

LTC11D125

Title: Report from the Academic Director of Taught Programmes
Author: Dr Adam Longcroft (Academic Director of Taught Programmes)
Circulation: Learning & Teaching Committee – 25 July 2012
Agenda: LTC11A007
Version: Final
Status: Open

Issue

Proposals from the Academic Director of Taught Programmes (ADTP) regarding revised Marking Grids/Scales for use within the University from 2012/13 onwards. These would supersede the existing Senate Scale.

Recommendation

LTC members are asked to consider the proposed grids contained in the report.

Resource Implications

It is not clear that there are likely to be any resource implications. It is not intended that reference to the marking grids will save or add time devoted to marking by academics – it will merely aid them in assigning marks in a fair and consistent fashion across the 100% marking range.

Risk Implications

The recommendations contained will have a 'risk' element for the University in the sense that decisions about policy/processes will have an impact on practice and thus outcomes for students.

Equality and Diversity

It is not envisaged that any of the recommendations contained in the report will impact on groups with protected characteristics.

Timing of decisions

The report from the Director of Taught Programmes contains recommendations that need to be 'signed-off' by LTC before the end of the 2011/12 academic session for use during 2012/13.

Further Information

Contact: Dr Adam Longcroft, Academic Director of Taught Programmes, UEA 01603 592261
a.longcroft@uea.ac.uk

Background

The Academic Director for Taught Programmes reports to LTC key developments around policy relating to teaching and learning. The report attached contains a number of recommendations that will affect processes in 2012/13.

Discussion

The report from the Academic Director for Taught Programmes proposes changes which involve the existing Senate Scale being superseded by the new Marking Grids.

Revised University Marking Grids/Scales

Introduction

A number of academic colleagues, including the Faculty Associate Deans for Learning & Teaching, recognise that the current Senate Scale has severe limitations in terms of its language, its lack of precision, and its usefulness as a guide to the qualities of work which fall into different grade/classification boundaries. It is recognised that the University's Good Honours statistics fall behind those of its close competitors and it is also recognised that one of the reasons for this are marking cultures within the institution. Too few students are being awarded 2(i) and 1st class marks, primarily because the 'bar' is being set unrealistically high – as a consequence in some schools it is highly unlikely that a bright student would gain a 1st class degree. The existing Senate Scale may be a significant factor in the development of conservative marking cultures and the general reluctance to use the full range of the marks available, due to:

- i) the language used in the descriptors at the top and bottom of the scale.
- ii) the failure to differentiate sufficiently at the top end of the scale (e.g. the 30% wide 1st class band)

The Academic Director for Taught Programmes has consulted TPPG on changes to the Senate Scale and presented the three examples (Docs A, B, C) at TPPG meeting on 23 November and subsequently at the November meeting of LTC. Feedback from colleagues has resulted in further revisions to the Marking Grids. These are focused on:

- 1) Creating three separate bands within the 1st class range (low, high and exemplary 1sts)
- 2) Adjusting the language of the descriptors to ensure a better alignment with the classification bands.
- 3) Adjusting the wording of the band at the pass threshold – removing reference to DoS and stating simply that students gaining less than 40% should meet with their advisor or the marker to review the factors that might have resulted in a Fail.

During the revision process the Marking Grids have been informed by existing marking scales and grids of similar kinds in a number of other HEIs, including the following:

- University of Leeds
- University of Durham
- University of Nottingham
- University of Manchester
- University of Leicester
- University of Liverpool

The ADTP is conscious of the fact that the Marking Grids presented for LTC's consideration are unlikely to be 'perfect'. This isn't the key issue. We need, instead, to ask ourselves a simple question: *Are they an improvement on the existing Senate Scale and likely to be a greater usefulness in helping markers award marks across the full range of the 100% scale?*

The answer to this question, I believe, is a resounding '**Yes**'.

Marking cultures

Marking cultures exist in every University and often vary from School to School or subject to subject. This is to be expected: mathematicians look for different qualities in student coursework when compared with historians. The 'problem' – if we wish to refer to it as such – is that at UEA markers across a number of subject areas are less inclined to give marks above 60%, and considerably less inclined to give marks above 70% or 80% than their peers in many other '94 Group or Russell Group Universities. The marking 'culture' at UEA seems, therefore, to be characterised by a certain 'conservatism' and 'timidity' – especially with regard to the award of marks at the upper end of the 100% marking scale.

When is a 1st a 1st?

The issue is complicated by some 'odd' perceptions of the expected attributes of a 1st class submission amongst some academics. Some academics argue that even small grammatical errors

should preclude the award of a 1st class mark. Others have argued that a 1st class submission should be of 'publication quality' or should be an important contribution to the discipline. In some instances colleagues have argued that the upper 20% of the marking scale should be reserved for students who produce something 'remarkable' or truly 'special' or unexpected in terms of its originality and/or creativity. In some cases it seems that a student has to verge on 'genius' to achieve a 1st class mark. As a consequence, those few students who do achieve a mark over 70% or even 75% often tend only to receive praise and positive feedback from markers. Markers focus on 'how well' the student has done, and how strongly they have performed in key areas, without giving the student a clear indication of where the other 25 marks were 'lost', or how the student might avoid losing them in their next assignment.

