

Appendix 3

Using Assessment Criteria



It is essential that students are supplied with assessment criteria which provide guidance on what markers will be expecting to see in the work. These should be provided to students together with the assignment. A common way of compiling assessment criteria is by use of grids – see the example below. These can be created manually but can also be generated within the Grade Mark facility of Turnitin.

Ideally you should avoid the use of subjective terms such as Excellent, Good and Poor in your assessment criteria as people will define these in a different manner and certainly students will not gain much benefit from simply being told something is good or poor. It is better to try and describe what you would expect to see. For example 'poor use of English' is less informative for students than 'significant errors in sentence construction*/ grammar*/ spelling* (*delete as appropriate)'.

When designing marking criteria it can be helpful to subdivide the fail and first class categories into 0-30% and 30-40% and 70-80% and 80-100% respectively. This is particularly important for the fail category as 30% is a threshold value for passing a module. At the upper end, having more clearly defined characteristics can also encourage staff to award marks above 80%. The indicative rubrics below shows how the full range of marks can be used for this purpose.

GENERIC DESCRIPTORS: DISCIPLINE AND ASSESSMENT TYPE NEUTRAL	Command of the Subject	Subject Specific Skills & Practices	Scholarly and Professional Skills & Attributes
90-100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a breadth and depth of substantive knowledge that is excellent and informed by the highest level of scholarship • Excellent integration of the full range of appropriate principles, theories, evidence and techniques • Goes beyond the material displaying exceptional flair in tackling issues identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceptional application of theoretical and technical knowledge to achieve learning outcomes • Exceptional professional presentation using an appropriate range of resources and reflecting professional norms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work that influences how academics and students think about their discipline through: being original within the discipline; achieving the highest level of compelling, coherent and concise argument attainable within the level of study; using a full range of high quality sources to inform but not dominate the argument
80-89%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a breadth and depth of substantive knowledge that is comprehensive, accurate, relevant and informed by advanced scholarship • Excellent integration of the full range of appropriate principles, theories, evidence and techniques • Goes beyond the material with excellent conceptualization which is original, innovative and/or insightful 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent and original application of theoretical and technical knowledge to achieve the learning outcomes • Excellent professional presentation using an appropriate range of resources and reflecting professional norms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work that has real potential to influence how academics and students may think about the discipline through: being original on the basis of its excellence in the context of the level of study; a compelling, coherent and concise argument; drawing on a full range of high quality sources
70-79%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informed by a breadth and depth of substantive knowledge that is comprehensive, accurate, relevant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constantly applies theoretical and technical knowledge to achieve 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work that has some potential to influence how academics and students may think about the discipline through: some originality

	<p>with awareness of advanced scholarship</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good integration of a full range of appropriate principles, theories, evidence and techniques • Goes beyond the material with very good conceptualization which is often original, innovative and/or insightful 	<p>learning outcomes with some originality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good professional presentation using an appropriate range of resources and reflecting professional norms 	<p>on the basis of its excellence in the context of the level of study; arguments which are coherent, concise, and frequently compelling; drawing on a wide range of high quality sources</p>
60-69%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a breadth and depth of substantive knowledge that is comprehensive and accurate • Good integration of a range of appropriate principles, theories, evidence and techniques • Some good insight into the material 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear evidence of the application of theoretical and technical knowledge to achieve learning outcomes with few obvious flaws • Professional presentation using a good range of resources and reflecting professional norms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work that critically engages with current thinking in the discipline through: clear differentiation between the quality and appropriateness of the sources used; arguments which are coherent and concise and offer robust conclusions; the development of a good analytical model
50-59%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates an adequate breadth and depth of substantive knowledge but with only a few errors or omissions • Demonstrates an adequate understanding of a range of appropriate principles, theories, evidence and techniques 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate application of theoretical and technical knowledge to achieve learning outcomes although with some obvious flaws • Presentation which adequately reflects relevant professional norms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work that accurately reports on current thinking in the discipline through: the repetition of, rather critical engagement with, limited sources; adequate differentiation between the quality and appropriateness of sources used; drawing adequate conclusions which do not always fully reflect the complexity of the subject

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows some ability to critically engage with the material 		<p>matter; an adequate if unsophisticated analytical model</p>
40-49%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incomplete breadth and depth of substantive knowledge with some errors or omissions Demonstrates an awareness of appropriate principles, theories, evidence and techniques Limited and underdeveloped critical engagement with the material 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates limited ability to put theory into practice Demonstrates limited technical ability but lacking theoretical and reflective insights Presentation which reflects professional practice in a limited manner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work that offers a limited understanding of thinking in the discipline through: limited attention paid to the quality, range and appropriateness of the sources used; poorly informed opinion led work which lacks a clear evidence base; a limited and underdeveloped structure of argument; work that is of limited coherence and clarity
30-39%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little relevant knowledge which is minimal in its breadth and depth with major errors or omissions Minimal awareness of the appropriate principles, theories, evidence and techniques Fails to demonstrate sufficient critical engagement with the material 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates a minimal ability to meet learning outcomes in the grasp of both theory and technical knowledge Presentation which displays little more than cursory attention to professional norms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work that often misrepresents or misunderstands thinking in the discipline through: minimal attention paid to the quality, range and appropriateness of sources used; poorly informed opinion led work with a minimal evidence base; no real underlying structure of argument; work that is frequently confused and incoherent
20-29%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not demonstrate even a basic understanding of the subject matter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lacks any real application of skills to meet learning outcomes Fails to demonstrate any substantive meeting of learning outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work that fundamentally misrepresents or misunderstands thinking in the discipline through: a lack of attention to the quality, range and appropriateness of sources used; poorly informed

