

Doctoral assessment criteria

Policy number/version		5.2.1.1/V02
Section		ASSESSMENT AND INTEGRITY
Type		Academic policy
Date of creation		September 2017
Date of last revision		February 2021
Date of approval of current version		March 2021
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) 5.2.1 Assessment regulations of doctoral degrees

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 all doctoral degree programmes for modules and theses.
- 2.2 Applies to methods of assessments used within all doctoral degree programmes for proposal defence.
- 2.3 Applies in conjunction with the University policy for assessment of postgraduate work.

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 Percentage 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 Students' performance will be assessed according to specific criteria.

4.2 The Criteria will relate to the method of assessment used.

4.3 A percentage grade will be awarded relative to standards of performance described for each criteria.

4.4 Modules will be graded as Distinction, Pass, or Fail. A Distinction is awarded for an overall percentage grade of 70 or above. A Pass is awarded for an overall percentage grade of 50 to 69. A Fail is awarded for an overall percentage grade below 50.

4.5 All elements of doctoral degree programmes will refer to the descriptions contained herein.

4.6 Assessment results will be derived and communicated using the descriptions contained in the Assessment Grading Template below.

4.7 Assessment Grading Template:

Assessment criteria and grading (standards) description for modules and theses		% mark	Weighted mark
KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING			
1	Identification of key issues and recognition of leading edge ideas Wide range of background reading including contemporary sources; explicit identification of theoretical formulation of argument; explicit identification of significant themes that recur and of areas of dissonance between studies/authors/domains within the overall field.		
2	Awareness of a variety of standpoints Attention drawn to the level of consistency evident within the accounts of leading authors/researchers/commentators; attention drawn to the chronology of ideas and practices; challenges to prevailing views highlighted.		
APPLICATION, ARGUMENT and ANALYSIS			
3	Extension and application of theoretical knowledge to generate new understandings Integration and synthesis of accounts of published authors; extrapolation from theory to generate further hypotheses; attention to the ways in which theoretical arguments and/or research findings have been or could be used to inform practice and make an original contribution to knowledge.		
4	Critical analysis of the sources or evidence bases Depth of background reading with attention to genre and epistemological assumptions; independent critical evaluation of the reliability of evidence; independent critical evaluation of the validity of claims made; quality of evidence to support claims; attention to features of research design such as sampling, methods of data collection and analysis; evidence of active endeavours to control for confirmatory bias.		
COMMUNICATION and PRESENTATION			
5	Suitability and/or potential for dissemination/publication Purpose, audience, message, quality of presentation and communication; overall coherence and attention to detail.		
Overall mark and grade		Overall mark	Overall grade
Comments			

Assessment criteria and grading (standards) description for proposal defence			
Assessment criteria	Yes	Partially	No
<p>1. Purpose and objectives of the study</p> <p>The purpose, objectives, research questions, research aims, research gap, and research scope are clearly identified and discussed. The purpose, objectives, and research questions are aligned and related.</p>			
<p>2. Theoretical and conceptual framework</p> <p>There is clear identification and discussion of the theories, models or other conceptual frameworks used in the study, along with identification of the main underlying theorist and/or theoretical discussion in the field promoting or recommending this type of research. Proper rationale and reasoning is provided for the theories, models or other conceptual frameworks used.</p>			
<p>3. Situating the study within the wider research field</p> <p>The study is situated in a particular gap among an identifiable field of research interest. Other studies related to the research topic are identified, discussed and critiqued or credited. The significance of the study and its uniqueness among its field is identified and discussed. Contribution to knowledge is identified and discussed.</p>			
<p>4. Research approach and methodology</p> <p>Justification and rationale for empirical research designed provided is convincing and credible. The methodology is clearly and fully identified and discussed. This includes a discussion of the site and participant selection, the methods used for data collection or information collection (with a discussion of the design of the instruments and inclusion in the appendices), ethical consideration, limitations, validity, reliability, and any other significant research conduct issues.</p>			
<p>5. Anticipated results</p> <p>Initial ideas on anticipated results based on the theoretical or conceptual framework are identified and discussed. The importance of the anticipated results is discussed in terms of their contribution to the field.</p>			