

Assessment Regulations for Taught Awards

GENERAL

1. These regulations apply to all taught undergraduate and postgraduate programmes and qualifications leading to an award of New College of the Humanities (the College).
2. These regulations should be read in conjunction with [AQF7 Academic Regulations for Taught Awards](#).
3. The term 'programme' is used to refer to the curriculum route that leads to a named award as defined in each programme specification. The term 'course' is used to refer to each credit bearing component of study as defined in each Course Descriptor.
4. To be eligible for an award a student must be registered on the award and all awards must have been completed within the approved maximum registration periods specified in Table 1.

Table 1: Maximum length of registration period

Traditional Qualifications	FHEQ Level	Indicative FT Length (years)	Full time Maximum Registration (years)	Indicative PT Length (years)	Part time Maximum Registration (years)
Certificate of Higher Education	4	1	3	2	4
Diploma of Higher Education	5	2	4	4	6
Bachelor's Degree or Honours Degree	6	3	5	6	8
Postgraduate certificate	7	1	2	1	2
Postgraduate Diploma	7	1	2	2	4
Taught Master's Degree	7	1	2	2	4

5. Students on an approved programme can only study the courses on that programme and may not substitute these for other courses; except through the application of **Recognition of Prior Learning and Credit Transfer**.
6. Practice-based standards and requirements of professional bodies may be reflected in learning outcomes where appropriate.
7. Assessment is a matter of academic judgment and not just the computation of marks. Specific rights of appeals against a decision involving academic judgement are very limited.
8. An award may, however, only be made when the student has fulfilled the objectives and learning outcomes of the programme and achieved the required academic standard.

DEFINITIONS

Anonymous Marking	Where the identity of students is concealed during the marking process.
Assessment	The process of measuring the performance of students (for example, examinations, coursework and dissertations) that enables students to monitor their progress and contributes to their academic results.
Second Marking	Second marking is used at any level and for any type of assessment to assist examiners who are less familiar with assessment at HE Level and/or other College standards. In this case, the second examiner will be an experienced member of faculty and should provide feedback to the first examiner on both the level and the nature of the feedback provided.
Double Marking	Two markers mark the students' work, with the second marker seeing the first marker's mark and feedback. All dissertations or final projects at Level 6 and Level 7 are double marked. All other assessments are moderated.
Feedback	Information provided to students on the quality of their performance in relation to assessment criteria, which forms the basis of improved student learning. Feedback can help to highlight areas to develop, prioritise or change, and provide new ideas, insights and contexts on perspectives to consider.
Assessment Criteria	Statements specifying the standards that must be met and the evidence that will be gathered to demonstrate the achievement of learning outcomes. The purpose of assessment criteria is to establish clear and unambiguous standards of achievement for each learning outcome.
Formative Assessments	This type of assessment normally has no or low weighting in the final mark for a Course or Programme. The goal of formative assessments is to provide an opportunity for students to monitor their learning.
Learning Outcomes	What the student is expected to be able to do or demonstrate, in terms of particular knowledge, skills and understanding, by the end of the Course or Programme.

Mark Sheet	A list of all students eligible to take the assessment/course and the agreed marks or grades awarded, including first and second markers' grades where applicable.
Marking Scheme	A detailed breakdown of how marks for the assessment are allocated to specified components or criteria, possibly including a model answer.
Moderation	A process intended to ensure that an assessment outcome is fair and reliable, that the Assessment Criteria have been applied consistently, and that feedback to students is appropriate and consistently provided.
Summative Assessments	An assessment is summative when the grading of the assessment contributed to the final grade for a Course. The aim of summative assessment is to evaluate students' attainment of the Learning Outcomes within a Course or Programme.

