

Tasks 1,2,3

Student's Name: Student's Number:	Marker's Initials:	Grade:
--------------------------------------	--------------------	--------

University Performance Descriptors – Level 7

The pass rate at Masters Level = 50% L7 (Masters Level)	
90-100% Outstanding	This work is outstanding and is of a standard which could be considered for future publication in a professional journal. The work demonstrates engagement in a focused academic debate which presents a range of evidence underpinning a deep understanding of all the issues studied and a totally justified position. The work demonstrates a high level of originality with challenges to current theory and/or practice and specific, focused examples of contestability. There is evidence of a high level of synthesis of theoretical exemplars, underpinning principles and practical interpretation. No obvious errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.
80-89% Excellent	The work is of an excellent standard and has the potential for future publication in a professional context. The work demonstrates engagement in an academic debate which presents clear evidence of a considered understanding of the professional issues studied, the approach adopted and the position taken. The work enhances current theory and/or practice and displays a range of examples of contestability. There is evidence of clear synthesis of theoretical issues and practice. A critical analysis of theoretical models and/or practical applications has resulted in a distinct level of originality. Very few errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.
70-79% Very good	There is evidence of analysis and critique of concepts, models of key authors, rival theories, and major debates together with some evidence of synthesis. The work fully considers the complexity of the context in which it is situated and the impinging external factors; it takes cognisance of differing perspectives and interpretations and recognises dilemmas. Ideas are presented in a succinct manner and conclusions are well reasoned. The work shows an ability to critique the underlying assumptions upon which current views are based and to challenge received opinion. Few errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.
60-69% Good	The work demonstrates a capacity to express views based on sound argument and solid evidence in an articulate and concise way, and, where relevant, to put forward and make use of criteria for the judgement of theories and issues. There is evidence of effective engagement in a critical dialogue relating to professional practice, a clearly presented overview of an area of concern, and a comparative review of key authors, rival theories and major debates. The work demonstrates a willingness to question and to explore issues and to synthesise theoretical perspectives and practical application within a given professional context. Some small repeated errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate

50-59% Pass	<p>The structure and focus are evident and relevant to the assignment task. There is evidence of engagement with pertinent issues. Key authors and major debates are clearly presented and there is evidence of suitable basic reading. The work explores and analyses issues, but is not strong on presenting synthesis or evaluations. The work is mainly descriptive, but has achieved all the learning outcomes. Some repeated errors in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate.</p>
40-49% Fail	<p>Whilst some of the characteristics of a pass have been demonstrated, the work does not address each of the outcomes for the specified assessment task. There may be little evidence of an ability to apply the principles of the module to a wider context. The work may be an overly descriptive account demonstrating only minimal interpretation, and very limited evidence of analysis, synthesis or evaluation. No counterarguments or alternative frames of reference are generated or considered. There is evidence of sufficient grasp of the module's learning outcomes to suggest that the participant will be able to retrieve the module on resubmission.</p>
30-39% Fail	<p>The work has failed to address the outcomes of the module. There are fundamental misconceptions of the basis of the module. The work is mainly descriptive and shows little or no understanding of relevant theory. There is insufficient evidence to suggest that the author will be able to retrieve the assignment without retaking the module.</p>
20-29% Fail	<p>This work shows little or no understanding of relevant theory. There is little reference to appropriate literature and no evidence of independent thought or criticality. Overall the work is unduly descriptive and presents only a superficial grasp of the essential issues.</p>
10-19% Fail	<p>This work is not coherent and shows severe faults in referencing or grammar or syntax as appropriate. It includes unsubstantiated statements or assertions. It is unstructured and extremely badly presented. It is totally descriptive and lacks any attempt at analysis.</p>
0-9% Fail	<p>No real attempt to address assignment brief or learning outcomes.</p>
Additional comments:	