The difficulty we have is that in each discipline academics give different emphasis to different criteria – again, this is to be expected. The point, however, is that regardless of the emphasis placed on different criteria, the criteria themselves should be clear and transparent to students and the performance of students should be measured against them, according to whatever emphasis is placed on each. In the proposed marking grids, the ADTP has divided the 1st class category into three separate bands: Low 1st (70-79%), High 1st (80-89%) and Exemplary 1st (90-100%). This should help academic colleagues to differentiate more easily between 1st class work of varying quality and reward scripts that conform to the descriptors for High 1st and Exemplary 1st with the very high marks they merit.

Some points of clarification

Let us be clear about a few important things:

1. We have a 100% marking scale. We should use 100% of the marks available, and not just the middle 30% between 40 and 70.
2. Each assignment should have clear learning outcomes so that students know what they are expected to achieve or demonstrate in their submitted work. There should be no 'opaque' criteria or unspoken qualities that a marker is looking for – criteria should be explicit. Students need to know 'where the goalposts are' so they can get the ball in the net.
3. If a student demonstrates achievement of all the learning outcomes to an exceptionally high standard, they should be awarded with a very high mark in the 90-100% range.
4. Failure to do well in relation to one learning outcome should not, in itself, necessarily preclude the award of a 1st class mark.
5. The award of a 1st class mark should not be entirely dependent on eloquent prose style. I am sure we can all agree that the standard of written English in student submissions should be an important assessment criteria for most assignments. However, it should only be ONE of the criteria on which an essay or assignment is assessed. Other criteria might include things like sophistication of argument, use of evidence, critical evaluation of key concepts/ideas, structure, presentation, methodology etc. If a student performs VERY strongly in most of the criteria, but their work contains grammatical errors, a 1st class mark can and should be awarded unless accuracy of written English is weighted at more than 30% of the marks available.
6. Penalising students disproportionately for weaknesses in grammar undermines notions of equality and fairness. Take for example an international student (for whom English is an additional language) who has been admitted to a degree with a 6.5 IELTS score. The chances are that their spoken English might be good, but their written English might be rather less well developed than that of a native English speaker. Whilst the student might do their best to achieve the highest standards of grammar in their written submissions, it might contain grammatical errors. If the presence of such errors automatically disqualifies them from gaining a 1st, despite their work being very strong in all other respects, then they really are enormously disadvantaged. If an assignment has clearly articulated assessment criteria, or learning outcomes, and the student demonstrates most of these to a very high standard, then they should be given the mark that reflects their overall performance.

7. We should not expect 'perfection' in a 1st class piece of work – especially a lower 1st in the 70-80% range. The view that a 1st should be of 'publication quality' is simply unreasonable. Many staff struggle to achieve work of publication quality so why should we expect this of an 18/19 year-old student or any student for that matter? It should be possible for a student to gain a 1st by demonstrating the stated learning outcomes to a high standard or meeting generic assessment criteria to a high standard. This isn't about 'dumbing down' – far from it. Rather, it is about rewarding excellent work with high marks – and giving credit where credit is due. When drafting their work for submission, students are not submitting it for publication and their work should not be marked as if it is.

The Marking Grids

Different modes of assessment require different criteria. For this reason the ADTP has proposed three separate Marking Grids for:

- i) Coursework (essays, reports etc)
- ii) Dissertations (or extended projects)
- iii) Oral presentations

The ADTP is liaising with colleagues in SCI regarding the development of a similar Marking Grid that might be of value to staff in the sciences when marking student coursework.

The Marking Grids are aimed primarily at staff marking student assessments. They are intended to provide a guide which staff can refer to during the marking process. The descriptors are intended to help staff determine how well students have performed under a number of separate criteria which, for 'Coursework', include:

- Achievement of learning outcomes and level of scholarship
- Presentation
- Argument and understanding
- Critical analysis
- Use of sources and evidence
- Academic referencing
- Written Communication

If they wished to, staff could take these seven criteria and cut and paste them into a simple table that they could then use in their own marking practice:

Criteria	Weighting	Mark allocated
Achievement of learning outcomes and level of scholarship	20	13
Presentation	5	2
Argument and understanding	20	14
Critical analysis	20	12
Use of sources and evidence	20	10
Academic referencing	5	4
Written Communication	10	8
Total:	100%	63%

Or, they could simply use the criteria to provide a set of reference points to inform their marking. They might not 'weight' each of the criteria as I have suggested above, but simply use them to differentiate between scripts of different quality.

Or, they might use the criteria in the box above to provide a 'structure' to the feedback they provide to students. This could easily be added to existing feedback sheets.

Feedback Grid
<i>Achievement of learning outcomes and level of scholarship</i>
<i>Presentation</i>
<i>Argument and understanding</i>
<i>Critical analysis</i>
<i>Use of sources and evidence</i>
<i>Academic referencing</i>
<i>Written Communication</i>

Feedback sheets

Most schools already have well-designed feedback sheets that markers fill-in when marking work. Some have a 'generic' feedback sheet which is used to mark all coursework. Some have separate feedback sheets designed around specific types of coursework/assessments. The intention is not that these marking grids replace these existing feedback sheets – rather, the intention is that the marking grids inform the way that staff interpret the criteria required for a 1st, 2(i), 2(ii) etc.

Recommendation from the ADTP:

That LTC approve and endorse the three proposed Marking Grids for use in 2012/13. These should be easily accessible from the LTS website, and via a link in the Calendar. They should also be accessible via Student and Course Handbooks.

