

RAU Marking Criteria

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1	<b>IFY Generic Marking Criteria</b>								
2			<b>0-34 Fail</b>	<b>35-39 Marginal fail</b>	<b>40-49 Adequate</b>	<b>50-59 Acceptable</b>	<b>60-69 Good</b>	<b>70-79 Excellent</b>	<b>80-100 Outstanding</b>
3	Knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories, topics and/or practice.	IFY	Weak and flawed understanding of basic concepts, theories, topics and /or practice. Work contains significant omissions and inaccuracies.	Limited and fragmentary demonstration of understanding of basic concepts, theories, topics and /or practice. The work may contain omissions and inaccuracies.	Adequate understanding of basic concepts, theories, topics and /or practice. Simple, factual approach covering core content only. Minimum requirement as preparation for study at Level 4	Acceptable understanding of basic concepts, theories, topics and /or practice. Some breadth and depth of knowledge and understanding demonstrated. Few omissions and inaccuracies.	Good and consistent understanding of basic concepts, theories, topics and /or practice. Good breadth and depth of understanding. Minimal omissions and inaccuracies	Detailed knowledge and understanding of basic concepts, theories, topics and /or practice. No omissions or inaccuracies.	High quality work. Very detailed knowledge and understanding of basic concepts, theories, topics and /or practice. No omissions or inaccuracies.
4	Application of knowledge (i.e. concept, theory, topic) and/or skill to the assessment task and practice (assessment brief to include details of the problem to be addressed and skills required plus additional factors to be considered e.g. ethical issues, sustainability factors, environmental factors etc.)	IFY	Work is largely irrelevant and/or inaccurate. Assessment task has not been understood or addressed appropriately.	Weak and/or irrelevant interpretation of the task with, at times, flawed and inaccurate work presented.	Limited interpretation and evaluation of ideas. Presentation of concepts with weak but adequate application to the assessment task.	Acceptable interpretation and evaluation of ideas and concepts. Acceptable use of relevant skills, methods and approaches to addressing the task.	Good interpretation and evaluation of ideas and concepts. Appropriate skills, methods and approaches used to address the task.	Excellent interpretation and evaluation of ideas and concepts. Highly appropriate skills, methods and approaches used to address the task.	Exceptional interpretation and evaluation of ideas and concepts. Highly appropriate skills, methods and approaches used to address the task.
5	Development of supported/substantiated argument and evidence of analysis and critical reasoning	IFY	No or very limited development of an argument, content often not relevant to the task set. Very limited or no use of evidence to support the work submitted.	Work is largely descriptive with very limited development of an argument. Lack of an awareness of different perspectives and limited analysis.	Some development of arguments showing an awareness of the area of study and different perspectives and approaches. Limited analysis and critical reasoning.	Awareness of the area of study and different perspectives and approaches. Some use of analysis and critical reasoning to develop an argument.	Good awareness of the area of study and different perspectives and approaches. Use of analysis and critical reasoning to develop a supported argument.	Strong awareness of the area of study and different perspectives and approaches. Good use of analysis and critical reasoning to develop a robust well supported argument.	Thorough and detailed awareness of the area of study and different perspectives and approaches. Outstanding use of analysis and critical reasoning to develop and support a robust, persuasive argument.
6	Use of resources and information, evidence of selection and engagement with relevant resources (academic/ discipline based/ current information and data).	IFY	No evidence of reading or engagement with appropriate resources and information. No referencing or significant inconsistencies and errors in referencing.	Limited evidence of reading or engagement with appropriate resources and information. No referencing or significant inconsistencies and errors in referencing.	Some engagement with core resources and information. Heavy reliance on a limited number of resources and/or use of inappropriate resources and information. Weak use of referencing conventions with some inconsistencies.	Engagement with core resources and appropriate information and resources. Referencing may show some inaccuracies and/or inconsistencies.	Engagement with a wide range of information and resources. Good use of referencing with no or very few inaccuracies and inconsistencies.	Very good engagement with a wide range of information and resources including material beyond the taught content of the module. Good application of referencing with no inaccuracies or inconsistencies.	Excellent, critical engagement with a wide range of information and resources including material beyond the taught content of the module. Consistent and accurate use of referencing.