ASSESSMENT OF COURSES

9. All students registered for a particular course should follow the same assessment plan and consequently take the same number of assessment elements and assessment types, although the precise assessment element may legitimately vary between student groups and students. One Progression and Award Board will ratify the marks for all the students taking that course in the same sitting.
10. The first assessment attempt (first sitting) for all elements must be scheduled to occur before the end date of the course.
11. The form of assessment for each course must be specified within the Course Descriptor. Where there is more than one element of assessment, the weighting attached to each element must be stated on the Course Descriptor.
12. All courses must be summatively assessed; assessment elements will normally be marked using the common assessment mark scheme (see [AQF7 Academic Regulations for Taught Awards](#)). A mark must be produced for each assessment element such that an overall course mark can be determined. Exceptionally, there may be a requirement for an individual assessment element to be exempt from marking. Such exceptions must be approved through the programme approval or course approval and programme modification processes and stated on the Course Descriptor.
13. See [Annex A](#) for the Generic Grade Criteria for Level 4, Level 5, Level 6 and Level 7.

COURSE PASS MARK

14. The overall course pass mark is 40% for undergraduate programmes and 50% for postgraduate programmes. Marking on a pass/fail basis is not permitted except for zero weighted assessments.
15. Marks for all assessment elements will be aggregated, according to their weighting as defined in the Course Descriptor, at each assessment sitting to determine the overall course mark for that sitting. Course marks will not be rounded up or down. For the purposes of progression and award, the

best mark achieved for each element will be aggregated, regardless of sitting. The course will be deemed a pass where the aggregated course result is 40% or above, even if individual elements are below 40%, for undergraduate programmes; or where the aggregated course result is 50% or above, even if individual assessments are below 50%, for postgraduate programmes.

16. There may be a requirement for individual assessment elements to be passed in their own right (i.e., a must pass element). In these circumstances, those elements must achieve a pass mark of 40%/50% or more. Such exceptions must be approved through the College's programme and course approval and modification procedure and stated on the Course Descriptor (see [AQF4 Programme and Course Approval and Modification](#)). Note: for Degree Apprenticeships programmes, all assessment elements must be passed.
17. Where a course has more than one assessment element, and one element is 'deferred' the course mark for that sitting will be calculated on the marks available and, regardless of the course outcome, the student will be offered an opportunity to attempt the deferred element at the next sitting.
18. Course marks will be aggregated according to their weighting as defined in the Course Descriptor. Course marks will not be rounded up or down (see [AQF7 Academic Regulations for Taught Awards](#)).

LATE SUBMISSION OF SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT ELEMENTS

19. Students are strongly advised to submit their assessments ahead of the published deadlines. If assessments are submitted after the published deadline, penalties will be imposed. The graduated penalty system is:
 - Up to one day late of the published submission deadline = 5% points deducted from the grade. For example, an assignment awarded 58% from the markers, the final mark recorded will be 53%. If the assignment is awarded 42% from the markers, the final mark recorded will be 37%.
 - Two to seven days late, any mark of 42% or higher will be capped at 40% for undergraduate students. Any mark of 50% or higher will be capped at 50% for postgraduate students. Any mark below 42% for undergraduate students and below 50% for postgraduate students will stand.
 - Students who do not submit their assignment within seven days, and have no approved extenuating circumstances, are deemed to have failed that assessment element and the mark recorded will be 0%.

EXTENSION OF AN ASSESSMENT SUBMISSION DEADLINE DATE

20. Students may submit a request for an extension to an assessment submission date where Extenuating Circumstances have impacted on their learning and where a later submission would put them in a position of being 'fit to study' and to complete the work.

21. All approved extension requests will result in the student having an additional seven days from the original deadline date in which to submit their assessment, standard procedure for late submissions will apply.

SUBMISSIONS

22. Students are required to make a credible and reasonable attempt at all assessments by showing that:
 - 22.1. The submission is in the form required by the assessment brief.
 - 22.2. The academic content of the submission addresses the specified topic.
23. Submissions which do not meet these criteria will be regarded as a non-submission for assessment purposes and awarded a mark of zero.

