

# UCL

## UCL Student Assessment Criteria for Taught Programmes An Illustrative Guide



## Aims of this Guide

This Guide provides broadly based student assessment criteria, presented by level of study in line with those defined by the [Framework for Higher Education Qualifications](#). The criteria are **not prescriptive**, but are designed to:

- **Illustrate the types of learning typically expected of students** following taught higher education programmes, at the given curriculum level
- **Inform departments and programme leaders when creating and refining their own subject-specific marking criteria**, and also when devising intended learning outcomes (ILOs) for programme and module specifications
- **Complement [QAA Subject Benchmark Statements](#)**
- **Provide students with a broad sense of the kinds of learning expected of them** on UCL's taught programmes, as they progress through levels of study
- **Highlight the particular attributes and skills expected of students engaging in UCL's distinctive approach to research-based education**, as exemplified in the [UCL Connected Curriculum](#) framework.

## Student engagement with assessment criteria

Students on all taught programmes benefit greatly from understanding the specific assessment criteria used for their discipline in general and, where appropriate, for different types of assignment (for example, oral presentations and practical tasks, as well as written work). Students can work with staff to:

- Develop and/or discuss assessment criteria.
- Use the criteria for self-assessment and/or peer assessment, so that they can try them out in an authentic assessment activity. These activities help to develop subject knowledge and awareness of valuable scholarly practices.

It can be very helpful if the relevant subject-specific criteria are referred to explicitly when staff give **feedback to students** on assignments. Feedback clearly focused on the criteria, whether written or oral, can highlight both the strengths demonstrated by students and specific areas for improvement. Students are encouraged to look carefully at their feedback, so that it 'feeds forward' into future learning and assignments, and they may also find it useful to look at the relevant bank of assessment criteria in this Guide, as they exemplify some typical dimensions of undergraduate and postgraduate learning.

Finally, students may be interested in applying, with staff support, to lead a project on developing assessment criteria in their subject through [UCL ChangeMakers](#).

## Developing these criteria and sharing good practice

The illustrative criteria in this Guide have been informed by those used by UCL departments whose students give the most positive feedback on the use of criteria and by those used in Russell Group universities whose students are most satisfied with the clarity and helpfulness of their assessment criteria. They are also underpinned throughout by those provided by the QAA as part of the [Framework for Higher Education Qualifications](#).

The categories and examples of criteria will be enhanced over time, and UCL welcomes feedback on them from staff and students. We are also developing **case studies of good practice** about the development and use of local assessment criteria and about the provision of feedback to students which explicitly helps their learning. These will be made available on the [Teaching and Learning Portal](#), and can be shared with colleagues at a [UCL Arena Exchange Seminar](#). To share your own examples or to provide feedback to UCL, please email [ConnectedCurriculum@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:ConnectedCurriculum@ucl.ac.uk).