7	Clear, coherent and appropriate presentation of assessment task (written, recorded, oral, etc.) and full acknowledgement through correct use of referencing conventions of the source of ideas/information/quotes etc.	IFY	Work is extremely disorganised and confusingly expressed. Poor use of English. Inappropriate style of presentation.	Work is poorly presented and is, in parts, confusing and disjointed. Information and ideas often poorly expressed and presented.	Overall an ordered and structured presentation of information. Relevant ideas and concepts are reasonably expressed.	Coherently ordered and structured information. Relevant ideas and concepts are clearly expressed.	Good, competent presentation of ideas and concepts. Good structure and clarity of expression.	Excellent presentation of work with a coherent structure and effective and clear expression of ideas and concepts.	Extremely well presented and structured work, strong and coherent expression of ideas and concepts.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1	<b>Level 4 Generic Marking Criteria</b>								
2			<b>0-34 Fail</b>	<b>35-39 Marginal fail</b>	<b>40-49 Adequate</b>	<b>50-59 Acceptable</b>	<b>60-69 Good</b>	<b>70-79 Excellent</b>	<b>80-100 Outstanding</b>
3	Knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories, topics and/or practice.	L4	Substantially inadequate evidence of knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories and/or topics. The work contains omissions and flaws.	Weak work. Inaccuracies in knowledge and understanding which indicate a limited grasp of key concepts, theories and/or topics. Some omissions and inaccuracies.	Adequate identification of key concepts, theories and/or topics, this may be imitative and/or lack depth. May include some omissions and inaccuracies.	Acceptable descriptions of key concepts, theories and/or topics, there may also be a recognition of peripheral issues. Few or no omissions.	Good explanations of a range of key concepts, theories and/or topics, some of which are explored in-depth. Some awareness of wider issues demonstrated.	Detailed discussions of relevant key concepts, theories and/or topics, evidence of an awareness of their limitations.	Detailed exploration of relevant key concepts, theories and/or topics, including a critical account of ambiguities and limitations.
4	Application of knowledge (i.e. concept, theory, topic) and/or skill to the assessment task and practice (assessment brief to include details of the problem to be addressed and skills required plus additional factors to be considered e.g. ethical issues, sustainability factors, environmental factors etc.)	L4	Inadequate understanding of discipline. Very limited and/or irrelevant application of concepts and ideas to the assessment task.	Limited understanding of the discipline demonstrated with inaccurate, inappropriate and/or limited attempt(s) to apply theory.	Adequate identification of theory(s) leading to perfunctory explanation and application(s).	Acceptable descriptions of theories leading to generalised applications(s), there may also be a recognition of peripheral issues.	Good explanation and application of theory. Some of the work may suggest a deeper engagement with the discipline.	Systematic and logical application of relevant theory which critically explores elements of the discipline.	Original integration and application of relevant theory which critically evaluates elements of the discipline.
5	Development of supported/substantiated argument and evidence of analysis and critical reasoning	L4	No evidence of analysis. Unsubstantiated opinions presented. Largely descriptive work not relevant to the task set.	Entirely or almost entirely descriptive, little or no evidence of analysis. Has accepted information uncritically. Unsubstantiated opinions usually present.	Limited evidence of analysis, work is mainly descriptive, uncritical acceptance of information, and unsubstantiated opinions may be evident.	Evidence of analysis using simple logic and some use of critical argument. On balance the work is still descriptive.	Analysis of a range of information. Arguments are coherent and critical with appropriate amounts of evidence; substantiated opinions are presented.	Relevant information is analysed using defined techniques and principles. Arguments are critical and concise. Opinions are justified using evidence.	Relevant information is fluently synthesised to formulate critical arguments which are concisely presented. These are sustained throughout to form a coherent piece which evidences an analytical approach to information handling.
