# Generic University Criteria1 for Assessment of Taught Programmes

1. The assessment criteria below provide generic threshold and marking descriptors that characterise what is expected of our students at each level of their curriculum. The descriptors essentially set out an increasing level of challenge, complexity and independent learning in relation to the knowledge, skills and attributes of a St Mary’s graduate. The criteria and descriptors draw upon good practice in the sector, the SEEC2 guidelines and QAA’s Framework for Higher Education3 (2014), and complement the QAA Subject Benchmark Statements4.
2. The criteria and descriptors should be used by Programme teams to develop and inform their own subject-specific marking criteria and when devising programme and module level intended learning outcomes. Student engagement with module level assessment and marking criteria is vital in developing their understanding of how assessment tasks relate to learning outcomes, and thereby appreciating what is expected of them by way of the types of learning as they progress through their programmes of study.
3. When providing students with feedback on assignments it is very helpful to address each of the assessed learning outcomes and in doing so establish targets with the student for how they could achieve the higher mark band.
4. When assessing an assignment for a student to pass, all or the majority of the learning outcomes must have been achieved at the threshold level. The final mark will be determined by the majority fit of assessed outcomes. For example, a student may have one or two features of their work judged to be in the 70-79% mark boundary but the majority of assessed criteria are considered to fit the 60-69% set of descriptors. Therefore the student would be awarded a mark in the 60-69& mark boundary.
5. The descriptors**5** for the University’s generic assessment criteria are indicated at Table 1 below:

# Table 1 - Descriptors of each assessment criterion:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Knowledge and**  **Understanding** | **Intellectual skills** | **Scholarly practices** | **Enquiry and research skills** | **Professional and life skills** |
| Knowledge and | Analysis, synthesis, creativity, | Including use of relevant literature, | Including research-related | Including skills in creativity, digital |
| comprehension of the | deployment of structured | academic writing, academic | skills, and communicating | practices, working with others and |
| subject or field of enquiry | reasoning supported by | integrity, appropriate academic | findings in a style appropriate | as part of a group, presentation |
|  | evidence; focus on topic, critical | conventions including referencing | for a given audience and | skills, project management skills |
|  | reflection and drawing | protocols and adherence to word- | context | and acting on critical reflection of |
|  | conclusions | length or time limits |  | own practice |

1. Use of the Generic University Criteria and adoption at Programme level should be read in conjunction with the University’s Academic Regulations6

1 For descriptors of assessment criteria refer to Table 1

2 <http://www.seec.org.uk/seec-credit-level-descriptors-2010/>Accessed 05.02.16

3 <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/qualifications-frameworks.pdf>Accessed 23.02.16

4 <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/assuring-standards-and-quality/the-quality-code/subject-benchmark-statements>Accessed 05.02.16

5 Definitions derived from SEEC level descriptors, <http://www.seec.org.uk/seec-credit-level-descriptors-2010/>Accessed 05.02.16

