

**10.2 Annex
2**

Undergraduate Level 2: LUBS Generic Assessment Criteria (FHEQ 5)

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.

	Knowledge and Understanding	Research and evidence	Analysis and Evaluation	Presentation
Grade	<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; referencing</i>
93-100 Exceptional	Exceptional knowledge of appropriate principles and concepts; excellent critical understanding of ways in which principles and ideas have developed; considerable understanding of the limits of own knowledge, and how this influences analyses/interpretations	Exceptionally wide range of research-informed reading beyond the taught elements of the module; perceptive ability to identify data, information and/or sources appropriate to nature of investigation/question	Exceptional application of appropriate methods of enquiry relevant to investigation/question/data; strong ability to evaluate critically and authoritatively different approaches and an excellent understanding of their limits; outstanding level of synthesis in addition to analysis; ability to apply concepts extensively beyond areas in which they were first studied; proposes own insightful ideas/interpretations	Exceptionally coherent, clear, balanced and persuasive argument; convincing 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 appropriate principles and concepts; considerable ability to understand critically ways in which principles and ideas have developed; understanding of the limits of own knowledge, and how this influences analyses/interpretations	Very high quality evidence of research-informed reading beyond the taught elements of the module; considerable ability to identify data, information and/or sources appropriate to nature of investigation/question	Meticulous and consistent application of appropriate methods of enquiry relevant to investigation/question/data; ability to evaluate critically different approaches including an understanding of their limits; credible level of synthesis in addition to analysis; ability to apply concepts outside areas in which they were first studied; proposes own advanced ideas/interpretations	Very high quality, coherent, clear, balanced and persuasive argument; convincing 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 appropriate principles and concepts; ability to understand critically ways in which principles and ideas have developed; some awareness of limits to knowledge	High quality evidence of research-informed reading beyond the taught elements of the module; ability to identify data, information and/or sources appropriate to nature of investigation/question	Good application of appropriate methods of enquiry relevant to investigation/question/data; ability to evaluate critically the appropriateness of different approaches including their limits; good level of synthesis in addition to analysis; ability to apply concepts outside areas in which they were first studied; proposes own good ideas/interpretations	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 principles and concepts; some ability to understand ways in which principles and ideas have developed; limited awareness of limits to knowledge	Some evidence of research-informed reading relevant to the module; competent ability to identify data, information and/or sources appropriate to nature of investigation/question	Competency in applying methods of enquiry relevant to investigation/question/data; some ability to evaluate critically the appropriateness of different approaches; some ability to apply concepts outside areas in which they were first studied; proposes some good independent ideas/interpretations	Reasonable, clear argument; focus on relevant issues; appropriate logical structure with good conclusion; accurate and consistent citation and referencing

40-49 Limited	<p style="text-align: center;">Threshold level</p> <p>Limited knowledge of principles and concepts; limited ability to understand ways in which principles and ideas have developed; basic awareness of limits to knowledge</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Threshold level</p> <p>Limited evidence of research-informed reading relevant to the module; ability to identify some data, information and/or sources appropriate to the nature of investigation/question</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Threshold level</p> <p>Limited application of some methods of enquiry relevant to investigation/question/data; shows some ability to evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches; proposes limited independent ideas/interpretations</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Threshold level</p> <p>Limited argument; reasonable focus; structure evident; evidence of largely correct referencing and citation</p>
35-39 Poor	<p>Work does not meet the standards required to pass; gaps in knowledge of principles and concepts; little ability to understand ways in which principles and ideas have developed</p>	<p>Little evidence of relevant reading; limited ability to identify data, information and/or sources appropriate to the nature of investigation/question</p>	<p>Deficient in relevant methods of enquiry to investigation/question/data; no understanding of different approaches; little analysis; lacking in independent ideas/interpretations</p>	<p>Work does not meet the standards required to pass; unstructured argument; lacking in focus; severe weaknesses in referencing and citation</p>
1-34 Very Poor	<p>Work is well below the standards required to pass; Major gaps in knowledge of principles and concepts; lacking ability to understand ways in which principles and ideas have developed</p>	<p>Absence of relevant reading; inability to identify any data, information and/or sources</p>	<p>No relevant methods of enquiry; no understanding of different approaches; analysis absent; no independent ideas/interpretations</p>	<p>Work is well below the standards required to pass; lacks argument; no focus; no referencing</p>
0	<p>Work of no merit or absent</p>			