MARKING

ANONYMOUS MARKING POLICY

24. The College policy on anonymous marking specifies that work should be marked anonymously wherever possible in order to provide reassurance that marking is fair. Similarly, decisions on progressions and awards must be made anonymously.
25. All examination scripts and all summative course work submitted for assessment at Levels 4-7 should be marked anonymously. Any exceptions to this policy should be formally approved using the Variance to Academic Regulation Form during the course approval procedure.
26. Anonymity should remain until such time as the marking process is complete. Once the process is complete, candidate names and numbers should be reconciled with marks in preparation for Course Assessment Board meetings.
27. It is recognised that, while the principle of anonymity ought to be retained, the blanket application of anonymous marking is not always possible (e.g., oral examinations, presentations or performances, laboratory or field work, research dissertations or theses). When this is the case, it is the responsibility of the Faculty to ensure that marks are awarded in a fair and equitable manner through the use of specific moderation techniques.

MARKING ILLEGIBLE SCRIPTS

28. An illegible script, either in its entirety or in part, is one that is not possible for a marker to decipher in a way that is fair and/or reliable and therefore an assessment decision cannot be made.
29. If a marker is unable to read a script, the script must be sent to the Head of Faculty (HoF) to confirm that the script is illegible. If the HoF is the marker, the script must be sent to the Registrar.
30. If it is confirmed that the script is illegible, Registry will contact the student in question, in writing, and ask them to attend the College in order to dictate their examination script for transcription. If the student refuses to attend, they will be awarded a mark of zero.

31. The person appointed to type the script must not be a registered student of the College (undergraduate or postgraduate). The costs associated with producing the script will fall to the student, and the cost will be agreed between the College and the scribe.
32. The content of the original script cannot be amended in any way, including spelling or grammatical errors or altering any figures or diagrams. The student will be informed that the purpose of attendance is to transcribe the existing script and that any addition or omission of material will constitute a breach of academic integrity.
33. If any text cannot be transcribed (including by the student), it will be highlighted on the original script.
34. Following transcription, the student must sign a form to confirm that the transcript is a true copy of the original. The form should be kept separately from the transcript, to preserve the student's anonymity during the marking process.
35. This procedure does not apply where alternative examination arrangements are in place for a student or where special considerations apply which relate to a student's ability to write legible.

COMPENSATION

36. Compensation is only available to students registered on undergraduate programmes. Compensation is not permitted on Degree Apprenticeship programmes or postgraduate taught programmes.
37. Compensation is the process by which the Programme and Award Board, in consideration of the student's overall performance in the programme and their engagement on a programme recommends that credit be awarded for a course in which the student has failed to satisfy the assessment criteria, in order to enable the student to progress to the next level or be awarded the appropriate qualification.
38. Compensation will be used to re-dress marginal failure where a student has obtained a minimum mark of 35% (UG) in each assessment element in the course being considered for compensation.
39. Compensation can only be used when a student has attempted all assessments for a given sitting across all courses at that level.
40. At undergraduate level compensation will be permitted up to 30-credit points per level.
41. Compensation cannot be applied to courses that a student is studying in addition to the programme they are registered on.
42. Compensation may not be applied to courses where a student has failed an element which has been designated as a 'must pass' or where a student has failed the course as a result of receiving an academic misconduct penalty of failing the course with no right to re-sit.
43. Compensation will be applied automatically when all the above criteria for compensation have been met. Where students are eligible for compensation

in more than one course at that level, the course with the highest average mark will be compensated. If, exceptionally, a Head of Faculty/Programme Director considers a compensation should not be applied then they must apply to the Chair of PAB for an exemption from this regulation.

PROGRESSION CRITERIA

UNDERGRADUATE

44. Students can proceed to the next level of the programme with a maximum of 30 referred/deferred credits from the current level. Students cannot progress to the next level with an irretrievably failed course where all its reassessment opportunities have been exhausted.
45. Students who are unable to progress to the next level will be required to repeat the failed courses.
46. Final year, Level 6 students who are referred in 30 credits or less after the second attempt (second sitting) and cannot be compensated in the failed course(s) will be offered the opportunity to have two further attempts at the failed assessment elements or accept the exit award for which they are eligible. Where a student fails to notify the College of their choice within 10 working-days, they will be given the appropriate award.
47. Students who achieve fewer than 90 credits at Level 6 after the second attempt (second sitting) will be offered the option to repeat the failed course(s) or accept the exit award for which they are eligible.

