

COMMON AWARDS ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AT LEVEL 4

RESOURCES FOR OTHERS

	86 - 100	76 – 85	70 - 75	65 - 69	60 - 64	55 - 59	50 - 54
Evidence of fulfilment of all relevant learning outcomes	Overwhelming	Excellent and extensive	Excellent	Very good	Good	Sound	Sound, but with limitations
Knowledge and understanding in resource and/or commentary – understanding of relevant subject matter	Thorough, in- depth and impressive understanding	Very wide-ranging and very thorough understanding	Wide-ranging and thorough understanding	Very good understanding of relevant material	Secure understanding of relevant material	Sound understanding of relevant material	Some sound understanding with limitations
Resource – ability to integrate subject and context	Exceptionally insightful integration, imaginative and well informed	Exceptional integration, , creative and well informed	Excellent integration, creative, and well informed	Very good integration, well informed and with evidence of creativity	Good and well informed integration	Sound and informed integration	Sound integration but patchy and occasionally uninformed
Tailoring of content to the genre of the resource, its context, audience and situation	Superb tailoring to genre and context	Outstanding tailoring to genre and context	Excellent tailoring to genre and context	Very good tailoring	Good tailoring	Generally appropriate tailoring	Some but limited tailoring
Presentation of resource – as appropriate, structure, clarity, use of language and style	Exemplary structure, style and presentation	Excellent and attractive presentation	Excellent presentation	Very clear presentation	Clear presentation	Sound presentation	Generally comprehensible but some flaws in presentation and/or lack of clarity
Commentary – reflection, integration of theory and practice	Exceptionally insightful integration, imaginative and well informed	Exceptional integration, creative and well informed	Excellent integration, creative, and well informed	Very good and well informed integration	Good and informed integration	Sound and informed integration	Sound integration but patchy and occasionally uninformed
Critical thinking, analysis, synthesis and argument	Exemplary clarity of thought, argument, synthesis	Outstanding clarity of thought, argument, analysis, synthesis	Excellent clarity of thought, argument, analysis, synthesis	Very good, with strong evidence of analytical thinking	Good, with evidence of analytical thinking	Adequate: some evidence of argument and analysis, but some weaknesses	Some evidence of argument and analysis but inconsistent
Presentation of commentary: clarity, organisation, language and style, referencing	Lucid and exemplary presentation	Fluent and outstanding presentation	Excellent, clear presentation	Very good, clear presentation	Good, clear presentation	Adequate presentation	Adequate presentation but some flaws
Overall impression	Exemplary	Outstanding	Excellent	Very good	Good	Sound	Fair

	45 - 49	40 – 44	35 - 39	30 - 34	10 - 29	0 – 9
Evidence of fulfilment of all relevant learning outcomes	Sufficient but restricted	Just sufficient	Nearly sufficient	Insufficient, but much is covered	Clearly insufficient	None or minimal
Knowledge and understanding in resource and/or commentary – understanding of relevant subject matter	Some grasp but many errors and/or gaps in coverage and relevance	Some general understanding but many errors, omissions and misunderstandings	Little grasp with a multitude of errors, misunderstandings and omissions	Barely relevant, largely erroneous	Negligible grasp or relevance with erroneous material	No understanding
Resource – ability to integrate subject and context	Patchy integration, unsound, lacking authenticity	Just adequate integration	Inadequate integration	Inadequate integration – lack of understanding	Minimal integration	No integration
Tailoring of content to the genre of the resource, its context, audience and situation	Some but very limited tailoring	Very poor connection to genre and context	Inadequate connection to genre and context	Little awareness of genre and context	Indifferent to genre and context	No connection to genre and context
Presentation of resource – as appropriate, structure, clarity, use of language and style	Generally comprehensible but significant flaws in presentation	Generally comprehensible, but poor presentation with a number of flaws	Unclear and poor presentation	Confused with many flaws in presentation	Unacceptable presentation	Little or no comprehensible material
Commentary – reflection, integration of theory and practice	Patchy integration - some relevant reflection but limited	Just adequate integration – limited evidence of relevant reflection	Inadequate integration – little evidence of relevant reflection	Inadequate integration – very little evidence of relevant reflection	Minimal integration	No integration
Critical thinking, analysis, synthesis and argument	Some, but limited	Some but very limited	Very little	Minimal	Incoherent, inaccurate or inappropriate	No discernible argument or analysis
Presentation of commentary: clarity, organisation, language and style, referencing	Basically acceptable presentation, but with flaws	Just acceptable presentation, but a number of flaws	Poor presentation	A multitude of flaws in presentation	Unacceptable presentation; largely incomprehensible	Insufficient evidence
Overall impression	Weak	Very weak	Poor	Very poor	Unacceptable	Unacceptable

