

10.1 Annex 1

Undergraduate Level 1: LUBS Generic Assessment Criteria (FHEQ 4)

These marking criteria are generic and designed to be used as guidance. The levels structure relates to National Qualifications Framework (NQF) curriculum levels in which students demonstrate progression as they move between levels (see QAA 2014). The mark awarded will take into consideration the 'best fit' band for that piece of work, i.e. the work may display one or two of the characteristics in a particular band, but may not achieve the standard of the band overall. The mark awarded should reflect the overall best fit band for that piece of work. For less generic pieces of assessment, marking criteria should be provided on a modular basis and tailored to these particular forms of assessment, for example group work and oral presentations.

Grade	Knowledge and Understanding	Research and evidence	Analysis and Evaluation	Presentation
	<i>range, depth and understanding of principles and concepts; evaluation and interpretation</i>	<i>identification of relevant data/literature/information to support task</i>	<i>application of technique/interpretation of qualitative and quantitative data/synthesis</i>	<i>argument/focus/structure/conclusions</i>
93-100 Exceptional	Exceptional knowledge of key foundational principles and concepts at undergraduate level; ability to evaluate and interpret these innovatively within the area of study. Awareness of ambiguities of knowledge	Exceptionally wide range of appropriate research-informed reading beyond the taught elements of the module; ability to decipher relevant data/information/sources to address question/investigation	Exceptional ability to identify and apply relevant techniques to present, evaluate and interpret quantitative and/or qualitative data in accordance with foundational theories; sophisticated interpretation of key arguments and identification of points of difference in literature	Exceptionally coherent, clear, balanced and persuasive argument; strong focus on relevant issues; use of logical structure including clear, valid and reflective conclusions; accurate and consistent citation and referencing
70-92 Excellent	Excellent knowledge of key foundational principles and concepts at undergraduate level; ability to evaluate and interpret these reflectively within the area of study. Begins to show awareness of limitations to knowledge	Very high quality evidence of appropriate research-informed reading beyond the taught elements of the module; ability to engage with relevant data/information/sources to address question/investigation	Excellent ability to identify and apply relevant techniques to present, evaluate and interpret quantitative and/or qualitative data in accordance with foundational theories; clearly identifies relevant arguments and points of difference in literature	Very high quality, coherent, clear, balanced and persuasive argument; strong focus on relevant issues; use of logical structure including clear, valid and reflective conclusions; accurate and consistent citation and referencing
60-69 Good	Good knowledge of foundational principles and concepts at undergraduate level; ability to evaluate and interpret these within the area of study	High quality evidence of appropriate research-informed reading beyond the taught elements of the module; ability to locate required data/information/sources to address question/investigation	Good ability to apply required techniques to present, evaluate and interpret quantitative and/or qualitative data in accordance with foundational theories; identifies key arguments and points of difference in literature	High quality, coherent, clear and balanced argument; strong focus on relevant issues; use of logical structure including clear and valid conclusions; accurate and consistent citation and referencing
50-59 Reasonable	Reasonable knowledge of foundational principles and concepts at undergraduate level; shows some ability to evaluate and interpret these within the area of study; some errors may be evident	Evidence of appropriate reading within the taught elements of the module; competent ability to locate data/information/sources to address question/investigation	Competency in applying required techniques to present, evaluate and interpret quantitative and/or qualitative data in accordance with foundational theories; identifies arguments and points of difference in literature but often descriptively	Reasonable, clear argument; focus on relevant issues; appropriate structure with good conclusion; accurate and consistent citation and referencing
40-49 Limited	Threshold level Adequate knowledge of foundational principles and concepts at undergraduate level; shows limited ability to evaluate and interpret these within the area of study; some errors and omissions evident	Threshold level Use of set reading only; limited ability to locate data/information/sources to address question/investigation	Threshold level Limited ability to apply some techniques to present, evaluate and interpret quantitative and/or qualitative data in accordance with foundational theories; limited ability to identify arguments and points of difference in literature; descriptive	Threshold level Limited argument; reasonable focus; structure evident; evidence of largely correct referencing and citation
35-39 Poor	Work does not meet the standards required to pass; gaps in knowledge of foundational principles and concepts; superficial attempts to evaluate or interpret these	Little evidence of reading within the taught elements of the module; insufficient ability to locate data/information/sources to address question/investigation	Lacking in ability to apply techniques to present, evaluate and interpret quantitative and/or qualitative data; little understanding of arguments and points of difference in literature	Work does not meet the standards required to pass; unstructured argument; lacking in focus; severe weaknesses in referencing and citation

1-34
Very Poor

Work is well below the standards required to pass; major gaps in knowledge of foundational principles and concepts; lacks evaluation and interpretation

No evidence of reading; unable to locate data/information/sources

No techniques used to present, evaluate and interpret data; no understanding of arguments and literature

Work is well below the standards required to pass; lacks argument; no focus; no referencing

0
Work of no merit or absent