POSTGRADUATE

48. Students are required to achieve 180 Level 7 credits to be awarded the postgraduate taught programme.
49. Within the programme structure, some course may be designated as a corequisite or a prerequisite for another course. This is to enable the student to demonstrate that their skills and knowledge are at a standard to progress to the next course.
 - 49.1. Corequisite: a course required to be taken in conjunction with another course.
 - 49.2. Prerequisite: a course that is required to be taken before another course.
50. Corequisites and prerequisites are agreed through the College's regulations ([AQF4 Programme and Course Approval and Modification](#)).

REASSESSMENT

DEFINITIONS

Refer	The student is required to attempt the failed assessment element(s) only. College is not expected to provide tutorials for referral assessment.
-------	--

	The marks for referred assessments will be capped at the pass mark.
Defer	The student's application for Extenuating Circumstances against an assessment element was approved and therefore they will be permitted to take that assessment again at the next available opportunity without any additional penalty; existing penalties will remain.
Deficit Course	This refers to the course which was not passed after the second sitting, but the student was able to proceed to the next level/stage with that deficit. Students will be required to undertake the assessments that have not been passed in this course at the next available opportunity. The marks will be capped at the pass mark.
Repeat Course	This refers to a course which was not passed after the second sitting and the student was not able to proceed to the next level. The course must be attempted again with attendance. Students will be assessed in the course as if for the first time: marks will not be capped and marks from the original attempt will not be carried forward. Students cannot progress with a failed repeat course as it becomes an irretrievably failed course.
Irretrievably Failed	Where all attempts on a course have been taken and the course has not been passed. Students cannot progress to the next level/stage where they have irretrievably failed a course and will be offered the appropriate exit award or institutional credits.

REASSESSMENT OPPORTUNITIES

51. Where students have failed to achieve a pass mark for the course at the first sitting, they shall be offered a referral attempt for each failed element at the second sitting, except where the recommendation of an Academic Misconduct Panel invokes a 'no right to referral' academic penalty.
52. Students shall not be able to re-attempt any passed elements of assessment except where students are required to repeat a course or where an academic misconduct penalty of fail course has been recommended.
53. Students must attempt the referred and deferred assessments at the next sitting as indicated at the time of results publication.
54. Students who, after the second sitting, failed the course but are eligible to progress to the next level with deficit credits will be granted two further attempts at the failed assessment element(s). Deficit courses that have not been passed after the final attempt will be classified as an irretrievable failed course. Students cannot progress to the next level with an irretrievable failure.
55. Students who, after the second sitting, did not pass the course because of deferred elements but are eligible to proceed with deficit credits will be granted further attempts at the failed assessment element(s).

56. Students who, after the second sitting, are unable to progress to the next level shall be permitted one opportunity to repeat the course(s) which were not passed, except where the recommendation of the Academic Misconduct Panel invokes a 'no right to resit' academic penalty. Students must register for the repeat course(s) and attempt all assessment elements.
57. Where a student is referred in an assessment element as a result of a proven case of academic misconduct, they must make a valid attempt at the referred element. If no valid attempt is made, the course mark will be marked as zero, fail.
58. Where a student has submitted Extenuating Circumstances which have been accepted, they will be offered a deferral, that is, another attempt to take the missed assessment element. In such cases, the deferred assessment element will be marked as normal and the earned mark awarded. In cases where a deferral is offered in respect of a referred assessment, the mark will be capped at 40% (UG) and 50% (PG).
59. Where a student has passed a course, but been deferred in an element, they will be offered the opportunity to take the deferred element.

AWARDS

60. For the definition of traditional awards see the [AQF7 Academic Regulations for Taught Awards](#).

CONFERMENT OF AWARDS OF STUDENTS ADMITTED WITH ADVANCED STANDING OR AWARDED THROUGH RPL

61. PAB will take account of the credit value of the exempted level in judging a student's eligibility against the thresholds set for conferment of the College's Awards. When calculating the final classification/result, only the courses assessed at the College will be counted – no marks for the exempted level(s) will be awarded.
62. When a student has been given credit for prior learning, Progression and Award Boards will take account of that credit in judging the student's eligibility against the credit thresholds set for conferment of the College's Awards.
63. Where the calculation method includes discounting of courses and the student has 60 or more credits at Level 5 then discounting will be applied in line with the classification method below using only those courses and credits studied at the College.

