulation and analysis carried out with appropriate accuracy</p> <p>Critical and/or comparative</p>	<p>Evidence is analysed in systematic and principled manner</p> <p>Demonstrates good understanding of application of theory to evidence producing some insightful analysis</p> <p>Work shows awareness of and critical discussion of significant literature in the chosen area</p> <p>Demonstrates the ability to select and use literature to substantiate</p>

	<p>Demonstrates an understanding of relevant skills</p> <p>Logical and well-organised flow of content</p> <p>Well expressed</p>	<p>and fluent analysis of the topic or problem</p> <p>Answers reasonably accurate</p> <p>Some evidence of independent ideas.</p> <p>Able to reach valid/relevant conclusions</p> <p>Able to suggest extensions of the work</p>	<p>comments on most observations</p> <p>Few unexplained observations or unjustified claims and speculations</p> <p>Good evidence of extended reading</p> <p>Demonstrates original or innovative thinking</p>	<p>argument</p>
<p>C: 50 – 59%</p>	<p>Attempt made at critical analysis</p> <p>Arguments mostly supported by relevant facts</p> <p>Demonstrates familiarity with the correct methods needed for problem-solving tasks</p> <p>Demonstrates some difficulties in the use of methods</p> <p>Some evidence of an original or creative approach.</p> <p>Some incomplete answers</p> <p>Demonstrates some knowledge of the topic</p> <p>Demonstrates some of the relevant skills.</p> <p>Logical flow of content</p> <p>Reasonable clarity of expression</p>	<p>Adequately prepared</p> <p>Displays a reasonably systematic approach</p> <p>Demonstrates some understanding of the material and methodology.</p> <p>Able to work appropriately (independently, or participatively in groups)</p> <p>Adequate presentation</p> <p>Demonstrates some credible analysis of the topic or problem</p> <p>Answers questions with some wider understanding of the key ideas</p> <p>Able to reach valid conclusions</p> <p>Able to suggest extensions of the work</p>	<p>A systematic account of the assignment</p> <p>Reasonable presentation</p> <p>An adequate record of the aims and methods of the work</p> <p>Data manipulation and analysis contains few inaccuracies or omissions</p> <p>Comments on most observations, mainly reasonable</p> <p>Some unexplained or unjustified observations</p> <p>Some evidence of extended reading</p> <p>Some evidence of original or innovative thought</p>	<p>Data collection and analysis is adequate</p> <p>Demonstrates an appropriate degree of commitment</p> <p>Demonstrates the ability to select relevant material to answer the question set</p> <p>The discussion of the data and other material demonstrates a general understanding of the theoretical principles involved and their application to professional practice.</p> <p>At times anecdotal/ descriptive at times</p> <p>Some evidence of the ability to be analytical</p> <p>Demonstrates awareness of some literature in the chosen area, but there may be gaps</p> <p>Use of literature may be descriptive rather than analytical and supportive of argument</p>
<p>D: 40</p>	<p>Some ability at critical analysis</p>	<p>Disorganised</p>	<p>An unsystematic account of the</p>	<p>Data collection and analysis is</p>

- 49%	<p>Arguments not always supported by relevant facts</p> <p>Demonstrates some familiarity with some methods needed for problem-solving tasks</p> <p>Not able to apply methods reliably and consistently</p> <p>Lacks evidence of originality or creativity</p> <p>Questions answered incompletely</p> <p>Demonstrates patchy knowledge of the topic</p> <p>Demonstrates limited capability with the relevant skills</p> <p>Logical flow of content</p> <p>Clarity of expression poor</p> <p>Overall, of sufficient quality to allow re-assessment or compensation</p>	<p>Approach unsystematic</p> <p>Understanding of material and methodology partial</p> <p>Has difficulty in working independently, or participates only passively in a group.</p> <p>Inadequate presentation</p> <p>Analysis of the topic or problem confused or inappropriate</p> <p>Answers to questions show limited understanding of the key ideas</p> <p>Able to reach some valid conclusions, but unable to suggest appropriate extensions of the work</p> <p>Overall, of sufficient quality to allow re-assessment or compensation</p>	<p>assignment task</p> <p>An incomplete record of the aims and methods of the work</p> <p>Data manipulation and analysis contains significant inaccuracies or omissions</p> <p>Few comments on the observations</p> <p>Many unexplained or unjustified observations</p> <p>No evidence of extended reading</p> <p>Overall, of sufficient quality to allow re-assessment or compensation</p>	<p>adequate and demonstrates an appropriate degree of commitment</p> <p>Significant deficiencies in one or more of the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The discussion of the data and other material does not demonstrate a sufficient understanding of the theoretical principles involved and their application to professional practice. The work may be anecdotal/descriptive at times, and there is no evidence of the ability to be analytical Work shows awareness of some literature in the chosen area, but there may be significant gaps <p>Use of literature may be descriptive rather than analytical and supportive of argument</p> <p>Overall, of sufficient quality to allow re-assessment or compensation</p>
E: less than 40%	<p>Lacks critical analysis</p> <p>Arguments not informed or supported by relevant facts</p> <p>Lacks familiarity with most methods needed for problem-solving tasks</p> <p>No ability to apply methods reliably or consistently</p> <p>No evidence of an original or</p>	<p>Poor preparation with unsystematic approach</p> <p>Very limited understanding of the material and methodology</p> <p>Not able to work appropriately (with independence or participatively in groups)</p> <p>Poor presentation</p>	<p>An unsystematic, incomplete or inaccurate account of the assignment.</p> <p>A sketchy record of the aims and methods of the work</p> <p>Data manipulation and analysis contains numerous inaccuracies or omissions</p>	<p>Data collection is inadequate indicating lack of commitment</p> <p>Poor analysis of the data</p> <p>Analysis wholly descriptive and/or inappropriate material selected for analysis</p> <p>Commentary shows major problems in the ability to understand the</p>

	<p>creative approach Answers incomplete Lack of breadth or depth of knowledge Answers often irrelevant Deployment of skills inappropriate or lacking Disorganised flow of content Clarity of expression poor</p>	<p>Confused analysis of the topic or problem No understanding of the key ideas Not able to reach valid conclusions Not able to suggest appropriate extension of the work Not able to answer questions</p>	<p>Very few comments on the observations Many unexplained or unjustified observations No evidence of further reading</p>	<p>theoretical principles involved and their application to professional practice. Little or no reference to significant literature in the area Work is anecdotal rather than analytical</p>
--	--	---	--	--