Indicative Guide to Assessment Criteria for Masters Level Modules

Students' final marks will *normally* have the majority of the characteristics in the final mark range

Characteristics	Distinction Level (70% and >)	Very Good Pass (60-69%)	Satisfactory Pass (50-59%)	Marginal Fail (45-49%)	Clear Fail (< 45%)
Introduction/ Contextual Framework	Demonstrates **excellent** ability to place HR topic/ question within a wide organisational and contextual framework.	Demonstrates a **very good** ability to place HR topic/ question within a wide organisational and contextual framework.	Demonstrates an **acceptable** level of ability to place HR topic/ question within a wide organisational and contextual framework.	Demonstrates **difficulty** in placing the HR topic/ question within a wide organisational and contextual framework (e.g. fails to identify context and/ or omissions are apparent).	**Inability** to place the HR topic/ question within a wide organisational and contextual framework.
Scope of knowledge, understanding & application	Displays **exceptional** breadth of knowledge, understanding & application of all aspects of the HR topic/ question. Has critical awareness of current published research in both highly research based and applied articles/ reports.	Displays **very good** breadth of knowledge, understanding & application in most, but not all aspects of the HR topic/ question. Has comprehensive, but not always 'critical' awareness of current published research in both highly research based and applied articles/ reports, however some reliance on textbooks is evident.	Displays broadly **competent** breadth of knowledge, understanding & application in most, but not all aspects of the HR topic/ question. Has satisfactory level of awareness of some of current published research in both highly research based and applied articles/ reports however at times is reliant on one source above other. Answer can be superficial at times with occasional factual omission(s) and/ or	Displays **simplistic** and rather **superficial** breadth of knowledge, understanding & application in most, but not all aspects of the HR topic/ question. Has limited level of awareness of some of current published research in both highly research based and applied articles/ reports, possibly with some glaring errors. Demonstrates heavy reliance on textbooks as source.	Displays **wholly simplistic and superficial** breadth of knowledge, understanding & application in most aspects of the HR topic/ question. Relies on low level sources (if any) and demonstrates a definite unfamiliarity with topic that doesn't meet required standards.

			mistake(s). May demonstrate an over reliance on textbooks.		
Characteristics	**Distinction Level** **(70% and >)**	**Very Good Pass** **(60-69%)**	**Satisfactory Pass** **(50-59%)**	**Marginal Fail** **(45-49%)**	**Clear Fail** **(< 45%)**
Depth and linkages (where relevant) Critical analysis, synthesis and evaluation	Demonstrates **outstanding** depth, and (where relevant), integrative links across the various areas of the organisation(s) and HR subject area. **Critically analyses, synthesises and evaluates** a range of relevant information such as specialised theories, principles and concepts, utilising where appropriate, models and frameworks into an evidence-based argument.	Demonstrates **very good** depth, and (where relevant), some integrative links across the various areas of the organisation(s) and HR subject area. **Very good analysis, synthesis and evaluation** of most of the possible range of relevant information such as specialised theories, principles and concepts. Utilises as appropriate, models and frameworks into an evidence-based argument however some issues remain unexplored.	Develops **adequate** depth, and (where relevant) alludes to possible integrative links across the various areas of the organisation(s) and HR subject area. Does attempt **basic analysis, synthesis and evaluation** of some of the possible range of relevant information such as specialised theories, principles, concepts, models and frameworks. Relatively rare use of evidence-based argument and some issues do remain unexplored.	**Little evidence** of real depth in understanding, with no attempt to refer (where relevant) to possible integrative links across the various areas of the organisation(s) and HR subject area. Relies largely on **description** but does attempt to refer to a limited range of relevant information (such as specialised theories, principles, concepts, models and frameworks). A significant number of issues remain unexplored and there is little/ no attempt to develop/ argue a case.	Evidence of **misunderstanding,** personal prejudices/ opinions that are not justified/ related to reading. Does not identify (where relevant) possible integrative links across the various areas of the organisation(s) and HR subject area. **Descriptive, superficial/ anecdotal** in nature. No attempt to refer to relevant specialised theories, principles, concepts, models and frameworks. A large number of issues are not referred to / explored. No attempt is made to develop/ argue a case

Characteristics	Distinction Level (70% and >)	Very Good Pass (60-69%)	Satisfactory Pass (50-59%)	Marginal Fail (45-49%)	Clear Fail (< 45%)
Marshalling of data and structure	Marshalls data and structures it appropriately to develop (from introduction to conclusion) a clearly logical flow with excellent cohesion between sections. Draws appropriate logically derived and fully justified conclusions and inferences. Recommendations are focused, relevant and convincing.	Marshalls data and structures it appropriately to develop (from introduction to conclusion) a mostly logical flow with generally good cohesion between sections. Draws apposite, largely logical and justified conclusions and inferences. Recommendations are for the most part, focused, relevant and convincing.	Competent marshalling of data and structure although at times this may not be entirely satisfactory. Does generally flow but not always a good cohesion between sections. Does draw some appropriate conclusions and inferences but not all are fully justified/ logically derived. Recommendations make sense but are not always relevant/ practical.	Endeavours to marshal data and structure but overall effect is unsatisfactory. Some difficulties in terms of flow and cohesion between sections. Attempts to draw some appropriate conclusions and inferences but they are generally not justified/ logically derived. Recommendations, if present, seem like 'wish-lists' with little clear idea about implications for organisation/ link to issue(s) identified.	Evident difficulty in structure, flow and cohesion between sections. Relies on unjustified assertions which mean that conclusions and/or inferences are invalid/ irrelevant. Does not generate recommendations, or where attempt is made, resorts to simplistic recipies for action that are naïve.
Academic style and presentation.	Observes academic style. Excellent referencing and cross referencing with no errors. Spelling and grammar are exemplary.	Observes academic style. Very good referencing and cross referencing with few errors. Very few spelling and grammar errors.	Readable, but doesn't always observe academic style. Satisfactory referencing and cross referencing with a number of errors apparent. Some spelling and grammar errors.	Presentation is generally poor and doesn't follow academic style. Minimal referencing and cross referencing with errors apparent. Regular evidence of spelling and grammatical errors.	Presentation is poor with no attempt to follow an academic style. No referencing and cross referencing apparent but where found, is incorrect. Reader unfriendly, with serious errors in gramar

Adapted from ABS Benchmarks for Masters Business and Management, QAA Framework for HE qualifications; CIPD 2010; SHEFC 2010