AWARD OF A TAUGHT DEGREE

Bachelor's Degree

64. In order to complete a Degree with Honours, students shall satisfy the requirements associated with such an award as set out in the programme specification.

65. Students may be considered for an Honours degree, having been assessed in and been awarded 360 credits, Levels 4-6. Students must have been assessed in all courses.¹
66. Where a student has been assessed in 360 credits, and has achieved at least 300 credits, the student will be eligible for the award of an Ordinary Degree.

Master's Degree

67. In order to complete a Degree, students shall satisfy the requirements associated with such an award as set out in the programme specification.
68. Students may be considered for an award, having been assessed in and been awarded 180 credits, Level 7. Students must have been assessed in all courses.²

CLASSIFICATION OF AWARDS

Bachelor's Degrees

69. Classification marks for undergraduate programmes will be calculated using the weighted average course marks for the best 90 credits at Level 4, weighted at 1; best 90 credits at Level 5, weighted at 3; and all Level 6 120 credits, weighted at 5. Classifications averages are calculated to one decimal point places. For further information, please refer to [AQF7 Academic Regulations for Taught Awards](#) Annex B: Calculation of Classification Mark.
70. The calculated overall classification mark will determine the Honours classification awarded, the classification boundaries are:
 - 70.1. Bachelors Award with Honours:
 - 70.1.1. 69.5% or more: First Class
 - 70.1.2. 59.5% – 69.4%: Second Class (First Division)
 - 70.1.3. 49.5% - 59.4%: Second Class (Second Division)
 - 70.1.4. 39.5% - 49.4%: Third Class
 - 70.2. For further information on the weighting calculation, please see [Annex B](#).

Master's Degrees

71. Master's Award with Merit:
 - 71.1. Attained a mark of 62% or above in 60 credits.
 - 71.2. Attained a mark of 58% or above in at least half of the remaining credits.
72. Master's Award with Distinction:
 - 72.1. Attained a mark of 72% or above in 60 credits.
 - 72.2. Attained a mark of 68% or above in at least half of the remaining credits.

¹ Credit awarded through the Recognition of Prior Learning Process is assessed credit

² Credit awarded through the Recognition of Prior Learning Process is assessed credit

EXIT AWARDS

73. A student who withdraws or is withdrawn from a programme, will be granted credit for those courses completed successfully at the College or been awarded through the Recognition of Prior Learning, except where credit has been withdrawn as a result of an academic misconduct penalty.
74. Exiting students who have shown they have achieved the specified learning outcomes for an award at a lower level than that which they were originally registered on will be granted that award.
 - 74.1. Undergraduate
 - 74.1.1. Certificate of Higher Education for successful completion of 120 L4 credits.
 - 74.1.2. Diploma of Higher Education for successful completion of 120 L4 credits and 120 L5 credits.
 - 74.2. Postgraduate
 - 74.2.1. Postgraduate certificate for successful completion of 60 L7 credits
 - 74.2.2. Postgraduate diploma for successful completion of 120 L7 credits.

POSTHUMOUS AWARDS

75. An award may be conferred posthumously where a student was close to completing their programme of study. The relevant Progression & Award Board will consider each case on an individual basis.
76. No classification shall be awarded in the case of a posthumous award.
77. Exits awards and the College's Diploma may also be conferred as a posthumous award.
78. For further information, please see [AQF7 Academic Regulations for Taught Awards](#), Section 7.88.