UEA SENATE SCALE: COURSEWORK

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
90-100% Exemplary 1st	All learning outcomes are met at an exemplary standard showing creativity and innovation. Demonstrates an exemplary understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains the highest standards of scholarship that can be expected of a degree-level submission.	Exemplary presentation: clear, logical, imaginative, creative and original. Almost flawless.	Highly effective and sustained arguments, demonstrating exemplary level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Addresses all aspects of the assignment to exemplary standard.	Work demonstrates exemplary standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Exemplary in its use of ideas, concepts and theory. Exemplary analysis of data. Exemplary self-reflection.	Exemplary use of sources/case studies and/or evidence. Demonstrates deeply impressive command of data or literature, drawing on a very broad range of material and/or examining the topic in considerable detail. Demonstrates an exemplary sensitivity to the limits/limitations of evidence.	Exemplary in all respects. Outstanding bibliography with academic referencing conventions employed accurately, consistently and according to established practice within the discipline.	Exemplary standard of written English. Written communication, including use of subject-specific language, is of highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a degree-level submission.
80-89% High 1st	All learning outcomes have been fully met to a very high standard. Demonstrates a strong understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a very high level of scholarship, though small potential improvements can be readily identified.	A very high standard of presentation: clear, logical and few errors.	Coherent and articulate arguments, demonstrating a very high level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment to a high standard.	Work demonstrates a very high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts, theory to good effect. High level of self-reflection.	Work demonstrates a very strong command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail. Also demonstrates a high level of awareness of, and sensitivity to, the limits of evidence.	A very high standard of referencing throughout. Bibliography conforms to a very high standard. Errors very few and mostly very minor.	A very high standard of written English
70-79% Low 1st	All learning outcomes have been fully met to a high standard. Demonstrates a strong understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains an impressive level of scholarship, though there may be scope for improvement in a number of areas.	A high standard of presentation: clear, logical and few errors.	Coherent and articulate arguments, demonstrating a high level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment to a high standard.	Work demonstrates a high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts, theory to good effect. High level of self-reflection.	Work demonstrates a strong command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail. The submission shows awareness of, the limits/limitations of evidence.	A high standard of referencing throughout. Bibliography conforms to a high standard, though there may be a number of small errors which can be easily corrected in future submissions.	A high standard of written English
60-69% 2(i)	All learning outcomes have been met to a good standard. Demonstrates a good understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a good level of scholarship, but lacks sophistication of a 1 st class piece.	A good standard of presentation: clear, mostly logical, and errors are mostly very minor.	The student has submitted work which contains evidence of insight. Thought it may lack finesse, it is thorough, clear and shows an understanding of the subject context. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment.	The work contains some good examples of critical analysis and but limited originality and creativity in use of ideas, concepts, case studies etc. Good level of self-reflection.	The student draws on a good range of material but lacks breadth of engagement with the secondary literature required for a 1 st class mark. Good use of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Partial awareness of the limits of evidence.	A good standard of referencing, though a number of errors or inconsistencies may be present. Good bibliography but possibly containing technical errors, some minor, some more serious.	A good standard of written English, with only minor errors present
50-59% 2(ii)	All learning outcomes have been met satisfactorily. Some have been met to a good standard. Demonstrates some understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Standard of scholarship likely to be undermined by poor linkage of issues/themes, poor use of evidence, unsubstantiated claims etc.	A satisfactory standard achieved: mostly clear, some evidence of logical progression. Some minor inaccuracies.	Competent work, with evidence of engagement in the relevant issues, but little originality and only occasional insight. Gaps in understanding and knowledge; may not have addressed all aspects of the assignment.	Conscientious work and attentive to subject matter and/or task set, but balanced more towards a descriptive rather than a critical, analytical treatment.	Draws on a satisfactory but relatively limited range of sources. Some assessment of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Some use of examples. Treatment of data or literature is basically sound but too narrow in scope and underdeveloped. Understanding of the limits of evidence not fully articulated or understood.	Referencing satisfactory on the whole, though some inconsistencies or instances of poor/limited citation may be present. Satisfactory bibliography but likely to reveal some weaknesses in composition and use of referencing conventions.	A reasonable standard of written English, though a number of errors may be present.
40-49% 3rd	Learning outcomes have been met to the minimum required level. Understanding of link between theory	Barely satisfactory standard of presentation.	Work shows some understanding of the topic and some relevant	Narrow range of data and/or literature employed is very	Draws on a limited range of sources. Little attempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided but are poorly	Citations present, but referencing is poor, suggesting that little effort	A barely satisfactory standard of written English; a number of serious errors may be present;