6	Use of resources and information, evidence of selection and engagement with relevant resources (academic/ discipline based/ current information and data).	L4	No evidence of reading. Academic conventions and referencing have been largely ignored.	Evidence of indiscriminate reading. Academic conventions and referencing have been applied but there are numerous errors.	Limited evidence of reading. Academic conventions and referencing have been applied inconsistently.	Evidence of reading. Literature is accurately but, descriptively utilised. Academic conventions and referencing have been correctly applied.	Evidence of reading beyond keys texts which, is used appropriately to substantiate opinions. Academic conventions and referencing have been correctly and consistently applied.	Relevant evidence is presented which suggests a critical engagement with the literature. Academic conventions and referencing have been correctly and consistently applied.	Relevant evidence is presented which suggests a critical engagement with current research literature(s). Academic conventions and referencing have been correctly and consistently applied.
7	Clear, coherent and appropriate presentation of assessment task (written, recorded, oral, etc.) and full acknowledgement through correct use of referencing conventions of the source of ideas/information/quotes etc.	L4	Unstructured, very disorganised and/or incoherent. Poor use of English. Inappropriate style of presentation.	Minimal attempt to address the task, poorly structured and generally disorganised. Incorrect or inconsistent style of presentation.	Addresses the task but shows limited evidence of technical competence, the submission is organised but there are numerous shortcomings in style and formatting.	Addresses the task appropriately and evidences technical competence. The submission is organised and there are few errors in style and formatting.	Fully addresses the task and evidences a sound grasp of technical conventions. The submission is well organised and there are very few errors in style and formatting.	Interprets the task to present an original piece which evidences a confident grasp of technical conventions. The submission is deftly organised with only slight errors in style and formatting.	Interprets the task in an original fashion to present a piece which demonstrates a sophisticated grasp of technical convention. The submission is highly organised with no discernible errors.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1	<b>Level 5 Generic Marking Criteria</b>								
2			<b>0-34 Fail</b>	<b>35-39 Marginal fail</b>	<b>40-49 Adequate</b>	<b>50-59 Acceptable</b>	<b>60-69 Good</b>	<b>70-79 Excellent</b>	<b>80-100 Outstanding</b>
3	Knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories, topics and/or practice.	L5	Very unsatisfactory work showing flawed understanding of knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories and/or topics. Omissions and inaccuracies in the work presented.	Weak work. Limited and/or fragmentary knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories and/or topics demonstrated. Some omissions and/or inaccuracies presented.	Simple, largely factual approach showing limited or narrow knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories and/or topics. May include some inaccuracies.	Acceptable work, largely descriptive, showing knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories and/or topics but lacking depth and breadth.	Good and consistent knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories and/or topics. Explanations and some detail presented.	High quality work presenting a detailed discussion of knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories and/or topics.	Outstanding quality work showing detailed knowledge, understanding and exploration of key concepts, theories and/or topics.
4	Application of knowledge (i.e. concept, theory, topic) and/or skill to the assessment task and practice (assessment brief to include details of the problem to be addressed and skills required plus additional factors to be considered e.g. ethical issues, sustainability factors, environmental factors etc.)	L5	Very limited and/or irrelevant understanding of the discipline. Application of concepts and ideas to the assessment task is also lacking development.	Limited understanding of the discipline and the application of ideas and concepts to the assessment task. Limited links between theory and practice.	Adequate identification and explanation of relevant theories and concepts. Some application to the task but few direct linkages made.	Accurate and generally consistent discussion of theories and concepts with appropriate application to the assessment task. Links made between the theories/concepts and their application.	Good application of theory and concepts to practice, appropriate and well articulated links made between the two.	Excellent, detailed application of theory and concepts to practice. Highly appropriate, well developed and articulated links made between theory and practice.	Excellent, detailed exploration and application of theory and concepts to practice. Demonstration of original thought. Highly appropriate and well developed and articulated links made between theory and practice.