## HEQF Level 4 First undergraduate level

Marks	0-19	20-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-100
	Fail (F)	Fail (E)	Pass: 3 <sup>rd</sup> (D)	Pass: 2.2 (C)	Pass: 2.1 (B)	Ist (A)	Ist (A)
<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>	Major gaps in knowledge and understanding. Significant inaccuracies.	Gaps in knowledge and superficial understanding. Some inaccuracies.	Broadly accurate knowledge and understanding of the material. Some elements missing and flaws evident.	Sound, routine knowledge and understanding of the material, main concepts and key theories. Some flaws may be evident.	Good, consistent knowledge and understanding of the material, main concepts and key theories at this level.	Detailed knowledge and understanding of the main concepts/ theories at this level. Beginning to show awareness of the limitations of the knowledge base.	Highly detailed knowledge and understanding of material, concepts and theories for this level of study. Awareness of the ambiguities and limitations of knowledge.
<b>Intellectual skills</b>  <i>e.g. analysis and synthesis; deploying logical argument supported by evidence; focus on topic; drawing conclusions</i>	Brief and irrelevant. Descriptive. Only personal views offered. Unsubstantiated generalisations. Little or no attempt to draw conclusions.	For the most part descriptive. Views/ findings sometimes illogical or contradictory. Generalisations/ statements made with scant evidence. Conclusions lack relevance and/or validity.	Some awareness of issues. Sense of argument emerging though not completely coherent. Some evidence to support views, but not always consistent. Some relevant conclusions	Issues identified within given areas. An emerging awareness of different stances and ability to use evidence to support a coherent argument. Broadly valid conclusions.	Good analytical ability. Acknowledgement of views of others. Arguments generally logical, coherently expressed, well organised and supported. Sound conclusions.	Very good analysis throughout. Perceptive and persuasive points made within given area. Explicit acknowledgement of other stances. Arguments well-articulated, and logically developed with a range of evidence. Strong conclusions.	Logical, articulate analysis a consistent feature. Persuasive points made throughout the work within a highly articulate, balanced argument. Judiciously selected evidence, drawn from relevant research. Convincing conclusions.
<b>Scholarly practices</b>  <i>e.g. use of relevant literature; academic writing; academic honesty, referencing and citation</i>	No evidence of reading. Views are unsupported and non- authoritative. Academic conventions largely ignored.	Evidence of little reading appropriate for the level of study, and/or indiscriminate use of sources. Academic conventions used weakly.	Some evidence of reading, with superficial linking to given text(s). Some academic conventions evident and largely consistent, but with some weaknesses.	Knowledge of literature beyond core text(s). Literature used accurately but descriptively. Academic skills generally sound.	Knowledge of the field of literature appropriately used to support views. Research-informed literature integrated into the work. Good use of academic conventions.	Critical engagement with appropriate reading. Knowledge of research-informed literature embedded in the work. Consistently accurate use of academic conventions.	Exceptionally wide range of relevant literature used critically to inform argument, balance discussion and/or inform problem-solving. Consistently accurate and assured use of academic conventions.

<p><b>Research and enquiry</b>  <i>e.g. grasping, framing and/or creating questions; applying method for gathering evidence; ethics and integrity; analysis of evidence; communicating findings in a style appropriate for a given context and audience</i></p>	<p><b>Research skills:</b>          Very little or no evidence of ability to undertake straightforward research-related tasks, even with guidance.  <b>Communication</b> in relation to the task is inappropriately pitched for the context and audience.</p>	<p><b>Research skills:</b>          Limited evidence of ability to undertake straightforward research tasks, even with guidance.  <b>Communication</b> of any findings may have some merit but is inappropriately pitched for the audience.</p>	<p><b>Research skills:</b>          Some evidence of ability to collect appropriate data/ information and undertake straightforward research tasks with external guidance.          Can <b>communicate</b> in a range of formats, including orally, appropriate to the discipline(s), but with evident weaknesses.</p>	<p><b>Research skills:</b>          Can collect and interpret appropriate data/ information and undertake straightforward research tasks with external guidance.          Can <b>communicate</b> effectively in a range of formats, including orally, appropriate to the discipline(s).</p>	<p><b>Research skills:</b>          Can collect and interpret appropriate data/ information and successfully undertake straightforward research tasks with limited external guidance.          Can <b>communicate</b> well and consistently in a range of formats, including orally, appropriate to the discipline(s).</p>	<p><b>Research skills:</b>          Can collect and interpret appropriate data and successfully undertake research tasks with a degree of autonomy.          Can <b>communicate</b> very effectively in a range of formats, including orally, appropriate to the discipline(s).</p>	<p><b>Research skills:</b>          Can collect and interpret appropriate data/ information and undertake research tasks with autonomy and exceptional success.          Can <b>communicate</b> highly effectively in a range of formats, including orally, appropriate to the discipline(s).</p>
<p><b>Professional and life skills</b>  <i>e.g. creativity; digital practices; presentation skills; ethical awareness; team-working; self-management; project and time management; leadership; ability to recognize own strengths and weaknesses and take steps to improve.</i></p>	<p>Very little evidence of the required skills in any of the skills areas.</p>	<p>Limited evidence of skills in the range identified for the assessment at this level.          Significant weaknesses evident, which suggest that the candidate is not on course to gain skills necessary for graduate-level employment.</p>	<p>Can <b>work effectively with others</b> as a member of a group, and meet most obligations to others (e.g. tutors and peers).          Some evidence of ability to apply methods appropriately to address a well-defined <b>problem</b>.          Able to <b>recognise own strengths and weaknesses</b> in relation to professional, digital and practical skills identified by others, but lacking insight in some areas.</p>	<p>Can <b>work effectively with others</b> as a member of a group, and meet obligations to others (e.g. tutors and peers).          Can apply methods accurately to address a well-defined <b>problem</b>, and begin to appreciate the complexity of the issues in the discipline.          Able to <b>evaluate own strengths and weaknesses</b> in relation to professional, digital and practical skills identified by others.</p>	<p>Can <b>work very effectively with others</b> as a member of a group, and meet all obligations to others (e.g. tutors and peers).          Can apply methods accurately to address a well-defined <b>problem</b>, appreciating the complexity of the issues in the discipline.          Able to take initiative in <b>evaluating own strengths and weaknesses</b> in relation to professional, digital and practical skills identified by others.</p>	<p>Can <b>work very effectively with others</b> as a member of a group, showing leadership skills where appropriate, and meet all obligations to others (e.g. tutors/peers).          Can apply methods accurately and very effectively to address a well-defined <b>problem</b>, appreciating the complexity of the issues in the discipline.          Able to show insight and autonomy in <b>evaluating own strengths and weaknesses</b> in relation to professional, digital and practical skills.</p>	<p>Can <b>work exceptionally well with others</b> as a key member of a group, showing leadership skills, negotiating and meeting all obligations to others (e.g. tutors/peers).          Can apply methods accurately and highly effectively to address a well-defined <b>problem</b>, appreciating the complexity of a range of issues.          Able to show insight and autonomy in <b>evaluating own strengths and weaknesses</b> in relation to professional, digital and practical skills.</p>
<p>Level 4 Marks</p>	<p><b>0-19</b></p>	<p><b>20-39</b></p>	<p><b>40-49</b></p>	<p><b>50-59</b></p>	<p><b>60-69</b></p>	<p><b>70-79</b></p>	<p><b>80-100</b></p>