UEA SENATE SCALE: COURSEWORK

	and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is only adequate. Standard of scholarship undermined by poorly constructed ideas, arguments, use of evidence, partial response to the question etc.	Some inaccuracies /errors may be of a more serious nature. Work has been rushed to completion.	knowledge, but its treatment is basic, unimaginative, superficial and the student's grasp of key concepts is weak. Arguments employed are poorly evidenced and/or contain flaws.	limited. May be mostly limited to material provided in lectures/seminars.	chosen or employed. Lacking in sophistication or finesse. The submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence/ability in the use of evidence. Limits of evidence very poorly articulated or understood.	has been made to follow guidance. Work is vulnerable to unwitting plagiarism. Bibliography barely adequate. Many errors, some serious, revealing limited awareness of mechanics of scholarship.	Poorly structured and written, with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar.
Marks awarded in the range below indicate that the candidate has failed to achieve the standards required for a pass mark on this occasion. It is recommended that students receiving marks in this range meet with their advisor or the marker to review the factors that may have influenced the mark and ways in which their performance might be enhanced in subsequent assessments.							
35-39% Marginal Fail	Insufficient demonstration of learning outcomes to justify a pass grade. Understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is not sufficient for a Pass. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in several areas.	Unsatisfactory standard, lacking sufficient clarity, and a logical progression, with serious errors/inaccuracies.	The submission contains some material of merit, but it is only a partial attempt to address the question and fails to answer the question fully or in a robust manner with few (and mostly unsuccessful) attempts to construct argument(s). Poor understanding of key issues or concepts.	The treatment is mostly descriptive. Whilst the work contains some evidence of criticality or analysis, it is too limited or partial or lacking in depth to justify a pass.	Draws on a very limited range of sources. No real attempt to assess evidence. Examples are occasionally provided but are poorly chosen and employed. Entirely lacking in sophistication or finesse. The submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence/ability in the choice and use of evidence.	Citations present but very limited. Referencing is very poor. Bibliography is either omitted, partial or poorly structured. Guidance not followed. Poor referencing means work is highly vulnerable to unwitting plagiarism. Many serious errors, revealing very limited awareness of mechanics of scholarship.	Unsatisfactory standard of written English; too many serious errors present. Weaknesses undermine clarity of meaning. Text occasionally incomprehensible. Includes significant flaws in spelling, grammar, and basic sentence/paragraph composition
20-34% Fail	One or two learning outcomes have been met in a limited way. Understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is considerably below that required for a pass. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in many areas.	Very poor standard of presentation, lacking sufficient clarity, and a sufficiently logical progression, with many serious inaccuracies.	Little material of merit or relevance, revealing a paucity of understanding of key issues or concepts. Fails to address most aspects of the task or question set. Work lacks any sustained argument(s).	The treatment is almost wholly descriptive. Contains little evidence of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic.	Draws on minimal range of sources. Rarely goes beyond paraphrasing bits of lecture notes or easily accessible web sources. No attempt to assess evidence. Examples are very rarely provided and those that are are very poorly employed. Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citation almost or entirely absent. Guidance largely ignored. Bibliography omitted or very poorly assembled. Poor referencing means work is highly vulnerable to unwitting plagiarism. Awareness of mechanics of scholarship very weak.	A poor standard of written English. All of the flaws mentioned above, but of an even more serious nature.
10-19% Fail	The work submitted will have very limited relevance to any of the stated learning outcomes. Understanding of link between theory and practice is very weak. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in all areas.	Little evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation. Many serious errors/inaccuracies.	No material of merit or relevance, revealing a complete lack of understanding of key issues or concepts. Fails to address all aspects of the task or question set. No attempt to construct argument(s).	The treatment is wholly descriptive. No evidence of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic.	Almost complete absence of evidence. Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citations absent. Guidance entirely ignored. No bibliography that could merit description as such. Very poor referencing Highly vulnerable to unwitting plagiarism. Work shows no real attempt to apply the mechanics of scholarship.	A very poor standard of written English throughout with little care taken in the composition of proper sentences or paragraphs.
0-9% Fail	Lacks any understanding of learning outcomes. No understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Standard of scholarship very poor throughout.	No evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation.	No understanding is demonstrated. Arguments notable for their complete absence.	The treatment is wholly descriptive	Evidence absent Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citation entirely absent. Bibliography omitted. Highly vulnerable to unwitting plagiarism. Application of the mechanics of scholarship entirely absent.	Incomprehensible. No attempt to compose proper sentences or paragraphs.

