#### Assessment 2 – Written Report

**Brief:**

Compare the musculoskeletal training adaptations that occur due to velocity-based training based on velocity force profile (i.e. the difference between high load slow movement compared to low load fast movement). You will need to consider how muscular strength and adaptation may differ between the different types of training and you will need to critically evaluate the efficacy of these training methods for a recreational gym user and an elite athlete.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Comparison table | |
| High load / slow | Low load / fast |
| Gym user | Athlete |
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**Your response should include the following:**

* An introduction to the types of training, a description of the velocity force curve, the users (recreational and athlete) and the associated adaptations
* Discussion section including critical analysis of the different training methods (i.e. high velocity movements and the relative training adaptation versus low velocity movements and the respective adaptations). This should probably include the following sub sections: Velocity training, Comparison of methods of training, Comparison of adaptations, Comparison of athlete to gym user).
* As a part of the discussion you will need to provide an explanation of the training programme with the use of training theory and referenced material
* When comparing the expected adaptations, you will need to critically discuss velocity-based training with reference to previous research in relation to theory
* Conclusions drawn from the process
* Reference list (Harvard)

**Marking Criteria:**

Presentation/referencing 10%

Introduction 10%

Needs analysis & programme 20%

Compare/contrast adaptations 50%

Conclusion 10%

**MSc Assessment Grading Criteria**

The following criteria are used when determining the grade range. The student should demonstrate consistency across all parts of their work.

For a grade in the **A range** an assignment will, in addition to meeting the criteria set out in grade B and C:

1. Display a depth of analytical comment, critical evaluation and independent discussion with respect to facts, principles, theories, and practical application.
2. Consistently display the original and critical use of connections between areas in the discipline or between disciplines.
3. Show evidence of dealing with complex issues both systematically and creatively, making sound judgements in the absence of complete data, and has the potential to change practice.

For a grade in the **B range** an assignment will, in addition to meeting the criteria set for grade C:

1. Demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of knowledge underpinning theory and practice, which integrates skills of advanced analysis, synthesis, evaluation and application.
2. Use a critical awareness of current policies, strategies and/or new insights which are at the forefront of professional practice.
3. Show initiative in approach, liveliness and cogency of argument, and rigour in the handling of evidence.

For a grade in the **C range** assignments / coursework will:

1. Focus clearly on the question set, and identify and address the theoretical and practical issues it raises as well as any ethical implications where appropriate.
2. Demonstrates a thorough command of the body of knowledge and research to support practice.
3. Indicates at the outset the approach that is being taken to the question, including the particular fields of knowledge that are considered relevant, the particular context within it is being interpreted, and any particular assumptions that are to be examined.
4. Selects, organises and explores contemporary, factual and theoretical evidence relevant to the question in order to develop a logical and coherent line of argument, and reach a logically derived conclusion.

For a grade in the **F/G range** an assignment will not only fail to demonstrate that the criteria set out in grade C have been adequately met but will:

1. Include serious errors, limitations or inaccuracies that could result in inappropriate and/or dangerous professional judgment.
2. Omit major and basic ideas or findings that are central to recent research or professional practice relating to the topic in question.
3. Show no sign of appreciating the essential requirements of academic argument and/or practical application. E.g. make unsupported generalisations or value judgments, based largely on anecdote or unexamined personal experiences.

**Grade Classifications**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | **Percentage** | **Attributes / Classifications** |
| A+ | 85-100 | Excellent standard  (distinction) |
| A | 79-84 |
| A- | 70-78 |
| B+ | 67-69 | Very Good Standard  (merit) |
| B | 64-66 |
| B- | 60-63 |
| C+ | 57-59 | Good Standard  (pass) |
| C | 54-56 |
| C- | 50-53 |
| F+ | 47-49 | Unsatisfactory Standard  (referred/fail) |
| F | 44-46 |
| F- | 40-43 |
| G | 0 | No Submission |