5	Development of supported/substantiated argument and evidence of analysis and critical reasoning	L5	Largely irrelevant or inaccurate descriptive work. Views expressed lack logic and are largely unsubstantiated. Some content not relevant to the assessment task.	Largely descriptive work lacking logic or argument development. Little or no evidence of analysis. Has accepted information uncritically. Unsubstantiated opinions usually present.	Limited and inconsistent use of evaluation and critical analysis. Some emerging arguments developing but not always logical, coherent or accurate. Limited critical evaluation of information.	Evidence of use of evaluation and critical analysis to support arguments. May include some errors and inconsistencies. Limited critical evaluation of information.	Evidence of use of evaluation and critical analysis. Development of logical and coherent arguments using supporting evidence. Analysis of a range of information. Some evidence of originality. Critical use of information with some awareness of its limitations.	Consistent use of critical and evaluative skills to develop logical and coherent arguments. Excellent use of a range of supporting information. Evidence of originality and discussion of alternative arguments.	Excellent and consistent use of critical and evaluative skills to develop highly logical and coherent arguments. Excellent and critical use of a range of supporting information. Evidence of originality. Explicit discussion of alternative arguments and a strong awareness of their limitations.
6	Use of resources and information, evidence of selection and engagement with relevant resources (academic/ discipline based/ current information and data).	L5	No or limited evidence of reading or engaging in taught elements of the module. No or incoherent use of academic conventions and referencing.	Poor engagement with core resources and module information. Inconsistent and weak use of academic conventions and referencing.	Evidence of reading and engagement with core module content. Largely reliant on taught content. Use of academic conventions and referencing but some inconsistencies and inaccuracies.	Engagement with an appropriate range of resources, including information beyond the core module content. Referencing and academic conventions largely correct but may have minor inconsistencies and inaccuracies.	Engagement with a wide range of resources. Good application of referencing and academic conventions with only minor errors or inconsistencies.	Good, critical engagement with a wide range of relevant resources. Consistent and largely accurate use of referencing and academic conventions.	Excellent, critical engagement with a wide range of relevant resources including current research informed literature. Consistent and accurate use of referencing and academic conventions.
7	Clear, coherent and appropriate presentation of assessment task (written, recorded, oral, etc.) and full acknowledgement through correct use of referencing conventions of the source of ideas/information/quotes etc.	L5	Extremely disorganised work, content confusingly expressed. Poor expression and and inappropriate style of presentation.	Disorganised work, some or all information and ideas poorly and confusingly expressed. Incorrect or inconsistent style of presentation.	Work addresses the task and has a relevant structure but there are some shortcomings in the style of presentation and there may be some errors in use of language.	Work is structured in a largely coherent manner. The assessment task is correctly addressed and ideas and information are clearly expressed.	Good presentation of work with ideas and information clearly presented. The assessment task is correctly addressed. Good expression of ideas and information.	Excellent presentation of work with a coherent and consistent structure. Highly effective and clear expression of ideas and concepts.	Excellent presentation of work with a coherent and consistent structure. Sophisticated, effective, and possibly innovative, expression of ideas and concepts.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1	<b>Level 6 Generic Marking Criteria</b>								
2			<b>0-34 Fail</b>	<b>35-39 Marginal fail</b>	<b>40-49 Adequate</b>	<b>50-59 Acceptable</b>	<b>60-69 Good</b>	<b>70-79 Excellent</b>	<b>80-100 Outstanding</b>
3	Knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories, topics and/or practice.	L6	Unsatisfactory work, weak knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories and topics. Work includes inaccuracies and no awareness of latest research and developments in the discipline.	Weak and fragmentary knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories and topics. Work includes omissions and/or inaccuracies and no or limited awareness of latest research and developments in the discipline.	Factual and largely descriptive knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories and topics. Narrow interpretation/coverage of the discipline. Limited awareness of latest research and developments in the discipline.	Acceptable work, largely descriptive, showing knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories and/or topics but lacking depth and breadth. Some awareness of latest research and developments in the discipline.	Good and consistent knowledge, understanding and explanation of key concepts, theories and/or topics. Awareness of latest research and developments in the discipline beyond core lecture/seminar content.	Detailed and thorough discussion of knowledge, understanding of key concepts, theories and/or topics. Discussion informed by latest research and developments in the discipline beyond core lecture/seminar content.	Outstanding evaluation of the topic showing deep and detailed knowledge, understanding of key concepts, theories and/or topics. Evaluation explicitly informed by latest research and developments in the discipline.