UEA SENATE SCALE: DISSERTATIONS

Classification	Learning outcomes/scholarship	Presentation	Methodology	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
90-100% Exemplary 1st <i>Dissertation is 'exemplary' in most areas and strong in others</i>	All learning outcomes are met to exemplary standard. Dissertation demonstrates an exemplary understanding of link between theory and practice and related issues/standards. Attains highest standards of scholarship that can reasonably be expected of a degree-level submission.	Exemplary presentation: clear, logical, imaginative, creative and original. Almost flawless.	Underpinned by a sophisticated methodology. Demonstrates exemplary sensitivity in the use of quantitative and/or qualitative methods. Research tools employed are of exemplary standard. Exemplary awareness of research ethics.	Highly effective and sustained arguments, demonstrating a detailed and impressive level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Exemplary level of self-reflection.	Work demonstrates an exemplary standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Exemplary in its use of ideas, concepts, theory. Limitations in the research or incomplete conclusions are recognised by the candidate and explained.	Exemplary use of case studies and evidence. Demonstrates impressive command of data or literature, drawing on a very broad range of material and/or examining the topic in considerable detail.	Exemplary in all respects. Outstanding bibliography.	Exemplary standard of written English. Written communication. Use of subject-specific language, is of the highest standard one can reasonably expect in a degree level submission. Vocab exemplary.
80-89% High 1st <i>Dissertation is strong in all areas and exemplary in one or two.</i>	All learning outcomes have been met to a very high standard. Demonstrates a strong understanding of link between theory & practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a very high level of scholarship, though potential improvements can be identified.	A very high standard of presentation: clear, logical and few errors.	Coherent and articulate arguments, demonstrating a very high level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment to a high standard.	Dissertation demonstrates a very high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts, theory to good effect. High level of self-reflection.	Work demonstrates a very strong command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail. Also demonstrates a high level of awareness of, and sensitivity to, the limits of evidence.	A very high standard of referencing throughout. Bibliography conforms to a very high standard. Errors very few and mostly very minor.	A very high standard of written English. Bibliography conforms to a very high standard. Errors very few and mostly very minor.	A very high standard of written English, with only a few minor errors. Vocabulary of a very high standard.
70-79% Low 1st <i>Dissertation is strong in most areas.</i>	All learning outcomes have been fully met to a high standard. Dissertation demonstrates a strong understanding of link between theory & practice and related issues and/or standards. Attains a high level of scholarship, though there may be scope for improvement in a number of areas.	A high standard of presentation: clear, logical and few errors. Errors present are mostly of a minor nature.	The dissertation is underpinned by a sound methodology. Demonstrates a high level of skill and sensitivity in the use of quantitative and/or qualitative methods. Research tools employed are of a high standard. High level of awareness of research ethics.	Coherent and articulate arguments, demonstrating a high level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment to a high standard.	Work demonstrates a high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts, theory to good effect. Limitations in the research or incomplete conclusions are mostly recognised and some attempt is made to explained them.	Work demonstrates a good command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail.	A high standard of referencing throughout. Bibliography conforms to a high standard, though there may be a number of small errors which can be easily corrected in future work.	A high standard of written English is demonstrated, but there may be errors (mostly of a minor nature) in a number of sections. Text may reveal some limitations in use of a wide vocabulary.
60-69% 2(i) <i>Dissertation is 'good' in most areas and strong in some.</i>	All or most learning outcomes have been met to a good standard. Demonstrates a good understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a good level of scholarship, but lacks sophistication of a 1 st class piece.	Good standard of presentation: clear, mostly logical, though lacking the 'flair' of 1 st class submission. Errors mostly of a minor nature, but some may be more substantive.	Some weaknesses in methodology or use of research tools, but good attempt at the research process. Competent use of quantitative & qualitative methods. Research tools of good standard, though may lack sophistication. Good awareness of research ethics.	Dissertation contains evidence of insight. Thought it may lack finesse, it is thorough, clear and shows an understanding of the subject context. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment.	Contains some good examples of critical analysis but limited originality/creativity in use of ideas, concepts, case studies etc. Although there may be some awareness of the limitations of research, awareness of reasons for these and their implications is variable.	The student draws on a good range of material but lacks the breadth of engagement with the secondary literature required to achieve a 1 st class mark. Good use of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail.	A good standard of referencing, though some minor errors or inconsistencies may be present. Good bibliography, but lacking slightly in either breadth or depth.	A good standard of written English is demonstrated, but a number of errors (of varying seriousness) are likely to be present. Vocabulary demonstrates a rather limited range.
50-59% 2(ii) <i>Dissertation is 'good' in some areas but only satisfactory in others. Good</i>	All or most learning outcomes have been met satisfactorily. Some have been met to a good standard. Demonstrates some understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues/standards. Standard of	A satisfactory standard achieved: mostly clear, some evidence of logical progression. Some minor inaccuracies.	Methodology approach is basically sound but under-developed and lacking in sophistication. Research tools employed are satisfactory but lack finesse. Data retrieved may be of limited, breadth veracity or reliability. Only a basic	Arguments are presented but lack contextualisation. Competent work, with evidence of engagement in the relevant issues, but little flair and only occasional insight.	Diligent execution. Conscientious and attentive to subject matter but balanced more towards a descriptive rather than a critical, analytical treatment. Awareness of the dissertation's limitations is demonstrated but at a basic	Satisfactory but relatively limited range of sources. Some assessment of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Some use of examples.	Referencing satisfactory on the whole, though some inconsistencies or instances of poor/limited citation may be present. Satisfactory bibliography	A reasonable standard of written English, though a number of errors may be present, some of them of a more substantive nature. Vocabulary reveals a lack of