## HEQF Level 5 (Second undergraduate level)

Marks	0-19	20-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-100
	Fail (F)	Fail (E)	Pass: 3 <sup>rd</sup> (D)	Pass: 2.2 (C)	Pass: 2.1 (B)	Ist (A)	Ist (A)
<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>	Major gaps in knowledge and understanding of material at this level. Significant inaccuracies.	Gaps in knowledge and only superficial understanding of the well-established principles of area(s) of study. Some inaccuracies.	Some knowledge and understanding of material, of well-established principles of area(s) of study, and of the way in which those principles have been developed.	Broad knowledge and understanding of material, of well-established principles of area(s) of study, and of the way in which those principles have been developed.	Very good knowledge and understanding of material, of well-established principles of area(s) of study, and of the way in which those principles have been developed.	Very good, detailed understanding of material, 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 understanding of material, 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.
<b>Intellectual skills</b> <i>e.g. analysis and synthesis; deploying logical argument supported by evidence; focus on topic; drawing conclusions</i>	Unsubstantiated generalizations, made without use of any credible evidence. Lack of logic, leading to unsupported conclusions or missing conclusions. Lack of analysis and relevance.	Views/ findings largely irrelevant, illogical or contradictory. Generalisations/ statements made with scant evidence. Conclusions lack relevance and/or validity.	Awareness of main issues. Structure of argument effective, but with some gaps or weaknesses. Some evidence provided to support findings, but not always consistent. Some relevant conclusions.	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. Generally sound conclusions.	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.	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.	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.
<b>Scholarly practices</b> <i>e.g. use of relevant literature; academic writing; academic honesty, referencing and citation</i>	No evidence of reading. Views are unsupported and non-authoritative. Academic conventions largely ignored.	Evidence of little reading appropriate for this level and/or indiscriminate use of sources. Academic conventions used weakly.	Evidence of reading relevant sources, with some appropriate linking to given text(s). Academic conventions evident and largely consistent, with minor weaknesses.	Knowledge and analysis of a range of literature beyond core text(s). Literature used accurately and analytically. Academic skills generally sound.	Knowledge of the field of literature used consistently to support findings. Research-informed literature integrated into the work. Very good use of academic conventions.	Critical engagement with a range of reading. Knowledge of research-informed literature embedded in work. Consistently accurate use of academic conventions.	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.