4	Application of knowledge (i.e. concept, theory, topic) and/or skill to the assessment task and practice (assessment brief to include details of the problem to be addressed and skills required plus additional factors to be considered e.g. ethical issues, sustainability factors, environmental factors etc.)	L6	Very weak and/or irrelevant understanding of the application of theories, concepts and ideas to practice. No or only occasional links between theory and practice made.	Limited understanding of the application of theories, concepts and ideas to practice. Only occasional links and applications made and no evidence of evaluation.	Relevant and appropriate understanding of the application of theories, concepts and ideas to practice demonstrated. Some links between theory and practice made, adequate but limited evaluation.	Accurate and largely consistent application of theories, concepts and ideas to practice. Appropriate links and applications made and acceptable evidence of evaluation.	Good, consistent, accurate and logical application of theories, concepts and ideas to practice. Clearly articulated links and applications made and good evidence of evaluation.	Detailed, consistent, accurate and logical application of theories, concepts and ideas to practice. Clearly articulated and reasoned links and applications made and evidence of excellent evaluation using current research and information.	Exceptional application of theories, concepts and ideas to practice. Clearly articulated and reasoned links and applications made demonstrating outstanding skills. Evidence of evaluation using current research and information.
5	Development of supported/substantiated argument and evidence of analysis and critical reasoning	L6	Largely irrelevant or inaccurate descriptive work. No or very limited evidence of evaluation or analysis. No evidence of originality.	Largely descriptive work, weak or superficial evaluation and analysis. Information accepted uncritically and arguments are unsubstantiated. No evidence of originality.	Limited use of critical evaluation. Judgements and arguments are present but not always appropriately supported and substantiated. Omissions and inconsistencies may be present. Limited evidence of originality.	Largely logical and coherent judgements and substantiated arguments presented. Use of critical evaluation skills demonstrated but some omissions and inconsistencies still present. Some evidence and examples of originality.	Sound use of critical evaluation to make well informed judgements and substantiated arguments. Use of appropriate supporting evidence. Work shows originality and creativity. Very limited inconsistencies and inaccuracies.	Excellent and detailed use of critical evaluation to make well informed judgements and coherent, substantiated arguments. Clearly articulated links between different elements of the key arguments. Use of appropriate supporting evidence. Work shows originality.	Exceptional and detailed use of critical evaluation. Judgements and arguments are well informed, substantiated, accurate and consistent. Excellent use of supporting evidence. High levels of originality. No inconsistencies and inaccuracies.
6	Use of resources and information, evidence of selection and engagement with relevant resources (academic/ discipline based/ current information and data).	L6	No or limited evidence of reading or engaging in taught elements of the module. No or incoherent use of academic conventions and referencing.	Poor engagement with core resources and module information. No evidence of wider reading. Inconsistent and weak use of academic conventions and referencing.	Evidence of reading and engagement with core module content. Largely reliant on taught content. Use of academic conventions and referencing but may show some inconsistencies and inaccuracies.	Engagement with an appropriate range of resources, including literature informed by latest research and information beyond the core module content. Referencing and academic conventions largely correct but may have minor inconsistencies and inaccuracies.	Critical engagement with an appropriate range of resources, including literature informed by latest research and information beyond the core module content. Sound application of referencing and academic conventions with no or very minor inconsistencies and inaccuracies.	Critical engagement with a good range of resources, including literature informed by latest research and information beyond the core module content. Consistent and accurate application of referencing and academic conventions.	Excellent and creative critical engagement with a wide range of relevant resources including current research informed literature and information beyond the core content of the module. Consistent and accurate use of referencing and academic conventions.