# University Assessment Criteria – FHEQ Level 4\*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grading**  **criteria** | **Knowledge and**  **Understanding** | **Intellectual skills** | **Scholarly practices** | **Enquiry and research**  **skills** | **Professional and life skills** |
| **Mark band** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **0-29 : Fail** | Major gaps in knowledge and understanding. Significant inaccuracies. | Brief and irrelevant. Descriptive.  Only personal views offered. Unsubstantiated generalisations. Little or no attempt to draw conclusions. | No evidence of reading. Views are unsupported and non- authoritative. Academic conventions largely ignored. | **E&R skills**; Very little or no evidence of ability to undertake research- related tasks even with external guidance.  **Communication** of the task is inappropriately  pitched for the context and audience. | Very little evidence of the required skills in any of the skills areas. |
| **30-39 : Fail** | Gaps in knowledge and | For the most part descriptive. | Evidence of little reading | **E&R skills**; Limited | Limited evidence of skills in |
|  | superficial understanding. | Views/ findings sometimes | appropriate for the level of | evidence of ability to | the range identified for the |
|  | Some inaccuracies. | illogical or contradictory. | study, and/or indiscriminate | undertake | assessment at this level. |
|  |  | Generalisations/ statements | use of sources. Academic | straightforward E&R tasks | Significant weaknesses |
|  |  | made with scant evidence. | conventions used weakly. | even with external | evidence, which suggest |
|  |  | Conclusions lack relevance |  | guidance. | that the candidate is not on |
|  |  | and/or validity. |  | **Communication** of the | course to gain the |
|  |  |  |  | task may have some merit | necessary for professional- |
|  |  |  |  | but is inappropriately | level employment. |
|  |  |  |  | pitched for the context |  |
|  |  |  |  | and audience. |  |
| **40-49 :** | Broadly accurate knowledge | Some awareness of issues. | Threshold level. Some | **E&R skills**: Some evidence | Can **generally work** |
| **Pass (3rd)** | and understanding of the | Sense of argument emerging | evidence of reading, with | of ability to collect | **professionally and** |
| **(*Threshold*)** | material. Some elements | though not completely | superficial linking to given | appropriate information | **effectively with others** as a |
|  | missing and flaws evident. | coherent. Some evidence to | text(s). | and undertake | member of a group, and |
|  |  | support views, but not always | Some academic conventions | straightforward research | meet most obligations to |
|  |  | consistent. Some relevant | evident and largely consistent, | tasks with external | others (e.g. to peers and |
|  |  | conclusions | but with some weaknesses. | guidance. | tutors). |
|  |  |  |  | Can **communicate** in a | Some evidence of ability to |

6 <http://staffnet.stmarys.ac.uk/academic-services/QualityAssuranceAndProgrammeAdministrationRegistry/Pages/Academic-Regulations.aspx>