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient awareness of appropriate principles, theories, evidence and techniques Little evidence of critical engagement with the material 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No real attention to the disciplinary norms of presentation 	opinion-led work rather than evidence based argument; no real underlying structure of argument
10-19%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates confusion over the subject matter Little awareness of appropriate principles, theories, evidence and techniques No evidence of critical engagement with the material 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to demonstrate the use of skills to meet learning outcomes Fails to demonstrate any substantive meeting of learning outcomes No real attention to the disciplinary norms of presentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work that completely misrepresents or misunderstands thinking in the discipline through: inadequacy of sources used; unsubstantial assertion with no evidence base; failure to structure the argument being presented
0-9%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates mainly ignorance of the subject matter by presenting information of minimal relevance Little or no awareness of appropriate principles, theories, evidence and techniques 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learning outcomes are not met No real attention to any norms of presentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work that completely misrepresents or misunderstands thinking in the discipline through: absence or misuse of sources; work that is confused and incoherent

School of ADI: Grade Performances in Essay Writing

Classification	Knowledge & Understanding (reading & application)	Analysis (and logical development)	Synthesis/Creativity (and independent thinking)	Presentation/ Technique

75 plus 72 70 FIRST	Excellent: in-depth use of knowledge from a wide range of relevant sources. Applied and illustrated understanding of material.	Excellent: comprehensively well-made structure, argument and use of evidence. Sharply incisive analysis of material. Insightful conceptual links developed.	Excellent: illuminating integration of material and construction of strongly supported and distinctive, perspective.	Fluent. No errors of grammar, syntax, spelling and punctuation. Clear, coherent and style of writing. Instructive use of paragraphs.
68 - 9 67 64 – 5 'Very good' 62 60 II.1	Good: thorough use of knowledge, fairly wide range of sources, demonstrating relevance of these by well-made indicative example.	Good: effective structure, coherent argument and use of evidence, connections made.	Good: effective and appropriate integration of source, argument and illustration. Evidence of writer's own point of view emerging.	Quotes appropriately cited and set out. Mood and tone apt.
58 - 9 57 55 'Quite good' 'Satisfactory'	Satisfactory: shows evidence of reading and learning. Material generally relevant. Examples acceptable but sometimes derivative, not always well-chosen or convincingly developed.	Satisfactory: structure generally sufficient, argument and use of evidence acceptable, but some structural weakness and inconsistencies of argument. Connections underdeveloped.	Satisfactory: material holds together in generally satisfactory but not distinctive way.	Satisfactory: for the most part competent use of language. Evidence of undue reliance on original source, paraphrasing etc.

52					
50	II.2				
48 - 9 47 42 40	THIRD (pass)	Barely adequate: Descriptive &/or mainly reliant on recapitulation of source, demonstrating weak grasp of knowledge. Unconvincing examples.	Barely adequate: some structuring and attempt made to use evidence, but overall effect is fragmentary and unconvincing. Links poorly developed.	Barely adequate: material not integrated to reasoned argument. Negligible evidence of genuine authorial presence.	Barely adequate: uneven, unruly, poor use of language. Dependent on source. Confused and confusing.
38 - 9 37 32		Very Poor: Inappropriate use of source material. Little or no evidence of knowledge. Much irrelevant material. Inadequate reading.	Very Poor: unstructured. Reliant on lists of unconnected points. Muddled, illogical and incoherent thinking.	Very Poor: no connecting argument or explanation in the work.	Very Poor: close paraphrasing, perhaps edging over into plagiarism. Error-ridden, inarticulate, disjointed writing.

<p style="text-align: center;">30 FAIL</p> <p>BELOW 30% LEVEL IS AN UNACCEPTABLE FAILURE (RESUBMIT)</p>	<p>Unacceptably Poor: no evidence of reading or learning. Inaccurate and inappropriate.</p>	<p>Unacceptably Poor: no structure or logic of development. Confused, disconnected, irrelevant thinking.</p>	<p>Unacceptably Poor: entirely lacking integration or evidence of effort to develop it. Writer adopts inconsistent point of view.</p>	<p>Unacceptably Poor: Badly crafted to the point of being non-sense. Incomprehensible.</p>
	<p>The comments inscribed in the boxes above correspond to the benchmark score highlighted in the left-most column. That is to say, these indicative remarks relate to the signal numerical mark pointed-to within each class (42%, 62%, etc.) and do not encapsulate the whole band or class (40-50, 60-70, etc.)</p>			