COMMON AWARDS ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AT LEVEL 5

RESOURCES FOR OTHERS

	86 - 100	76 – 85	70 - 75	65 - 69	60 - 64	55 - 59	50 - 54
Evidence of fulfilment of all relevant learning outcomes	Overwhelming	Excellent and extensive	Excellent	Very good	Good	Sound	Sound, but with limitations
Knowledge and understanding in resource and/or commentary – understanding of relevant subject matter	Thorough, insightful and impressive understanding	Very wide-ranging and very insightful understanding	Wide-ranging and thorough understanding	Very good understanding of relevant material	Secure understanding of relevant material	Sound understanding of relevant material	Some sound understanding with limitations
Resource – ability to integrate subject and context	Exceptionally insightful integration, imaginative and well informed	Exceptional integration, , independently conceived, creative and well informed	Excellent integration, creative, and well informed	Very good integration, well informed and with evidence of creativity	Good and well informed integration	Sound and informed integration	Sound integration but patchy and occasionally uninformed
Tailoring of content to the genre of the resource, its context, audience and situation	Superb tailoring to genre and context	Outstanding tailoring to genre and context	Excellent tailoring to genre and context	Very good tailoring	Good tailoring	Generally appropriate tailoring	Some but limited tailoring
Presentation of resource – as appropriate, structure, clarity, use of language and style	Exemplary structure, style and presentation	Excellent and attractive presentation	Excellent presentation	Very clear presentation	Clear presentation	Sound presentation	Generally comprehensible but some flaws in presentation and/or lack of clarity
Commentary – reflection, integration of theory and practice	Exceptionally insightful integration, independently conceived, imaginative and well informed	Exceptional integration, independently conceived, creative and well informed	Excellent integration, creative, and well informed	Very good and well informed integration	Good and informed integration	Sound and informed integration	Sound integration but patchy and occasionally uninformed
Critical thinking, analysis, synthesis and argument	Exemplary clarity and independence of thought; exemplary argument and synthesis	Outstanding clarity and independence of thought; outstanding argument, analysis, synthesis; evidence of critical judgement	Excellent clarity of thought, argument, analysis, synthesis; evidence of critical judgement	Very good, with strong evidence of critical analysis	Good, with evidence of critical analysis	Adequate: some evidence of argument and analysis, but some weaknesses	Some evidence of argument and analysis but inconsistent
Presentation of commentary: clarity, organisation, language and style, referencing	Lucid and exemplary presentation	Fluent and outstanding presentation	Excellent, clear presentation	Very good, clear presentation	Good, clear presentation	Adequate presentation	Adequate presentation but some flaws
Overall impression	Exemplary	Outstanding	Excellent	Very good	Good	Sound	Fair