\* These assessment criteria are generic and apply to all discipline areas at the relevant level across the University. Each Programme supplements these with its own discipline-specific criteria, in line with the appropriate subject benchmarks and other relevant requirements: this applies to the conferment of degrees and the marking of individual assessment tasks.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  | range of formats, including orally, at a standard appropriate for the discipline and professional-level employment but with evident weaknesses. | apply methods appropriately to address a well-defined **problem**. Able to **recognise own strengths and weaknesses** in relation to professional, digital and practical skills, identified by  others, but lacks insight in some areas. |
| **50-59 :** | Sound, routine knowledge and | Issues identified within given | Knowledge of literature | **E&R skills:** Can collect and | Can **work professionally** |
| **Pass (2.2)** | understanding of the material, | areas. An emerging awareness | beyond core text(s). Literature | interpret appropriate | **and effectively with others** |
|  | main concepts and key | of different stances and ability | used accurately but | information and | as a member of a group, |
|  | theories. | to use evidence to support a | descriptively. Academic skills | undertake | and meet most obligations |
|  | Some flaws may be evident. | coherent argument. | generally sound. | straightforward research | to others (e.g. to peers and |
|  |  | Broadly valid conclusions. |  | tasks with external | tutors). |
|  |  |  |  | guidance. | Can apply methods |
|  |  |  |  | Can **communicate** in a | accurately to address a |
|  |  |  |  | range of formats, | well-defined **problem**, and |
|  |  |  |  | including orally, at a | begin to appreciate the |
|  |  |  |  | standard appropriate for | complexity of the issues in |
|  |  |  |  | the discipline and | the discipline. Able to |
|  |  |  |  | professional-level | **evaluate own strengths** |
|  |  |  |  | employment. | **and weaknesses** in in |
|  |  |  |  |  | relation to professional, |
|  |  |  |  |  | digital and practical skills |
|  |  |  |  |  | identified by others. |
| **60-69 :** | Good, consistent knowledge | Good analytical ability. | Knowledge of the field of | **E&R skills:** Can collect and | Can **work professionally** |
| **Pass (2.1)** | and understanding of the | Acknowledgement of views of | literature appropriately used | interpret appropriate | **and very effectively with** |
|  | material, main concepts and | others. Arguments generally | to support views. Research- | information and | **others** as a member of a |
|  | key theories at this level. | logical, coherently expressed, | informed literature integrated | successfully undertake | group, and meet most |
|  |  | well organised and supported. | into the work. Good use of | straightforward research | obligations to others (e.g. |
|  |  | Sound conclusions. | academic conventions. | tasks with limited | to peers and tutors). |
|  |  |  |  | external guidance. | Can apply methods |
|  |  |  |  | Can **communicate** well | accurately to address a |
|  |  |  |  | and consistently in a | well-defined **problem**, |
|  |  |  |  | range of formats, | appreciating the complexity |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  | including orally appropriate for the discipline and professional-level employment. | of the issues in the discipline. Able to take initiative in **evaluating own strengths and weaknesses** in relation to professional,  digital and practical skills identified by others |
| **70-79 :** | Detailed knowledge and | Very good analysis | Critical engagement with | **E&R skills:** Can collect and | Can **work professionally** |
| **Pass (1st)** | understanding of the main | throughout. Perceptive and | appropriate reading. | interpret appropriate | **and very effectively with** |
|  | concepts/ theories at this | persuasive points made within | Knowledge of research- | information and | **others** as a member of a |
|  | level. Beginning to show | given area. Explicit | informed literature embedded | successfully undertake | group, showing leadership |
|  | awareness of the limitations | acknowledgement of other | in the work. | research tasks with a | skills where appropriate, |
|  | of the knowledge base. | stances. Arguments well- | Consistently accurate use of | degree of autonomy. | and meet all obligations to |
|  |  | articulated, and logically | academic conventions. | Can **communicate** very | others (e.g. peers & tutors). |
|  |  | developed with a range of |  | effectively in a range of | Can apply methods |
|  |  | evidence. |  | formats, including orally, | accurately and very |
|  |  |  |  | appropriate for the | effectively to address a |
|  |  |  |  | discipline and | well-defined **problem**, |
|  |  |  |  | professional-level | appreciating the complexity |
|  |  |  |  | employment. | of the issues in the |
|  |  |  |  |  | discipline. Able to |
|  |  |  |  |  | demonstrate insight and |
|  |  |  |  |  | autonomy in **evaluating** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **own strengths and** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **weaknesses** in relation to |
|  |  |  |  |  | professional, digital and |
|  |  |  |  |  | practical skills. |
| **80-100 :** | Highly detailed knowledge and | Strong conclusions. | Exceptionally wide range of | **E&R skills:** Can collect and | Can **work professionally** |
| **Pass (1st)** | understanding of material, | Logical, articulate analysis a | relevant literature used | interpret appropriate | **and exceptionally well** |
|  | concepts and theories at this | consistent feature. Persuasive | critically to inform argument, | information and | **with others** as a member of |
|  | level. Awareness of the | points made throughout the | balance discussion and/or | successfully undertake | a group, showing |
|  | ambiguities and limitations of | work within a highly | inform problem-solving. | research tasks with | leadership skills, |
|  | knowledge. | articulate, balanced argument. | Consistently accurate and | autonomy and | negotiating and meeting all |
|  |  | Judiciously selected evidence, | assured use of academic | exceptional success. | obligations to others (e.g. |
|  |  | drawn from relevant research. | conventions. | Can **communicate** highly | peers & tutors). |
|  |  | Convincing conclusions. |  | effectively in a range of | Can apply methods |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  | formats, including orally, | accurately and very |
| appropriate for the | effectively to address a |
| discipline and | well-defined **problem**, |
| professional-level | appreciating the complexity |
| employment. | of a range of issues. Able to |
|  | demonstrate insight and |
|  | autonomy in **evaluating** |
|  | **own strengths and** |
|  | **weaknesses** in relation to |
|  | professional, digital and |
|  | practical skills. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title  Date  Version  Seen By | Generic University Criteria7 for Assessment of Taught Programmes  29/02/16  2  Assessment Policy Review Working Group 29/02/16 |