UEA SENATE SCALE: DISSERTATIONS

<i>intellectual engagement but execution flawed.</i>	scholarship likely to be undermined by poor linkage of issues/themes, poor use of evidence, unsubstantiated claims etc.		awareness of issues associated with us of qualitative/qualitative data. Awareness of research ethics limited.	Gaps in knowledge and understanding.	level.	Treatment of data or literature sound but underdeveloped.		development.
40-49% 3rd <i>Dissertation is only satisfactory in most areas and weak in some others. Modest evidence of intellectual engagement.</i>	Most learning outcomes have been met to a satisfactory level. Understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues/standards is barely adequate. Standard of scholarship undermined by poorly constructed ideas, arguments, use of evidence, partial response to the question etc.	Poor standard of presentation. Some errors & inaccuracies may be of a more serious nature. Work has been rushed to completion.	Methodological approach is barely adequate and flawed in some areas. Research tool simplistic and under-developed. Data may be of very limited breadth or reliability. Very little awareness of issues associated with us of qualitative/qualitative data. Awareness of research ethics barely satisfactory.	Arguments employed are poorly evidenced and/or flawed. Work shows some understanding of topic and relevant knowledge, but its treatment is basic. Grasp of key concepts is weak.	Narrow range of data and/or literature employed. Mostly limited to material provided in lectures/seminars. Little awareness of the dissertation's limitations or the implications of conclusions/recommendations.	Limited, modest range of sources. Little attempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided but are poorly chosen or employed. Lacking in sophistication or finesse. Limited level of engagement.	Citations present, but referencing is poor. Little attempt to follow guidance. Work is vulnerable to unwitting plagiarism. Bibliography barely adequate.	A barely satisfactory standard of written English; a number of serious errors present. Poorly structured and poor vocabulary and grammar. Vocabulary reveals major shortcomings
Marks awarded in the range below indicate that the candidate has failed to achieve the standards required for a pass mark. It is recommended that students receiving marks in this range should meet with their advisor or the marker to review the factors that may have influenced the mark and ways in which their performance might be enhanced in subsequent assessment.								
35-39% Marginal Fail <i>Dissertation is barely 'satisfactory' in a few areas and weak in most others.</i>	Learning outcomes not met to a satisfactory standard. Understanding of link between theory and practice is insufficient for a Pass. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with serious weaknesses in several areas.	Unsatisfactory standard, lacking sufficient clarity, structure. Many serious errors.	Methodological approach is unsound and flawed in too many areas. Research tools under-developed and/or inadequate. Data of insufficient breadth or reliability. Awareness of issues associated with us of qualitative/qualitative data appears to be minimal or non-existent.	Contains some material of merit, but only a partial attempt to address the question. Fails to address research Qs fully. Few (and mostly unsuccessful) attempts to construct argument(s). Poor understanding of key issues or concepts.	The treatment is mostly descriptive. Whilst the work contains occasional evidence of criticality or analysis, it is too limited or partial or lacking in depth to justify a pass. Hardly any awareness of the dissertation's limitations is demonstrated.	A very limited range of sources. No real attempt to assess evidence. Examples are occasionally provided but are poorly chosen or irrelevant. Entirely lacking in sophistication or finesse. Very limited level of engagement.	Citations present but very limited. Referencing is very poor. Bibliography is either omitted, partial or poorly assembled. Guidance ignored. Work is highly vulnerable to unwitting plagiarism.	Unsatisfactory standard of written English; too many serious errors present. Weaknesses undermine clarity of meaning. Weak vocabulary.
20-34% Fail <i>Dissertation is weak in most areas.</i>	One or two learning outcomes have been met in a limited way. Understanding of link between theory and practice is very weak. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with serious weaknesses in most areas.	Very poor standard of presentation. Many serious inaccuracies, typos, errors, and weaknesses in layout.	Dissertation reflects a very poor understanding of what a 'methodology' is. Approach is unsound and flawed at a fundamental level. Research tools under-developed and/or inadequate. Data minimal.	Little material of merit or relevance, revealing a paucity of understanding of key issues or concepts. Work lacks any sustained argument(s).	The treatment is almost wholly descriptive. Contains little evidence of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic. No awareness of the dissertation's limitations.	Draws on minimal range of sources. Simply paraphrasing bits of lecture notes or easily accessible web sources. No attempt to assess evidence. Minimal engagement.	Citation almost or entirely absent. Guidance ignored. Bibliography omitted or very poorly assembled. Witting/unwitting plagiarism.	A very poor standard of written English. All of the flaws mentioned above, but of an even more serious nature. Very weak vocabulary.
10-19% Fail <i>Dissertation is very weak in most areas.</i>	The work submitted will have very limited relevance to any of the stated learning outcomes. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with serious weaknesses in all areas.	Little evidence that any thought has been given to presentation. Many serious errors/typos	Little understanding of 'methodology' is apparent. Approach is entirely unsound and seriously flawed at a fundamental level. Tools and data unreliable/unsound.	No arguments present. No material of merit or relevance, revealing a complete lack of understanding of key issues or concepts.	The treatment is wholly descriptive. No evidence of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic. No awareness of the dissertation's limitations.	Almost complete absence of evidence. Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citation(s) largely absent. Witting/unwitting plagiarism likely to be present. No awareness of good academic practice.	A very poor standard of written English. Often incomprehensible.
0-9% Fail <i>Dissertation is very weak in all areas.</i>	No learning outcomes have been met. Standard of scholarship very weak in all areas. Falls a very long way short of a pass.	No evidence that any thought has been given to presentation.	Nothing that might be described as a 'methodology' is apparent. Total absence of proper research tools or usable data.	No understanding is demonstrated. Arguments notable for their complete absence.	The treatment is wholly descriptive. No awareness of the dissertation's limitations.	Evidence absent. Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citation entirely absent.	Entirely or mostly incomprehensible.