<p><b>Research and enquiry</b>  <i>e.g. grasping, framing and/or creating questions; methods for gathering evidence; ethics and integrity; analysis of evidence; communicating findings in a style appropriate for a given context and audience (specialist/non-specialist)</i></p>	<p>Little or no evidence of the required skills in any of the areas identified for assessment at this level.</p>	<p>Limited evidence of skills of research and enquiry in the range identified for assessment at this level. Significant weaknesses evident in several areas.</p>	<p><b>Research skills:</b>  Some evidence of ability to collect and interpret appropriate data/ information and undertake research tasks with limited external guidance. Can <b>communicate</b> findings in a range of formats, including orally, appropriate to the discipline(s), but with some weaknesses.</p>	<p><b>Research skills:</b> Can undertake research-like tasks, drawing on a range of sources, with limited external guidance  Can <b>communicate</b> effectively and confidently in a range of formats, including orally, appropriate to the discipline(s) and audience(s).</p>	<p><b>Research skills:</b>  Can successfully complete research-like tasks, drawing on a range of sources, with limited external guidance. Can <b>communicate</b> well, confidently and consistently in a range of formats, including orally, appropriate to the discipline(s). Can adapt style to different audiences.</p>	<p><b>Research skills:</b>  Can successfully complete research-like tasks, drawing on a range of sources, with a significant degree of autonomy. Can <b>communicate</b> very effectively and confidently in a range of formats, including orally, appropriate to the discipline(s) and different audiences.</p>	<p><b>Research skills:</b>  Evidence of exceptional success in undertaking a range of research-like tasks with high degree of autonomy for the level. Can <b>communicate</b> highly effectively, with diverse audiences, in a wide range of formats, including orally, as appropriate to the context.</p>
<p><b>Professional and life skills</b>  <i>e.g. creativity; digital practices; presentation skills; ethical awareness; team-working; self-management; project and time management; leadership; ability to identify learning points from work experience; recognition of own strengths and weaknesses and ability to take steps to improve.</i></p>	<p>Little or no evidence of the required skills in any of the areas identified for assessment at this level.</p>	<p>Limited evidence of skills in the range identified for assessment at this level. Significant weaknesses evident in key areas.</p>	<p>Can <b>work with others</b> as a member of a group, meeting most obligations to others, modifying responses appropriately. Can identify key areas of <b>problems</b> and generally choose appropriate methods for their resolution. Able to <b>recognise own strengths and weaknesses</b> in relation to professional and practical skills, but with limited insight in some areas.</p>	<p>Can <b>work effectively with others</b> as a member of a group, meeting obligations to others, modifying responses appropriately. Can identify key areas of <b>problems</b> and choose appropriate methods for their resolution in a considered manner. Able to <b>evaluate own strengths and weaknesses</b> in relation to professional and practical skills, and to develop own evaluation criteria.</p>	<p>Can <b>work very effectively and confidently with others</b> as a member of a group, meeting obligations to others, modifying responses appropriately. Can identify key areas of <b>problems</b> and choose, with autonomy, appropriate methods for their resolution in a considered manner. Able to take initiative in <b>evaluating own strengths and weaknesses</b> in relation to professional and practical skills identified by others and develop and effectively apply own evaluation criteria.</p>	<p>Can <b>work very effectively and confidently with others</b> as a member of a group, showing <b>leadership</b> skills where appropriate. Can identify key areas of <b>problems</b> confidently and choose, with autonomy and notable effectiveness, appropriate methods for their resolution. Able to show insight and autonomy in <b>evaluating own strengths and weaknesses</b> re professional and practical skills, showing excellent judgement.</p>	<p>Can <b>work exceptionally well with others</b> as a key member of a group, showing <b>leadership</b> skills where appropriate, meeting obligations to others. Can identify key areas of <b>problems</b> confidently and choose, with autonomy and exceptional effectiveness, appropriate methods for their resolution. Able to show insight and autonomy in <b>evaluating own strengths and weaknesses</b>, showing outstanding judgement.</p>
<p><b>Level 5 Marks</b>    <b>0-19</b>    <b>20-39</b>    <b>40-49</b>    <b>50-59</b>    <b>60-69</b>    <b>70-79</b>    <b>80-100</b></p>							