7 For descriptors of assessment criteria refer to Table 1

# Generic University Criteria8 for Assessment of Taught Programmes

**University Assessment Criteria – FHEQ Level 5\***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grading**  **criteria** | **Knowledge and**  **Understanding** | **Intellectual skills** | **Scholarly practices** | **Enquiry and research**  **skills** | **Professional and life skills** |
| **Mark band** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **0-29 : Fail** | Major gaps in knowledge and understanding. Significant inaccuracies. | Unsubstantiated generalizations, made without use of any credible evidence. Lack of logic, leading to unsupportable conclusions or missing conclusions. Lack of  analysis and relevance. | No evidence of reading. Views are unsupported and non- authoritative. Academic conventions largely ignored. | Little or no evidence of the required skills in any of the areas identified for assessment at this level. | Little or no evidence of the required skills in any of the areas identified for assessment at this level. |
| **30-39 : Fail** | Gaps in knowledge and superficial understanding. Some inaccuracies. | Views/findings largely irrelevant, illogical or contradictory.  Generalisations/statements made with scant evidence. Conclusions lack relevance  and/or validity. | Evidence of little reading appropriate for this level and/or indiscriminate use of sources. Academic conventions used weakly. | Limited evidence of skills of research and enquiry in the range identified for assessment at this level. Significant weaknesses evident in several areas. | Limited evidence of skills in the range identified for assessment at this level.  Significant weaknesses evident in key areas. |
| **40-49 :** | Satisfactory knowledge and | Awareness of main issues. | Evidence of reading relevant | **E&R skills:** Some | Can **work with others** as a |
| **Pass (3rd)** | understanding of the material, | Structure of argument | sources, with some | evidence of ability to | member of a group, |
| **(*Threshold*)** | of established principles of | effective, but with some gaps | appropriate linking to given | collect and interpret | meeting most obligations to |
|  | area(s) of study, and of the | or weaknesses. Some | text(s). | appropriate | others, modifying |
|  | way in which those principles | evidence provided to support | Academic conventions evident | data/information and | responses appropriately. |
|  | have been developed. | findings, but not always | and largely consistent, with | undertake research tasks | Can identify key areas of |
|  |  | consistent. Some relevant | minor weaknesses. | with limited external | **problems** and generally |
|  |  | conclusions. |  | guidance. Can | choose appropriate |
|  |  |  |  | **communicate** findings in | methods for their |
|  |  |  |  | a range of formats, | resolution. |
|  |  |  |  | including orally, | Able to **recognise own** |
|  |  |  |  | appropriate to the | **strengths and weaknesses** |
|  |  |  |  | discipline(s), but with | in relation to professional |
|  |  |  |  | some weaknesses. | and practical skills, but with |

8 For descriptors of assessment criteria refer to Table 1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  | limited insight in some  areas. |
| **50-59 :**  **Pass (2.2)** | Broad knowledge and understanding of the material, of established principles of area(s) of study, and of the way in which those principles have been developed. | Issues identified and critically analysed within given areas. An awareness of different stances and ability to use evidence to support argument. Ability to apply concepts and principles outside context of study context. Generally sound conclusions. | Knowledge and analysis of a range of literature beyond core text(s). Literature used accurately and analytically. Academic skills generally sound. | **E&R skills:** Can undertake research-like tasks, drawing on a range of sources, with limited external guidance. Can **communicate** effectively and confidently in a range of formats, including orally, appropriate to the discipline(s) and audience(s). | Can **work effectively with others** as a member of a group, meeting obligations to others, modifying responses appropriately. Can identify key areas of **problems** and choose appropriate methods for their resolution in a considered manner.  Able to **evaluate own strengths and weaknesses** in relation to professional and practical skills, and to develop own evaluation criteria. |
| **60-69 :**  **Pass (2.1)** | Very good knowledge and understanding of the material, of established principles of area(s) of study, and of the way in which those principles have been developed. | Good level of analysis and synthesis. An awareness of different stances and ability to use evidence convincingly to support argument. Ability to apply concepts/principles effectively beyond context of study. Valid conclusions. | Knowledge of the field of literature used consistently to support findings. Research- informed literature integrated into the work. Very good use of academic conventions. | **E&R skills:** Can successfully complete research-like tasks, drawing on a range of sources, with limited external guidance.  Can **communicate** well, confidently and consistently in a range of formats, including orally, appropriate to the discipline(s). Can adapt style to different audiences. | Can **work very effectively and confidently with others** as a member of a group, meeting obligations to others, modifying responses appropriately. Can identify key areas of **problems** and choose, with autonomy, appropriate methods for their resolution in a considered manner.  Able to take initiative in **evaluating own strengths and weaknesses** in relation to professional and  practical skills identified by |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  | others and develop and  effectively apply own evaluation criteria. |
| **70-79 :**  **Pass (1st)** | Excellent knowledge and understanding of the material, the main concepts/ theories at this level. Awareness of the limitation of their knowledge, and how this influences any analyses and interpretations based on that knowledge. | Excellent analysis and synthesis. A range of perceptive points made within given area for this level of study. Arguments logically developed, supported by relevant evidence.  Acknowledgement of other stances. Strong conclusions. | Critical engagement with a range of reading. Knowledge of research-informed literature embedded in work. Consistently accurate use of academic conventions. | **E&R skills:** Can successfully complete research-like tasks, drawing on a range of sources, with a significant degree of autonomy. Can **communicate** very effectively and confidently in a range of formats, including orally, appropriate to the discipline(s) and different audiences. | Can **work very effectivel6y with confidently with others** as a member of a group, showing **leadership** skills where appropriate.  Can identify key areas of **problems** confidently and choose, with autonomy and notable effectiveness, appropriate methods for their resolution.  Able to show insight and autonomy in **evaluating own strengths and weaknesses** re professional and practical skills, showing  excellent judgement. |
| **80-100 :**  **Pass (1st)** | Exceptional knowledge and understanding of the material, the main concepts/ theories at this level. Awareness of the limitation of their knowledge, and how this influences any analyses and interpretations based on that knowledge. | Exceptional analysis and synthesis are consistent features. Perceptive, logically connected points made throughout the work within an eloquent, balanced argument. Evidence selected judiciously analysed.  Persuasive conclusions. | Exceptionally wide range of relevant literature evaluated and used critically to inform argument, balance discussion and/or inform problem- solving. Accurate and assured use of academic conventions. | **E&R skills:** Evidence of exceptional success in undertaking a range of research-like tasks with high degree of autonomy for the level.  Can **communicate** highly effectively, with diverse audiences, in a wide range of formats, including orally, as appropriate to the context. | Can **work exceptionally well with others** as a key member of a group, showing **leadership** skills where appropriate, meeting obligations to others.  Can identify key areas of **problems** confidently and choose, with autonomy and exceptional effectiveness, appropriate methods for their resolution.  Able to show insight and autonomy in **evaluating**  **own strengths and** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  | **weaknesses,** showing  outstanding judgement. |