AEGROTAT AWARDS

79. An aegrotat award may be conferred where a student was close to achieving an award but due to illness or other valid reason, as approved by the Registrar, is unlikely to be able to complete their studies within the maximum registration period. The relevant PAB will consider each case on an individual basis.
 80. Where a student is receiving an aegrotat undergraduate or postgraduate degree no classification shall be awarded.
 81. The Diploma of Higher Education may also be conferred as an aegrotat Diploma of Higher Education.
 82. Aegrotat awards for students on other programmes may be conferred in certain exceptional circumstances.
-

Title: Assessment Regulations for Taught Awards					
Approved by: Academic Board					
Version number	Date approved	Date published	Author	Location	Proposed next review date
3.1	March 2021	April 2021	Director of Academic Services	Academic Handbook; Academic Quality Framework	August 2021
3.0	January 2021	January 2021	Director of Academic Services	Academic Handbook; Academic Quality Framework	August 2021
2.1	January 2021	January 2021	Director of Academic Services	Academic Handbook; Academic Quality Framework	August 2021
2.0	September 2020	September 2020	Head of Quality Assurance	Academic Handbook; Academic Quality Framework	August 2021
1.0	June 2019	-	Head of Quality Assurance	-	August 2021
Referenced documents	AQF7 Academic Regulations for Taught Awards; Recognition for Prior Learning; AQF4 Programme and Course Approval and Modifications; AQF 12 Assessment Boards; Assessment Regulations; Variance to Academic Regulations Form.				
External Reference Point(s)					



ANNEX A – GENERIC GRADE CRITERIA

LEVEL 4

GENERIC CRITERIA LEVEL 4						
KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING						
100/90/85/80	75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/45/42	35	20/5/0
Exceptional breadth and depth for work at this level.	Accurate and coherent in breadth, with depth in many areas.	Accurate in breadth, with depth in several areas.	Accurate, with depth in some aspects.	Largely accurate across most areas, with limited depth.	Inaccuracies/omissions in some areas, depth limited.	Substantial inaccuracies, omissions, irrelevancies.
Excellent understanding of concepts/theories (some of them abstract) and/or current practice, and several of their applications and implications.	Thorough understanding of concepts and theories (some of them abstract) and/or current practice, and some of their implications and applications.	Clear understanding of concepts and theories (some of them abstract) and/or practice and some of their implications and applications.	Satisfactory understanding of the relevant concepts, theories and/or practice; Shows some ability to deal with unfamiliar and abstract ideas.	Adequate understanding of the main concepts, theories, and/or practice; Engagement with unfamiliar/ abstract ideas or implications and applications is slight.	Occasional errors in understanding of main concepts, theories and/or practice; Struggles to engage with unfamiliar/ abstract ideas and complexities.	Substantial errors in understanding of concepts, theories and/or practice, or none.

GENERIC CRITERIA LEVEL 4						
SUBJECT SPECIFIC						
100/90/85/80	75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/45/42	35	20/5/0
Selects and applies appropriate methods to address/solve complex and often unfamiliar and unpredictable problems.	Applies appropriate methods to address/solve complex issues/problems, some unfamiliar/Unpredictable.	Uses appropriate given methods to address complex issues/problems, some unfamiliar/unpredictable.	Uses given methods to analyse issues/problems, some unfamiliar/unpredictable and complex.	Analysis using given methods is adequate.	Superficial analysis.	Analysis absent or with significant errors/Omissions.
Exceptional judgement in selection, analysis and evaluation of information and application of learning to different contexts.	Exercises judgement in selection, analysis and evaluation of information and application of learning to a different context.	Exercises judgement in selection and analysis of information, with some evaluation, and application of learning in a different context.	Satisfactory selection and analysis of information, with little evaluation; Applies some aspect of learning in a different context.	Limited ability to apply learning to complex, unfamiliar or unpredictable contexts or issues.	Some failure to apply learning to complex, unfamiliar or unpredictable issues/contexts.	Fails to apply learning.
Excellent investigative skills generate well-founded and evidenced conclusions/practical solutions.	Thorough investigation generates well-founded conclusions/practical solutions.	Investigation generates well-founded conclusions/practical solutions.	Investigation generates some conclusions/practical solutions.	Tendency to description and reliance on familiar/given methods and approaches.	Overly descriptive and reliant on familiar/given material or approaches.	Descriptive and heavily reliant on very restricted range of given/familiar material and approaches, poorly understood.