## HEQF Level 6 (Final undergraduate level)

Marks	0-19	20-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-100
	Fail (F)	Fail (E)	Pass: 3 <sup>rd</sup> (D)	Pass: 2.2 (C)	Pass: 2.1 (B)	Ist (A)	Ist (A)
<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>	Major gaps in knowledge and understanding of material at this level. Substantial inaccuracies.	Gaps in knowledge, with only superficial understanding. Some significant inaccuracies.	Understanding of key aspects of field of study; coherent knowledge, at least in part informed by current research in the subject discipline.	Systematic understanding of field(s) of study, as indicated by relevant QAA subject benchmark statements for the degree programme.	Good understanding of the field(s) of study; coherent knowledge, in line with subject benchmark, at least in part informed by current research in the subject discipline.	Excellent knowledge and understanding of the main concepts and key theories/ concepts of the discipline(s). Clear awareness of the limitations of the knowledge base.	Highly detailed knowledge and understanding of the main theories/concepts of the discipline(s), and an awareness of the ambiguities and limitations of knowledge.
<b>Intellectual skills</b> <i>e.g. analysis and synthesis; deploying logical argument supported by evidence; focus on topic; drawing conclusions</i>	Unsubstantiated generalizations, made without use of any credible evidence. Lack of logic, leading to unsupported/ missing conclusions. Lack of any attempt to analyse, synthesise or evaluate. Poor communication of ideas.	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 some logical, analytical thinking and some attempts to synthesise, albeit with some weaknesses. Some evidence to support findings/ views, but evidence not consistently interpreted. Some relevant conclusions	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	Sound, logical, analytical thinking; 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.	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.	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.
<b>Scholarly practices</b> <i>e.g. use of relevant literature; academic writing; academic honesty, referencing and citation</i>	Little evidence of reading. Views and findings unsupported and non-authoritative. Academic conventions largely ignored.	Evidence of little reading and/or of reliance on inappropriate sources, and/or indiscriminate use of sources. Academic conventions used inconsistently.	References to a range of relevant sources. Some omissions and minor errors. Academic conventions evident and largely consistent, with minor lapses.	Knowledge, analysis and evaluation of a range of research-informed literature, including sources retrieved, analysed independently. Academic skills consistently applied.	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.	Excellent knowledge of research informed literature embedded in the work. Consistent analysis and evaluation of sources. High-level academic skills consistently applied.	Outstanding knowledge of research-informed literature embedded in the work. Consistent analysis and evaluation of sources. High-level academic skills consistently and professionally applied.

<p><b>Research and enquiry</b>  <i>e.g. grasping, framing and/or creating questions; method for gathering evidence; ethics and integrity; analysis of evidence; communicating findings in a style appropriate for a given context and audience</i></p>	<p>Little or no evidence of the required skills in any of the graduate skills identified in the programme specification at this level.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p><b>Research skills:</b>  Can competently undertake reasonably straightforward research tasks with minimum guidance, but with minor weaknesses.  Can <b>communicate</b> in a range of formats, including orally, at a standard appropriate for graduate-level employment, and with limited weaknesses.</p>	<p><b>Research skills:</b>  Can competently undertake reasonably straightforward research tasks with minimum guidance  Can <b>communicate</b> effectively in a range of formats, including orally, at a standard appropriate for graduate-level employment. Adopts style and register appropriate for audience.</p>	<p><b>Research skills:</b>  Can successfully complete a range of research-like tasks, including evaluation, with very limited external guidance.  Can <b>communicate</b> well, confidently and consistently in a range of formats, including orally, at a standard appropriate for graduate-level employment. Adopts style and register to engage audience(s).</p>	<p><b>Research skills:</b>  Can very successfully complete a range of research-like tasks, including evaluation, with a significant degree of autonomy.  Can <b>communicate</b> professionally and confidently in a range of formats for diverse audiences, at a high standard appropriate for graduate-level employment.</p>	<p>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 autonomy. Can communicate findings with real professionalism, adapting style easily for given audiences.</p>
<p><b>Professional and life skills</b>  <i>e.g. creativity; digital practices; presentation skills; ethical awareness and practice; team-working; self-management; project and time management; leadership; ability to identify an draw on learning points from work/professional contexts; ability to recognize own strengths and weaknesses, and to take steps to improve, by identifying and choosing appropriate methods (online resources, courses, peer learning etc.).</i></p>		<p>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.</p>	<p>Can generally <b>work effectively within a team</b>, negotiating in a professional manner and managing conflict. Is largely confident and effective in <b>identifying and defining complex problems</b> and applying knowledge and methods to their solution.  Able to <b>recognise own strengths and weaknesses</b> in relation to graduate employment, with minor areas of weakness.</p>	<p>Can consistently <b>work effectively within a team</b>, negotiating in a professional manner and managing conflict. Is confident and flexible in <b>identifying and defining complex problems</b> and applying knowledge and methods to their solution.  Able to <b>evaluate own strengths and weaknesses</b> in relation to graduate employment.</p>	<p>Can consistently <b>work very well within a team</b>, leading &amp; negotiating in a professional manner and managing conflict.  Is confident and flexible in <b>identifying and defining a range of complex problems</b> and applying knowledge and methods to their solution.  Able to take initiative in <b>evaluating own strengths and weaknesses</b> in relation to graduate-level professional and practical skills, and act autonomously to develop new areas of skills as necessary</p>	<p>Can <b>work professionally within a team</b>, showing leadership skills as appropriate, managing conflict and meeting obligations.  Is professional and flexible in <b>autonomously defining a range of complex problems</b> and applying knowledge and methods to solution.  Shows insight and autonomy in <b>evaluating own strengths and weaknesses</b> and developing professional and practical skills needed for graduate-level employment.</p>	<p>Can <b>work exceptionally well and professionally within a team</b>, showing leadership skills as appropriate, managing conflict, and meeting all obligations.  Is exceptionally professional and flexible in <b>autonomously defining and solving a range of complex problems</b>. Outstanding ability to <b>evaluate own strengths and weaknesses</b>, showing outstanding attributes for graduate-level employment.</p>
<p>Level 6: Marks</p>	<p>0-19</p>	<p>20-39</p>	<p>40-49</p>	<p>50-59</p>	<p>60-69</p>	<p>70-79</p>	<p>80-100</p>