The descriptors for the University’s generic assessment criteria are indicated at Table 1 below. Use of the Generic University Criteria and adoption at Programme level should be read in conjunction with the University’s Academic Regulations9.

***Table 1 - Descriptors of each assessment criterion:***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Knowledge and**  **Understanding** | **Intellectual skills** | **Scholarly practices** | **Enquiry and research skills** | **Professional and life skills** |
| Knowledge and | Analysis, synthesis, creativity, | Including use of relevant literature, | Including research-related | Including skills in creativity, digital |
| comprehension of the | deployment of structured | academic writing, academic | skills, and communicating | practices, working with others and |
| subject or field of enquiry | reasoning supported by | integrity, appropriate academic | findings in a style appropriate | as part of a group, presentation |
|  | evidence; focus on topic, critical | conventions including referencing | for a given audience and | skills, project management skills |
|  | reflection and drawing | protocols and adherence to word- | context | and acting on critical reflection of |
|  | conclusions | length or time limits |  | own practice |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title  Date  Version  Seen by | Generic University Criteria10 for Assessment of Taught Programmes  26/02/16  1  Assessment Policy Review Working Group 29/02/16 |

9 <http://staffnet.stmarys.ac.uk/academic-services/QualityAssuranceAndProgrammeAdministrationRegistry/Pages/Academic-Regulations.aspx>

\* These assessment criteria are generic and apply to all discipline areas at the relevant level across the University. Each Programme supplements these with its own discipline-specific criteria, in line with the appropriate subject benchmarks and other relevant requirements: this applies to the conferment of degrees and the marking of individual assessment tasks. 10 For descriptors of assessment criteria refer to Table 1