	45 - 49	40 – 44	35 - 39	30 - 34	10 - 29	0 – 9
Evidence of fulfilment of all relevant learning outcomes	Sufficient but restricted	Just sufficient	Nearly sufficient	Insufficient, but much is covered	Clearly insufficient	None or minimal
Knowledge and understanding in resource and/or commentary – understanding of relevant subject matter	Some grasp but many errors and/or gaps in coverage and relevance	Some general understanding but many errors, omissions and misunderstandings	Little grasp with a multitude of errors, misunderstandings and omissions	Barely relevant, largely erroneous	Negligible grasp or relevance with erroneous material	No understanding
Resource – ability to integrate subject and context	Patchy integration, unsound, lacking authenticity	Just adequate integration	Inadequate integration	Inadequate integration – lack of understanding	Minimal integration	No integration
Tailoring of content to the genre of the resource, its context, audience and situation	Some but very limited tailoring	Very poor connection to genre and context	Inadequate connection to genre and context	Little awareness of genre and context	Indifferent to genre and context	No connection to genre and context
Presentation of resource – as appropriate, structure, clarity, use of language and style	Generally comprehensible but significant flaws in presentation	Generally comprehensible, but poor presentation with a number of flaws	Unclear and poor presentation	Confused with many flaws in presentation	Unacceptable presentation	Little or no comprehensible material
Commentary – reflection, integration of theory and practice	Patchy integration - some relevant reflection but limited	Just adequate integration – limited evidence of relevant reflection	Inadequate integration – little evidence of relevant reflection	Inadequate integration – very little evidence of relevant reflection	Minimal integration	No integration
Critical thinking, analysis, synthesis and argument	Some, but limited	Some but very limited	Very little	Minimal	Incoherent, inaccurate or inappropriate	No discernible argument or analysis
Presentation of commentary: clarity, organisation, language and style, referencing	Basically acceptable presentation, but with flaws	Just acceptable presentation, but a number of flaws	Poor presentation	A multitude of flaws in presentation	Unacceptable presentation; largely incomprehensible	Insufficient evidence
Overall impression	Weak	Very weak	Poor	Very poor	Unacceptable	Unacceptable

COMMON AWARDS ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AT LEVEL 6

RESOURCES FOR OTHERS

	86 - 100	76 – 85	70 - 75	65 - 69	60 - 64	55 - 59	50 - 54
Evidence of fulfilment of all relevant learning outcomes	Overwhelming	Excellent and extensive	Excellent	Very good	Good	Sound	Sound, but with limitations
Knowledge and understanding in resource and/or commentary – understanding of relevant subject matter	Sophisticated, thorough and impressive understanding	Very wide-ranging and very insightful understanding	Wide-ranging and thorough understanding	Very good understanding of relevant material	Secure understanding of relevant material	Sound understanding of relevant material	Some sound understanding with limitations
Resource – ability to integrate subject and context	Exceptionally insightful integration, imaginative and well informed	Exceptional integration, independently conceived, creative and well informed	Excellent integration, creative, and well informed	Very good integration, well informed and with evidence of creativity	Good and well informed integration	Sound and informed integration	Sound integration but patchy and occasionally uninformed
Tailoring of content to the genre of the resource, its context, audience and situation	Superb tailoring to genre and context	Outstanding tailoring to genre and context	Excellent tailoring to genre and context	Very good tailoring	Good tailoring	Generally appropriate tailoring	Some but limited tailoring
Presentation of resource – as appropriate, structure, clarity, use of language and style	Exemplary structure, style and presentation	Excellent and attractive presentation	Excellent presentation	Very clear presentation	Clear presentation	Sound presentation	Generally comprehensible but some flaws in presentation and/or lack of clarity
Commentary – reflection, integration of theory and practice	Exceptionally insightful integration, independently conceived, imaginative and well informed	Exceptional integration, independently conceived creative and well informed	Excellent integration, creative, and well informed	Very good and well informed integration	Good and informed integration	Sound and informed integration	Sound integration but patchy and occasionally uninformed
Critical thinking, analysis, synthesis and argument	Exemplary clarity, independence and originality of thought; exemplary argument and synthesis	Outstanding clarity and independence of thought; outstanding argument, analysis, synthesis; evidence of critical judgement	Excellent clarity of thought, argument, analysis, synthesis; evidence of critical judgement	Very good, with strong evidence of critical analysis	Good, with evidence of critical analysis	Adequate: some evidence of argument and analysis, but some weaknesses	Some evidence of argument and analysis but inconsistent
Presentation of commentary: clarity, organisation, language and style, referencing	Lucid and exemplary presentation	Fluent and outstanding presentation	Excellent, clear presentation	Very good, clear presentation	Good, clear presentation	Adequate presentation	Adequate presentation but some flaws
Overall impression	Exemplary	Outstanding	Excellent	Very good	Good	Sound	Fair