## HEQF Level 7 Masters level

Marks	0-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-85	86-100
	Fail	Fail	Pass	Merit	Distinction	Distinction
<p><b>Knowledge and understanding of field, and intellectual skills</b>  <i>e.g. analysis and synthesis; deploying logical argument supported by evidence; focus on topic; drawing conclusions</i></p>	<p>Demonstrates little knowledge of the field.            Demonstrates significant weaknesses in the knowledge base, and/or simply reproduces knowledge without evidence of understanding.            Shows little or no critical ability.            Poor, inconsistent analysis.</p>	<p>Demonstrates knowledge of the field and awareness of current evidence and issues, but with some notable weaknesses.            Lacks knowledge and understanding of some key areas.            Offers some appropriate analysis, but with some significant inconsistencies which affect the soundness of argument and/or conclusions.            Demonstrates very limited critical ability.</p>	<p>Demonstrates a sound knowledge and understanding of material within a specialised field.            Demonstrates an understanding of current theoretical and methodological approaches and how these affect the way the knowledge base is interpreted.            Provides evidence of relevant and sound analysis within the specialised area, with some critical evaluation.            Is able to analyse complex issues and make appropriate judgements.</p>	<p>Produces work with a well-defined focus.            Demonstrates a systematic knowledge, understanding and critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of the academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice.            Is able to evaluate methodologies critically and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses.            Is able to deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, making sound judgements in the absence of complete data.</p>	<p>Produces work of exceptional standard, reflecting excellent understanding.            Displays mastery of a complex and specialised area of knowledge and skills, with notable critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights at forefront of field.            Shows excellent ability to evaluate methodologies critically and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses.            Deals with complex issues systematically and creatively, making excellent judgements.</p>	<p>This work meets and often exceeds the standard for distinction, as described in the 70-85 band, across <i>all</i> sub-categories of criteria: knowledge and understanding of subject; intellectual skills; research skills; use of research-informed literature and other scholarly practices; and skills for life and professional employment.</p> <p>This work is of publishable quality, with only very minor amendments, and would be likely to receive that judgement if submitted to a peer-reviewed journal.</p> <p>Work is of such a quality that the student is clearly highly capable of doctoral research in the discipline and, in principle, should be prioritised for a postgraduate research grant.</p>
<p><b>Research and enquiry</b>  <i>e.g. framing and creating questions; using appropriate methods for gathering evidence; awareness of methodological benefits/ limitations; ethics and integrity; analysis of evidence; communicating findings for a given context and audience</i></p>	<p>Little or no skill demonstrated in selected techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship.            Lacks any understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge</p>	<p>Demonstrates some skill in selected techniques and/or approaches applicable to own research or advanced scholarship, but with significant areas of weakness.            Lacks sufficient understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge</p>	<p>Demonstrates understanding of and skills in selected techniques/ approaches applicable to own research or advanced scholarship.            Shows some originality in the application of knowledge, and some understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline            Able to communicate effectively with a given audience.</p>	<p>Displays a comprehensive understanding of and skills in techniques/approaches applicable to own research or advanced scholarship.            Shows originality in the application of knowledge, and a good understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline.            Able to communicate very effectively arguments, evidence and conclusions to specialist and non-specialist audiences.</p>	<p>Conducts research highly effectively, using technical and/or professional skills as appropriate.            Displays exceptional grasp of a range of techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship.            Shows originality in application of knowledge, and excellent grasp of how knowledge is created and interpreted in the discipline.            Able to communicate at a very high level arguments, evidence and conclusions to diverse audiences</p>	