# Generic University Criteria11 12for Assessment of Taught Programmes

**University Assessment Criteria – FHEQ Level 6\***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grading**  **criteria** | **Knowledge and**  **Understanding** | **Intellectual skills** | **Scholarly practices** | **Enquiry and research**  **skills** | **Professional and life skills** |
| **Mark band** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **0-29 : Fail** | Major gaps in knowledge and understanding of material at this level. Substantial inaccuracies. | Unsubstantiated generalisations, made without use of any credible evidence. Lack of logic, leading to unsupportable/missing conclusions. Lack of any attempt to analyse, synthesise or evaluate. Poor  communication of ideas. | Little evidence of reading. Views and findings unsupported and non- authoritative. Academic conventions largely ignored. | Little or no evidence of the required skills in any of the graduate skills identified in the programme specification at this level. |  |
| **30-39 : Fail** | Gaps in knowledge and superficial understanding with only superficial understanding. Some significant inaccuracies. | Some evidence of analytical intellectual skills, but for the most part descriptive.  Ideas/findings sometimes illogical and contradictory. Generalized statements made with scant evidence.  Conclusions lack relevance. | Evidence of little reading and/or of reliance on inappropriate sources, and/or indiscriminate use of sources. Academic conventions used inconsistently. | Limited evidence of the research skills identified in the programme specification. Significant weaknesses evident, which suggest that the candidate has not yet gained the research skills required for postgraduate  study. | Limited evidence of the graduate skills identified in the programme specification. Significant weaknesses evident, which suggest that the candidate has not gained the skills necessary for graduate- level employment. |
| **40-49 :**  **Pass (3rd) (*Threshold*)** | Satisfactory understanding of key aspects of field of study; coherent knowledge, at least informed by current research and scholarly activity in the subject discipline. | Evidence of some logical, analytical thinking and some attempts to synthesise, albeit with some weaknesses. Some evidence to support findings/views, but evidence  not consistently interpreted. | References to a range of relevant sources. Some omissions and minor errors. Academic conventions evident and largely consistent, with minor lapses. | **E&R skills:** Can competently undertake reasonably straightforward research tasks with minimum guidance, but with minor  weaknesses. Can | Can generally **work effectively within a team,** negotiating in a professional manner and managing conflict. Is largely confident and  effective in **identifying and** |

11 For descriptors of assessment criteria refer to Table 1

12 Use of the Generic University Criteria and adoption at Programme level should be read in conjunction with the University’s Academic Regulations12