UEA SENATE SCALE: ORAL PRESENTATION

Classification	Learning outcomes	Presentation	Projection, language and spoken English	Argument & understanding	Organisation & structure	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence
90-100% Exemplary 1st Presentation exemplary in most areas and strong in others.	All learning outcomes met to an exemplary standard. Demonstrates an exemplary understanding of link between theory and practice..	Exemplary: clear, logical, imaginative, creative and original. Almost flawless. Very high level of choreography. Almost flawless in delivery. Encouraged group participation and discussion and responded to questions with considerable flair and authority. Exemplary use of visual aids. Time management exemplary.	Exemplary standard of spoken English and diverse vocabulary. Exemplary use of disciplinary-specific terminology and language. Exemplary voice projection/eye contact/body language.	Highly effective arguments; deeply impressive level of understanding. Key points are rigorously argued and convincingly presented, with exemplary use of supporting evidence.	Exemplary structure with clear, logical progression. Organisation exemplary. Presentation has razor-sharp focus and sense of purpose.	Demonstrates exemplary standard of criticality. Exemplary in its analysis of ideas, concepts & theory. Where appropriate, the latter are 'applied' in a sophisticated manner.	Exemplary use of case studies/evidence. Impressive command of data/literature. Draws on very broad range of material. Examines the topic in considerable detail. Exemplary academic underpinnings.
80-89% High 1st Presentation strong in all areas and exemplary in one or two.	All learning outcomes met to a very high standard. Demonstrates a very strong understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards.	A very high standard achieved: clear, logical, few errors. The delivery - whilst not exemplary - is lively, with excellent use of visual aids (if appropriate) and some evidence of practice and choreography. Encouraged group participation and discussion and responded well to questions. Very good use of visual aids. Time management very good.	A very high standard of spoken English. Very good breadth of vocabulary. Very good use of disciplinary-specific terminology. Good voice projection and eye contact/use of body language.	Coherent and effective argument(s) are presented. Demonstrates a very high level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates.	Structure clear and well-suited to topic. Whilst not entirely without flaws, there is evidence of careful planning and attention to detail. Logical progression.	Work demonstrates a very high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts, theory to very good effect.	Work demonstrates an excellent command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail. Sound academic underpinnings.
70-79% Low 1st Presentation strong in most areas.	All learning outcomes fully met to a high standard. Demonstrates a strong understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards.	A high standard achieved: clear, logical, few errors. The delivery - whilst not exemplary - is lively, with good use of visual aids (if appropriate) and some evidence of practice and choreography. Encouraged group participation. Responses to questions are sound, but could be more incisive. Good use of visual aids. Time management good, but use of time could have been improved upon.	A high standard of spoken English. Good breadth of vocabulary. Good use of disciplinary-specific terminology. Good voice projection and eye contact/use of body language.	Coherent and effective argument(s) are presented, but some scope for improvement. Demonstrates a high level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates.	Structure clear and well-suited to topic. Whilst there is evidence of careful planning and attention to detail, there is some scope for refinement. Logical progression.	Work demonstrates a high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts, theory to good effect, though there is some scope for improvement.	Work demonstrates a good command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail. Some minor gaps may be identifiable, but no major omissions.
60-69% Pass 2(i) Presentation good in most areas and strong in some.	All learning outcomes have been met to a good standard. Demonstrates a good understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards.	A good standard of presentation: clear, mostly logical, and errors are mostly minor. Whilst lacking some finesse, the presentation is clear and lively. Makes appropriate use of visual aids. Time management good. Makes some attempt to engage the audience and responds well to questions.	A good standard of spoken English and vocabulary. Good use of disciplinary terminology and language. Voice projection and eye contact/body language are better than average, though some room for improvement.	Most points are illustrated with relevant examples, though the latter may not always contribute convincingly to the argument(s) made. Evidence of insight and an understanding of the subject context.	Structure generally clear and there is logical progression. Whilst the presentation shows evidence of care in its planning, needs more careful 'honing', and clearer focus.	The work contains some good examples of critical analysis and but limited originality and creativity in use of ideas, concepts, case studies etc.	Draws on good range of material but lacks the breadth of engagement with the secondary literature required to achieve 1 st class mark. Good use of evidence. Issues mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail.
50-59% Pass 2(ii) Presentation is good in some areas but only satisfactory in others.	All learning outcomes have been met satisfactorily. Some have been met to a good standard. Demonstrates some understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards.	A satisfactory standard achieved: mostly clear, some evidence of logical progression. 'Workmanlike'; lacks dynamism or creativity/imagination; rather 'stagey' in its delivery. More or less to time, though some parts may have been slightly 'rushed' or even omitted. Makes some attempt to engage the audience, though responses to questions of limited sophistication or authoritative.	Satisfactory standard of spoken English & vocabulary. Some discipline-specific terminology and language are used, mostly accurately. Voice projection/eye contact/body language are no more than satisfactory.	Competent work, with evidence of engagement in the relevant issues, but little flair and only occasional insight. Gaps in understanding and knowledge; may not have addressed all aspects of the assignment.	Generally accurate and relevant but some gaps and/or irrelevant material. Not always clear or logical.	Conscientious work and attentive to subject matter and/or task set, but balanced more towards a <u>descriptive</u> rather than a critical, analytical treatment. Some illustrative material, but not consistently critically evaluated.	Relatively limited range of sources. Some assessment of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in detail. Some use of examples. Treatment of data or literature is basically sound but narrow.