<p><b>Scholarly practices</b></p> <p><i>e.g. use of relevant literature; academic writing; academic honesty, referencing and citation</i></p>	<p>Fails to evidence or discuss/apply appropriate examples of literature relating to current research and advanced scholarship in the field. References to literature/ evidence and use of academic conventions are flawed/irrelevant.</p>	<p>Can evidence and discuss/apply examples of literature relating to current research but lacks critical engagement. References to appropriate literature/ evidence and use of academic conventions are insufficient and/or inconsistent.</p>	<p>Can evaluate critically examples of literature relating to current research and advanced scholarship in the field. Makes consistently sound use of appropriate academic conventions and academic honesty.</p>	<p>Is able to evaluate critically a range of literature relating to current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline. Makes consistently good use of appropriate academic conventions and academic honesty.</p>	<p>Is able to evaluate critically, with notable insight, a range of literature relating to current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline. Makes consistently excellent use of appropriate academic conventions and academic honesty</p>
<p><b>Professional skills and attributes</b></p> <p><i>e.g. creativity; digital literacies and practices; presentation skills; ethical awareness and integrity; collaboration and team-working; self-management; project and time management; leadership; innovation; ability to recognize own strengths and weaknesses, and to take steps to improve, by identifying and choosing appropriate methods (online resources, courses, peer learning etc.).</i></p>	<p>Significant weaknesses evident in key areas such as digital literacy, communication, problem-solving and project management. Inability to adapt. Inability to work flexibly, independently and/or as part of a team.</p>	<p>Demonstrates generally effective employability skills, including communication and problem-solving, but with some problematic areas of weakness. Limited ability to adapt. Ability to work flexibly, independently and/or as part of a team, but with areas of weakness.</p>	<p>Shows a consistently good level of employability skills, including team working, project management, IT/computer literacy, creativity and flexibility. Demonstrates capabilities to support effective communication in a range of complex and specialised contexts. Shows consistent ability in tackling and solving demanding problems. Can plan and direct own learning. Demonstrates ability to advance own knowledge and skills. Demonstrates the independent learning ability required for continuing professional development.</p>	<p>Shows a high level of employability skills, including team working, project management, digital literacy, creativity and flexibility. Demonstrates very effective communication in a range of complex and specialised contexts. Demonstrates self-direction in tackling and solving demanding problems. Can act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks at a professional or equivalent level. Demonstrates attitudes needed to advance own knowledge, understanding, and skills. Demonstrates the independent learning ability required for continuing professional development.</p>	<p>Shows a very high level of employability skills, including team working/leadership, project management, digital literacies and practices, creativity and flexibility. Demonstrates very high level communication skills in a range of complex contexts, and ability to write at publishable standard. Demonstrates autonomy and notable originality in tackling and solving demanding problems. Shows a high level of consistency and autonomy in planning and implementing tasks at a professional or equivalent level. Demonstrates the skills and attitudes needed to advance own knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills to a high level. Demonstrates the independent learning ability required for continuing professional development.</p>
<p><b>Level 7: Marks</b>      <b>0-39</b>      <b>40-49</b>      <b>50-59</b>      <b>60-69</b>      <b>70-85</b>      <b>86-100</b></p>					