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Some relevant conclusions. |  | **communicate** in a range of formats, including orally, at a standard appropriate for graduate- level employment, and with limited weaknesses. | **defining complex problems** and applying knowledge and methods to their solution.  Able to **recognise own strengths and weaknesses** in relation to graduate employment, with minor areas of weakness. |
| **50-59 :**  **Pass (2.2)** | Systematic understanding of  the field(s) of study, as indicated by relevant subject bench mark statements for the final degree programme. | Evidence of some logical,  analytical thinking and synthesis. Can analyse new and/or abstract data and situations without guidance. An emerging awareness of different stances and ability to use evidence to support the argument. Valid conclusions. | Knowledge, analysis and  evaluation of a range of research-informed literature, including sources retrieved, analysed independently.  Academic skills consistently applied. | **E&R skills:** Can  competently undertake reasonably straightforward research tasks with minimum guidance. Can **communicate** effectively in a range of formats, including orally, at a standard appropriate for graduate-level employment. Adopts style and register  appropriate for audience. | Can consistently **work**  **effectively within a team,** negotiating in a professional manner and managing conflict. Is confident and flexible in **identifying and defining complex problems** and applying knowledge and methods to their solution. Able to **evaluate own strengths and weaknesses** in relation to graduate  employment. |
| **60-69 :**  **Pass (2.1)** | Good knowledge and understanding of the field(s) of study, as indicated by relevant subject bench mark statements for the final degree programme. | Sound, logical, analytical thing; synthesis and evaluation.  Ability to devise and sustain persuasive arguments, and to review the reliability, validity & significance of evidence.  Ability to communicate ideas and evidence accurately and convincingly. Sound, convincing conclusions. | Good knowledge, analysis and evaluation of a range of research-informed literature, including sources retrieved, analysed independently with accuracy and assurance. Good academic skills, consistently applied. | **E&R skills:** Can successfully complete a range of research-like tasks, including evaluation, with very limited external guidance. Can **communicate** well, confidently and consistently in a range of formats, including orally, at a standard appropriate for graduate-level  employment. Adopts | Can consistently **work very well within a team,** leading & negotiating in a professional manner and managing conflict.  Is confident and flexible in **identifying and defining a range of complex problems** and applying knowledge and methods to their solution.  Able to take initiative in  **evaluating own strengths** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  | style and register to engage audience(s). | **and weaknesses** in relation to graduate-level professional and practical skills, and act autonomously to develop  new areas of skills as necessary. |
| **70-79 :**  **Pass (1st)** | Excellent knowledge and  understanding of the material, the main concepts/ theories of the discipline. Clear awareness of the limitation of their knowledge, and how this influences any analyses and interpretations based on that knowledge. | Thoroughly logical work,  supported by judiciously selected and evaluated evidence. High quality analysis, developed independently or through effective collaboration. Ability to investigate contradictory information and identify reasons for contradictions.  Strong conclusions. | Excellent knowledge of  research informed literature embedded in the work.  Consistent analysis and evaluation of sources. High- level academic skills consistently applied. | **E&R skills:** Can very  successfully complete a range of research-like tasks, including evaluation, with a significant degree of autonomy. Can **communicate** professionally and confidently in a range of formats for diverse audiences, at a high standard appropriate for graduate-level employment. | Can **work professionally**  **within a team,** showing leadership skills as appropriate, managing conflict and meeting obligations.  Is professional and flexible in **autonomously defining a range of complex problems** and applying knowledge and methods to solution.  Shows insight and autonomy in **evaluating own strengths and weaknesses** and developing professional and practical skills needed for graduate-level  employment. |
| **80-100 :**  **Pass (1st)** | Exceptionally knowledge and understanding of the material, the main concepts/ theories of the discipline. Awareness of the ambiguities and limitation of knowledge. | Exceptional work; judiciously selected and evaluated evidence. Very high quality analysis, developed independently or through effective collaboration. Ability to investigate contradictory information and identify reasons for contradictions.  Highly persuasive conclusions. | Outstanding knowledge of research-informed literature embedded in the work.  Consistent analysis and evaluation of sources. High- level academic skills consistently and professionally applied. | **E&R skills:** Impressive ability to draw on own research, and that of others, to formulate meaningful research questions. Exceptionally successful in a wide range of research tasks, including evaluation, with  a high degree of | Can **work exceptionally well and professionally within a team,** showing leadership skills as appropriate, managing conflict, and meeting all obligations.  Is exceptionally professional and flexible in  **autonomously defining and** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  | autonomy. Can **communicate** findings with real professionalism, adapting style easily for given audiences. | **solving a range of complex problems.** Outstanding ability to **evaluate own strengths and weakness,** showing outstanding  attributes for graduate- level employment. |

The descriptors for the University’s generic assessment criteria are indicated at Table 1 below. Use of the Generic University Criteria and adoption at Programme level should be read in conjunction with the University’s Academic Regulations13.

# Table 1 - Descriptors of each assessment criterion:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Knowledge and Understanding** | **Intellectual skills** | **Scholarly practices** | **Enquiry and research skills** | **Professional and life skills** |
| Knowledge and | Analysis, synthesis, creativity, | Including use of relevant literature, | Including research-related | Including skills in creativity, digital |
| comprehension of the | deployment of structured | academic writing, academic | skills, and communicating | practices, working with others and |
| subject or field of enquiry | reasoning supported by | integrity, appropriate academic | findings in a style appropriate | as part of a group, presentation |
|  | evidence; focus on topic, critical | conventions including referencing | for a given audience and | skills, project management skills |
|  | reflection and drawing | protocols and adherence to word- | context | and acting on critical reflection of |
|  | conclusions | length or time limits |  | own practice |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title  Date  Version  Seen by | Generic University Criteria14 for Assessment of Taught Programmes  26/02/16  1  Assessment Policy Review Working Group 29/02/16 |

13 <http://staffnet.stmarys.ac.uk/academic-services/QualityAssuranceAndProgrammeAdministrationRegistry/Pages/Academic-Regulations.aspx>

\* These assessment criteria are generic and apply to all discipline areas at the relevant level across the University. Each Programme supplements these with its own discipline-specific criteria, in line with the appropriate subject benchmarks and other relevant requirements: this applies to the conferment of degrees and the marking of individual assessment tasks. 14 For descriptors of assessment criteria refer to Table 1