

Marking criteria for MSc Practical

Grade	Briefing Notes	Research question/problem	Classification
A*	Virtually perfect: Very high, publishable standard. Minimal lapses or errors.	Highly insightful consideration of the methodology/approach and its strengths and weaknesses coupled with highly effective brief report of the research.	Distinction
A+	Exceptional: Very high standard in almost every aspect. Few minor lapses or errors.		
A	Outstanding: Very high standard in most aspects. Few minor lapses or errors.		
A-	Very good: High standard overall (competent, thorough), falling short of excellence in some aspects. Occasional minor lapses and errors.		
B	Good: Good standard, mostly sound. Some errors and omissions.	Thorough consideration of the methodology/approach and a sound report of the practical performed	Merit
C	Satisfactory: Reasonable standard (understanding limited or lacking in several errors). Some errors and omissions.	Consideration of the methodology/approach is limited in scope	Pass
D	Unsatisfactory: Poor standard in most aspects; limited, superficial; substantial errors and omissions.	Consideration of the methodology/approach is substantially lacking	Fail Marginal
F	Inadequate: Poor / very low standard throughout; limited, superficial; major errors and omissions. At least one section is missing or too unclear to understand. Fails to show basic understanding of the conventions of the discipline.		Fail

Your Practical lead will evaluate the two components of the report. Each grade band - A (Distinction), B (Merit), C (Pass), D (Fail Marginal), and F (Fail) - includes a description of the quality for each aspect; however, the report will be marked holistically, with one overall grade assigned. The overall grade might be modulated with a + and - symbol (e.g., B- or C+).

	A	B	C	D	F
Knowledge and understanding in the theoretical and practical background	Insightful, comprehensive, and current. Critically reflective with excellent scope of research cited. Clearly integrating the theoretical and practical aspects of the methodology.	Rigorous evaluation of the methodology. Integrates material from a wide range of sources	Captures the general concepts of the methodology and demonstrates familiarity with the current debates.	Mainly descriptive use of sources, failing to identify and discuss key issues pertaining. Limited evidence of understanding	There are omissions of expected content. Some errors in reporting and understanding with limited source materials.
Quality of brief report	Coherent, accurate, and concise. Successfully covers the critical parts of the work and its implications. Innovative and rigorous methods of data collection and analysis.	Largely clear, accurate, and concise. Covers the main component of the research practical conducted. Sets own experience in a wider context. Successful examination of alternative perspectives.	Captures main components of the research conducted. Includes reasoned conclusion from the evidence.	Lacks clarity: is difficult to understand and fails to adequately summarise the main components of the practical work. Describe the practice but with little analysis and evaluation. Insufficient analysis of the data.	Incoherent: Does not adequately or accurately summarise practical work. Inaccurate reporting and missing or erroneous analysis and evaluation.
Communication & presentation (Style, spelling errors, etc.)	<p>Well-organized throughout (e.g., follows APA style consistently; use of informative sub-headings).</p> <p>Overall flow of reporting is coherent and links between ideas in the separate sections.</p> <p>Quality and clarity of the writing is excellent. The writing is concise, sufficiently detailed, and without grammatical flaws.</p> <p>In-text referencing and the reference section are of a high quality (i.e., follows APA consistently, with attention to detail).</p>	<p>Organised.</p> <p>Overall flow of reporting is mostly coherent, but the report may be slightly disjointed in places.</p> <p>Quality and clarity of the writing is generally good. The writing is concise, sufficiently detailed, and has few grammatical flaws.</p> <p>Referencing and the reference section are of a very good quality.</p> <p>Well-presented including effective use of figures and tables.</p>	<p>Basic, but satisfactory, organisation (e.g., main APA sections followed, but may lack a clear flow of information within each section).</p> <p>Each section is somewhat disjointed without view to overall coherence.</p> <p>The writing is good but lacks precision (e.g. through inappropriate word choices or problems with what something refers to); there are several grammatical errors.</p> <p>Referencing and the reference section are of a good quality.</p>	<p>Disorganised.</p> <p>The quality and clarity of the writing is too poor to understand (e.g., insufficient detail, major inaccuracies, serious omissions).</p> <p>The writing has many errors (e.g. word choice, grammar).</p> <p>Too few /no references are provided. Does not include a reference section.</p> <p>Presentation is very poor (e.g., many inconsistencies and omissions).</p>	<p>Poorly organised (e.g., does not follow APA format; information not ordered chronologically).</p> <p>The report lacks overall coherence. The quality and clarity of the writing is poor, making it difficult to fully understand the arguments and research.</p> <p>There are many grammatical errors.</p> <p>Referencing is of poor quality. An appropriate references section has not been appended.</p> <p>Presentation is poor (e.g., several inconsistencies and omissions throughout).</p>

Presented to an almost professional standard of attention to detail, including all figures and tables.

Presentation is satisfactory. Includes most of the required figures and tables.