	45 - 49	40 – 44	35 - 39	30 - 34	10 - 29	0 – 9
Evidence of fulfilment of all relevant learning outcomes	Sufficient but restricted	Just sufficient	Nearly sufficient	Insufficient, but much is covered	Clearly insufficient	None or minimal
Knowledge and understanding in resource and/or commentary – understanding of relevant subject matter	Some grasp but many errors and/or gaps in coverage and relevance	Some general understanding but many errors, omissions and misunderstandings	Little grasp with a multitude of errors, misunderstandings and omissions	Barely relevant, largely erroneous	Negligible grasp or relevance with erroneous material	No understanding
Resource – ability to integrate subject and context	Patchy integration, unsound, lacking authenticity	Just adequate integration	Inadequate integration	Inadequate integration – lack of understanding	Minimal integration	No integration
Tailoring of content to the genre of the resource, its context, audience and situation	Some but very limited tailoring	Very poor connection to genre and context	Inadequate connection to genre and context	Little awareness of genre and context	Indifferent to genre and context	No connection to genre and context
Presentation of resource – as appropriate, structure, clarity, use of language and style	Generally comprehensible but significant flaws in presentation	Generally comprehensible, but poor presentation with a number of flaws	Unclear and poor presentation	Confused with many flaws in presentation	Unacceptable presentation	Little or no comprehensible material
Commentary – reflection, integration of theory and practice	Patchy integration - some relevant reflection but limited	Just adequate integration – limited evidence of relevant reflection	Inadequate integration – little evidence of relevant reflection	Inadequate integration – very little evidence of relevant reflection	Minimal integration	No integration
Critical thinking, analysis, synthesis and argument	Some, but limited	Some but very limited	Very little	Minimal	Incoherent, inaccurate or inappropriate	No discernible argument or analysis
Presentation of commentary: clarity, organisation, language and style, referencing	Basically acceptable presentation, but with flaws	Just acceptable presentation, but a number of flaws	Poor presentation	A multitude of flaws in presentation	Unacceptable presentation; largely incomprehensible	Insufficient evidence
Overall impression	Weak	Very weak	Poor	Very poor	Unacceptable	Unacceptable