UEA SENATE SCALE: ORAL PRESENTATION

<p>40-49% Pass 3rd Presentation is only satisfactory in most areas and weak in some.</p>	<p>Most learning outcomes have been met to a satisfactory level. Understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is barely adequate.</p>	<p>Barely satisfactory standard of presentation. Some errors of more serious nature. Not always easy to follow. Unimaginative and un-engaging. Lacks dynamism or flair – conveys meaning, but is sometimes unclear, muddled or clumsy. Little evidence of ‘practise’ prior to delivery. Uncomfortable responding to questions and little attempt at engaging audience. Poor time management: slightly under/over time.</p>	<p>Standard of spoken English and vocabulary is only just adequate for a pass. Use of disciplinary-specific terminology and language lacks precision and may be flawed. Use of voice projection and eye contact/use of body language are poor - considerable scope for improvement.</p>	<p>Work shows some understanding of the topic and some relevant knowledge, but its treatment is very basic, unimaginative, superficial and the student’s grasp of key concepts is quite weak. Arguments employed are poorly evidenced and/or contain flaws.</p>	<p>Material fairly disorganised with poor sense of ‘mission’ or key points the student wished to convey.</p>	<p>Narrow range of data and/or literature employed. A fairly superficial level of interpretation and generally derivative and lacking criticality in its use of evidence and/or sources.</p>	<p>Draws on a narrow range of sources. Mostly limited to material in lectures/seminars. Little attempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided but are poorly chosen/employed. Limited level of engagement in wider reading.</p>
<p>Marks awarded in the range below indicate that the candidate has <u>failed</u> to achieve the standards required for a pass mark. It is recommended that students receiving marks in this range should meet with their advisor or the marker to review the factors that may have influenced the mark and ways in which their performance might be enhanced in subsequent assessments.</p>							
<p>35-39% Marginal Fail Presentation is barely satisfactory in some areas and weak in most others.</p>	<p>Insufficient demonstration of learning outcomes to justify a pass grade. Understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is not sufficient for a Pass.</p>	<p>Unsatisfactory standard: lacks clarity, and logical progression, with serious errors/inaccuracies. Delivery is clumsy, or muddled or even incomprehensible. Unimaginative and un-engaging. Very little evidence of ‘practise’ prior to delivery. Fails to respond adequately to questions. No attempt to engage audience. Poor time management, - significantly under/over time.</p>	<p>Standard of spoken English and vocabulary falls below the standard required for a pass. Use of disciplinary-specific terminology and language is inaccurate. Voice projection and use of body language are poor.</p>	<p>Contains some material of merit, but only a partial attempt to address question/topic. Few attempts to construct argument(s). Poor understanding of key issues or concepts.</p>	<p>Structurally weak, muddled, lacking incoherence. Little sense of focus or sense of ‘mission’.</p>	<p>The treatment is <u>mostly descriptive</u>. Whilst the work contains some evidence of criticality or analysis, it is too limited or partial or lacking in depth to justify a pass.</p>	<p>Draws on <u>very limited</u> range of sources. No real attempt to assess evidence. Examples occasionally provided but poorly chosen/employed. Very limited engagement in wider reading and little understanding of how to select and use evidence.</p>
<p>20-34% Fail Presentation is weak in most areas. Poor engagement.</p>	<p>One or two learning outcomes have been met in a limited way. Understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is considerably below that required for a pass.</p>	<p>Very poor standard of presentation, lacking sufficient clarity, and a sufficiently logical progression, with many serious inaccuracies. Little attempt at time management, with no evidence (that is apparent) of rehearsal or practice. Little awareness is demonstrated of the ‘purpose’ of the oral presentation and the techniques required in delivering it.</p>	<p>Standard of spoken English and vocabulary is very poor. Use of disciplinary-specific terminology and language is inaccurate. No awareness of voice projection and body language.</p>	<p>Little material of merit or relevance, revealing a paucity of understanding of key issues or concepts. Fails to address most aspects of the task or question set. Work lacks any sustained argument(s).</p>	<p>Disorganised and incoherent. No obvious or apparent focus or sense of ‘mission’.</p>	<p>The treatment is <u>almost wholly descriptive</u>. Contains little evidence of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic.</p>	<p>Draws on <u>minimal</u> range of sources. Rarely goes beyond paraphrasing bits of lecture notes etc. No attempt to assess evidence. Examples rarely provided & very poorly employed. Submission reflects a <u>very limited engagement</u> in study.</p>
<p>10-19% Fail Presentation is very weak in most areas. Very poor engagement.</p>	<p>The work submitted will have very limited relevance to any of the stated learning outcomes. Understanding of link between theory and practice is very weak.</p>	<p>Little evidence of care or serious thought being given to the standard of presentation. Many serious errors/inaccuracies.</p>	<p>Spoken English and vocabulary cause for major concern: may require remedial intervention. Use of discipline-specific terms and language suggests <u>major deficiencies</u> in reading/knowledge.</p>	<p>No material of merit or relevance, revealing a complete lack of understanding of key issues or concepts. Fails to address all aspects of the task or question set. No attempt to construct argument(s).</p>	<p>Totally disorganised and incoherent. No obvious or apparent focus or sense of ‘mission’.</p>	<p>The treatment is <u>wholly descriptive</u>. No evidence of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic.</p>	<p>Almost complete absence of evidence. Submission reflects a <u>very limited level of engagement</u> in study on a more general level.</p>
<p>0-9% Fail Presentation is very weak in all areas. Almost total lack of engagement.</p>	<p>Lacks any understanding of learning outcomes. No understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards.</p>	<p>No evidence that <u>anything</u> other than perfunctory thought (a few minutes at best) has been given to the presentational aspects of the exercise. Quite clear that the presentation has not been informed, in any meaningful way, by any of the guidance provided.</p>	<p>Standard of spoken English totally inadequate for an oral exercise at HE level. Remedial intervention essential. Hardly any knowledge demonstrated.</p>	<p>Understanding and/or arguments either entirely absent or barely discernible.</p>	<p>Difficult to discern any organisation or structure.</p>	<p>The treatment is <u>wholly descriptive</u></p>	<p>Evidence absent. Submission reflects a <u>very limited level of engagement</u> in study on a more general level.</p>