7	Clear, coherent and appropriate presentation of assessment task (written, recorded, oral, etc.) and full acknowledgement through correct use of referencing conventions of the source of ideas/information/quotes etc.	L6	Extremely disorganised work, content confusingly expressed and does not address the task requirements. Very poor expression and inappropriate style of presentation.	Disorganised work, some or all information and ideas poorly and confusingly expressed. Incorrect or inconsistent style of presentation.	Work addresses the task and has a relevant structure but there are some shortcomings in the style of presentation. Relevant ideas and concepts are reasonably expressed. There may be some errors in use of language.	Work addresses the task and has a relevant structure. No or very few shortcoming in style of presentation. Relevant ideas and concepts are clearly expressed. Good use of language.	Good, competent presentation of ideas and concepts. Work addresses the task and has a good structure. Work is clearly expressed with very few errors in style and formatting.	Excellent presentation of ideas and concepts. Work addresses the task and has a coherent and consistent structure. Work is effectively and clearly expressed with no or very few errors in style and formatting.	Excellent presentation of work with a coherent and consistent structure. Sophisticated, effective, and possibly innovative, expression of ideas and concepts. No errors in style and formatting.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1	<b>Level 7 Generic Marking Criteria</b>								
2			<b>0-34 Fail</b>	<b>35-39 Marginal fail</b>	<b>40-49 Adequate</b>	<b>50-59 Acceptable</b>	<b>60-69 Good</b>	<b>70-79 Excellent</b>	<b>80-100 Outstanding</b>
3	Knowledge and understanding of key concepts, theories, topics and/or practice.	L7	Little or no knowledge of key concepts, theories and topics. Largely descriptive and based on repetition of information. Limited or no evaluation and discussion. Absence of scholarly argument or engagement with latest research and developments in the discipline.	Little knowledge of key concepts, theories and topics. Largely descriptive with little synthesis of existing scholarship. Limited evaluation, discussion and scholarly argument or engagement with latest research and developments in the discipline.	Adequate knowledge of key concepts, theories and topics. Generally descriptive with limited or restricted synthesis of existing scholarship. Limited or inconsistent evaluation, discussion and scholarly argument or engagement with latest research and developments in the discipline.	Acceptable knowledge of key concepts, theories and topics. Some parts may be largely descriptive but the submission also demonstrates some synthesis of existing scholarship. Demonstration of evaluation, discussion and engagement with latest research and developments in the discipline but may include some errors and inconsistencies.	Good knowledge and analysis of key concepts, theories and topics. Evidence of synthesis of existing scholarship beyond core lecture/seminar content. Demonstration of evaluation and development of scholarly argument and engagement with latest research and developments in the discipline. Limited errors and inconsistencies.	Excellent knowledge and analysis of key concepts, theories and topics. Synthesis of existing scholarship and evaluation and development of scholarly argument informed by latest research and developments in the discipline. Demonstration of independence of thought. High level of consistency with no or very few errors.	Outstanding evaluation of the topic showing deep knowledge, understanding of key concepts, theories and/or topics from a broad perspective. May include new ways to present or organise discipline content. Synthesis of existing scholarship. Evaluation and discussion explicitly informed by latest research and developments in the discipline.
4	Application of knowledge (i.e. concept, theory, topic) and/or skill to the assessment task and practice (assessment brief to include details of the problem to be addressed and skills required plus additional factors to be considered e.g. ethical issues, sustainability factors, environmental factors etc.)	L7	Insufficient, irrelevant or inaccurate application of theories concepts and ideas. Minimal attempt to address the assessment task.	Limited, inaccurate or inappropriate application of theories concepts and ideas. Application weak and restricted to core theories, concepts and ideas only.	Key theories, concepts and ideas explored. More details may be required and application may be variable or inconsistent.	Systematic and accurate application of theories, concepts and ideas. Good skills, methods and approaches used to address the task.	Detailed, accurate and systematic application of theories, concepts and ideas. Good skills, methods and approaches used to address the task. Some evidence of originality.	Excellent application of relevant theories, concepts and ideas. Very appropriate skills, methods and approaches used with originality to address the task.	Exceptional and sophisticated interpretation and application of ideas and concepts. Highly appropriate skills, methods and approaches used, with creativity and originality, to address the task.