COMMON AWARDS ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AT LEVEL 7

RESOURCES FOR OTHERS

	86 - 100	76 - 85	70 - 75	65 - 69	60 - 64	55 - 59
Evidence of fulfilment of all relevant learning outcomes	Fully satisfied at a consistently high level	Amply satisfied at a high level	Satisfied, many at a high level	Satisfied, some at a high level	Satisfied, many are more than satisfied	Satisfied, some are more than satisfied
Knowledge and understanding in resource and/or commentary – thorough understanding of relevant subject matter	Publishable quality; depth and breadth of understanding	Potentially publishable; depth and breadth of understanding	Excellent depth and breadth of understanding	Very good depth and breadth of understanding	Good depth and breadth of understanding	Adequate depth and breadth of understanding
Resource – ability to integrate subject and context	Exceptionally insightful integration, significant and informed by recent scholarship	Exceptional integration, significant and informed by recent scholarship	Excellent integration, informed by some recent scholarship	Very good integration, informed by some recent scholarship	Good integration with some reference to recent scholarship	Sound integration
Tailoring to the genre of the resource, its context, audience and situation	Superbly tailored to genre and context	Outstanding tailoring to genre and context	Excellent tailoring to genre and context	Very good tailoring to genre and context	Good tailoring to genre and context	Generally appropriate tailoring to genre and context
Presentation of resource – as appropriate, structure, clarity, use of language and style	Highest professional standards in presentation, structure, style and use of language	Professional standards in presentation, structure, style and use of language	Very good standards of presentation, structure, style and use of language	Well presented and structured; very good and clear use of language	Clear presentation, structure, style and use of language	Adequate presentation, structure and style
Commentary – ability to integrate subject and context	Exceptionally insightful integration, significant and informed by recent scholarship	Exceptional integration, significant and informed by recent scholarship	Excellent integration, informed by some recent scholarship	Very good integration, informed by some recent scholarship	Good integration, with some reference to recent scholarship	Sound integration
Critical thinking, analysis, synthesis and argument	Exceptional analysis and synthesis; creative, insightful and original, with critical depth	Excellent, insightful analysis and synthesis; insightful and original with critical depth	Excellent independent analysis and synthesis; high accuracy and good critical depth	Very good ability to analyse, argue, synthesise information	Good ability to analyse, argue, synthesise	Reasonable ability to analyse, argue and synthesise
Presentation of commentary: clarity, organisation, language and style, referencing	Highest professional standards; lucid, fluent, imaginative and compelling language and style	Professional standards; lucid, fluent and compelling language and style	Very good standards of presentation and organisation; clear and fluent language and style	Well presented and organised; very good and clear use of language	Clear presentation, organization, style and use of language	Adequate presentation, organization and style
Overall impression	Exemplary	Outstanding	Excellent	Very good	Good	Acceptable

	50 – 54	40 - 49	30 - 39	20 - 29	10 - 19	0 - 9
Evidence of fulfilment of all relevant learning outcomes	Satisfied	Some are satisfied	Few are satisfied	Few, if any, are satisfied	Very few, if any, are satisfied	None are satisfied
Knowledge and understanding – thorough understanding of relevant subject matter	Adequate breadth and depth of understanding but some gaps	Some grasp of field but patchy and inadequate	Partial and inadequate grasp of field	Severely limited grasp of field	Barely discernible grasp of field	No grasp of field
Resource – ability to integrate subject and context	Adequate integration but some inaccuracies	Some but little integration, poorly informed lacking authenticity	Very little integration, unsound	Minimal integration, often inappropriate	No persuasive integration	No integration
Tailoring to the genre of the resource, its context, audience and situation	Adequate tailoring to genre and context	Some but limited tailoring to genre and context	Very poor connection to genre and context	Little awareness of genre and context	Indifferent to genre and context	No connection to genre and context
Presentation of resource – as appropriate, structure, clarity, use of language and style	Adequate presentation, structure and style with some flaws	Inadequate presentation, structure and style, generally poor and with some significant flaws	Consistently poor presentation, structure and style with significant flaws	Very poor presentation with many flaws	Very poor presentation with a multitude of flaws	Unacceptable presentation, structure and style
Commentary – ability to integrate subject and context	Adequate integration but some inaccuracies	Little integration, poorly informed lacking authenticity	Very little integration, unsound	Minimal integration, often inappropriate	No persuasive integration	No integration
Critical thinking, analysis, synthesis, argument	Some but limited ability to analyse, argue and synthesise, not consistently maintained	Some but inadequate application of thinking to resource – limited evidence of relevant reflection	Little evidence of applying relevant thinking to resource	Very little evidence of applying thinking to resource	No application of thinking to resource	No evidence
Presentation of commentary: clarity, organisation, language and style, referencing	Adequate presentation but with some flaws	Inadequate presentation, generally poor with some significant flaws	Consistently poor presentation with significant flaws	Very poor presentation with many flaws	Very poor presentation with a multitude of flaws	Unacceptable presentation; omissions, errors, irrelevant sources
Overall impression	Adequate	Inadequate on balance	Inadequate	Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Abysmal