

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</i>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Exemplary presentation: clear, logical, imaginative, creative and original. Almost flawless.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Highly effective and sustained arguments, demonstrating a detailed and impressive level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates.</p>	<p>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 and explained. Exemplary level of self-reflection.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Exemplary in all respects. Outstanding bibliography.</p>	<p>Exemplary standard of written English. Use of subject-specific language is of the highest standard one can reasonably expect in a degree level submission. Vocabulary exemplary.</p>
80-89% High 1st <i>Dissertation is strong in most areas and may be exemplary in some</i>	<p>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.</p>	<p>A very high standard of presentation: clear, logical and few errors.</p>	<p>The dissertation is underpinned by a sound methodology. Demonstrates a very high level of skill and sensitivity in the use of quantitative and/or qualitative methods. Research tools employed are of a very high standard. High level of awareness of research ethics.</p>	<p>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 very high standard.</p>	<p>Dissertation demonstrates a very high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts, and theory to good effect. Very high level of self-reflection.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>A very high standard of referencing throughout. Bibliography conforms to a very high standard.</p>	<p>A very high standard of written English. Vocabulary of a very high standard.</p>
70-79% 1st <i>Dissertation is strong in most areas.</i>	<p>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 few areas.</p>	<p>A high standard of presentation: clear, logical and few errors. Errors present are mostly of a minor nature.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates a high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts, and theory to good effect. Limitations in the research or incomplete conclusions are mostly recognised and some attempt is made to explain them.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates a good command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail.</p>	<p>A high standard of referencing throughout. Bibliography conforms to a high standard, though there may be a number of small errors.</p>	<p>A high standard of written English is demonstrated. Text may reveal some limitations in use of a wide vocabulary.</p>

UEA SENATE SCALE: DISSERTATIONS

Classification	Learning outcomes/scholarship	Presentation	Methodology	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
60-69% 2(i) <i>Dissertation is 'good' in most areas and strong in some.</i>	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. Though 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, with only minor errors present. Vocabulary demonstrates a rather limited range.
50-59% 2(ii) <i>Dissertation is 'good' in some areas but only satisfactory in others. Good intellectual engagement but execution flawed.</i>	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 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.	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 awareness of issues associated with us of qualitative/qualitative data. Awareness of research ethics limited.	Arguments are presented but lack contextualisation. Competent work, with evidence of engagement in the relevant issues, but little flair and only occasional insight. Gaps in knowledge and understanding	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 level.	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 sound but underdeveloped.	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. Vocabulary reveals a lack of development.
40-49% 3 rd <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. 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

UEA SENATE SCALE: DISSERTATIONS

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 adviser 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.								
Classification	Learning outcomes/scholarship	Presentation	Methodology	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
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/quantitative 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 omitted, partial or poorly assembled. Guidance ignored.	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>	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, 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.	A very poor standard of written English. Too many serious errors present. Weaknesses greatly undermine clarity of meaning. 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/inaccuracies	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. No awareness of good academic practice. Work shows no real attempt to apply the mechanics of scholarship.	A very poor standard of written English. Often incomprehensible. Hardly any evidence of engagement or discipline-specific vocabulary.
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. Application of the mechanics of scholarship entirely absent.	Incomprehensible. No attempt to compose proper sentences or paragraphs.