5	Development of supported/substantiated argument and evidence of analysis and critical reasoning	L7	Lacks analysis and development of a supported and substantiated argument. No or very limited evidence of critical thought.	Weak and/or ineffective analysis and development of a supported and substantiated argument. Limited evidence of critical thought and originality.	Evidence of some analysis and initial development of critical thought and reasoning. Some development of original supported and substantiated argument and associated conclusions.	Evidence of analysis and development of critical thought and reasoning. Development of original supported and substantiated argument and associated conclusions but more depth required.	Evidence of strong critical thought and reasoning. Development of original supported and substantiated argument, including consideration of alternative perspectives, and presentation of convincing, conclusions.	Excellent analysis and development of critical thought and reasoning. Use of complex arguments, including consideration of different perspectives. Development of detailed and convincing conclusions. Work shows originality.	Exceptional and thorough analysis and development of critical thought and reasoning. Use of highly complex and current arguments, including consideration of different perspectives. Work shows originality. Synthesis and development of detailed and convincing conclusions.
6	Use of resources and information, evidence of selection and engagement with relevant resources (academic/ discipline based/ current information and data).	L7	Little or no evidence of reading and engagement with core module content. No engagement with information beyond the taught content. Use of academic conventions and referencing missing or very limited and includes inconsistencies and inaccuracies.	Limited evidence of reading and engagement with core module content. Largely reliant on taught content. Use of academic conventions and referencing is limited and includes inconsistencies and inaccuracies.	Evidence of reading and engagement with core module content. Largely reliant on taught content but some evidence of independent scholarship. Use of academic conventions and referencing but may show some minor inconsistencies and inaccuracies.	Engagement with a range of resources, including literature informed by latest research and information beyond the core module content. Some evidence of self-directed research and scholarship. Referencing and academic conventions largely correct but may have minor inconsistencies and inaccuracies.	Critical engagement with a wide range of relevant resources including some use of material at the forefront of current research. Evidence of self-directed and independent research and scholarship. Good use of referencing and academic conventions with no or very minor inconsistencies and inaccuracies.	Critical engagement with a wide range of relevant resources including those at the forefront of current research. Evidence of self-directed and independent research and scholarship. Consistent and accurate use of referencing and academic conventions.	Excellent and creative critical engagement with a wide range of relevant resources including those at the forefront of current research. Evidence of self-directed and proficient research and scholarship. Consistent and accurate use of referencing and academic conventions.
7	Clear, coherent and appropriate presentation of assessment task (written, recorded, oral, etc.) and full acknowledgement through correct use of referencing conventions of the source of ideas/information/quotes etc.	L7	Extremely disorganised work, content confusingly expressed and does not address the task requirements. Very poor expression and inappropriate style of presentation.	Disorganised work, some or all information and ideas poorly and confusingly expressed. Incorrect or inconsistent style of presentation.	Work addresses the task and has a relevant structure but there are some shortcoming in style of presentation. Relevant ideas and concepts are reasonably expressed. There may be some errors in use of language.	Work addresses the task and has a relevant structure. No or very few shortcoming in style of presentation. Relevant ideas and concepts are clearly expressed. Good use of language.	Good, competent presentation of ideas and concepts. Work addresses the task set and has a good structure. Work is clearly expressed with very few errors in style and formatting.	Excellent presentation of ideas and concepts. Work addresses the task and has a coherent and consistent structure resulting. Work is effectively, clearly and persuasively expressed with no or very few errors in style and formatting.	Excellent presentation skills demonstrated with work having a coherent and consistent structure. Sophisticated, effective and innovative expression of ideas and concepts. Impressive clarity of expression, work may be close to publishable or exhibit able quality. No errors in style and formatting.