GENERIC CRITERIA LEVEL 4						
SUBJECT SPECIFIC						
100/90/85/80	75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/45/42	35	20/5/0
Explores and evaluates information/ideas from a wide range of sources (may include primary sources).	Explores and deploys information from a wide range of mostly secondary sources.	Locates and organises a wide range of information/evidence.	Locates and organises a satisfactory range of information/evidence, some of it beyond the given/familiar.	Locates and organises an acceptable range of information/evidence mostly from given/familiar secondary sources.	Range of information limited to the familiar/given with some errors in organisation.	Range of information inadequate and disorganised.
Competence in all the required specialised practical, technical, creative, scholarly or work-related skills. exceeds expectations for this level.	Competence in all the required specialised practical, technical, creative, scholarly or work-related skills, exceeds expectations for this level in some aspects.	Competently uses all the required specialised practical, technical, creative, scholarly or work-related skills, with indications of more developed ability in some areas.	Competently uses all of the required specialised practical, technical, creative, scholarly or work-related skills, with more developed capability in at least one area.	Use of all the required specialised practical, technical, creative, scholarly, or work-related skills is adequate.	Use of some of the required specialised practical, technical, creative, scholarly or work-related skills is inadequate.	Inadequate use of many/all of the required specialised practical, technical, creative, scholarly or work related skills.

GENERIC CRITERIA LEVEL 4						
TRANSFERABLE SKILLS						
100/90/85/80	75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/45/42	35	20/5/0
Excellent presentation and organisation of work and lucid communication in all contexts.	Excellent presentation and organisation of work and lucid communication in most contexts.	Presentation and organisation of work appropriate to context and purpose, communication clear.	Satisfactory organisation and presentation of work, communications mostly appropriate to the context/purpose.	Organisation and presentation of work and communications adequate in most contexts; some mistakes/irrelevancies.	Elements of disorganisation/poor presentation/poor or inappropriate communication or expression.	Work is disorganised, poorly presented with poor inappropriate communication and expression.
Exemplary referencing/citation.	Extensive, accurate referencing/citation.	Referencing consistent and accurate.	Referencing mostly consistent/accurate.	Some errors in referencing.	Errors/omissions in referencing, or none.	Substantial errors in referencing, or none.
Work demonstrates independence and initiative beyond level expectations, setting objectives and taking responsibility for outcomes.	Work demonstrates independence and some initiative in setting objectives and taking responsibility for outcomes.	Work demonstrates independence in setting some objectives beyond those given and taking responsibility for outcomes.	Work demonstrates satisfactory independence in addressing objectives and taking responsibility for outcomes.	Work demonstrates adequate independence in taking responsibility for outcomes.	Work demonstrates insufficient independence in attempting to address given objectives and taking responsibility for outcomes.	Work fails to address objectives and take responsibility for outcomes.
Evidences developed team-working and indications of leadership ability.	Evidences developed team-working skills.	Evidences a high level of team-working skills.	Evidences team-working and basic leadership skills.	Tendency to rely on support/direction from others.	Over-reliance on support/direction from others.	Fails to engage in /shows deficiencies in team working.

GENERIC CRITERIA LEVEL 4						
TRANSFERABLE SKILLS						
100/90/85/80	75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/45/42	35	20/5/0
Critical reflection/self-evaluation exceptional for this level.	Reflection and self-evaluation often critical and insightful.	Reflection generates a number of critical insights.	Satisfactory reflection with some insights.	Limited reflection with few insights	Minimal reflection lacks insight.	Reflection inadequate/absent with no insight.

LEVEL 5

GENERIC CRITERIA LEVEL 5						
KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING						
100/90/85/80	75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/45/42	35	20/5/0
Exceptional breadth and depth.	Accurate and coherent in breadth, with depth in most areas.	Accurate in breadth, with depth in many areas.	Accurate, with depth in several aspects.	Largely accurate across most areas, with limited depth.	Accuracy limited in breadth and depth; Some inaccuracies/omissions.	Superficial/partial with substantial inaccuracies/omissions/irrelevancies.
Highly developed critical understanding of abstract concepts, theories and/or cutting-edge practice, their implications and applications.	Developed understanding of abstract concepts, theories and/or current practice and several of their implications and applications.	Thorough understanding of abstract concepts, theories and/or current practice and some of their implications and applications.	Satisfactory understanding of the relevant concepts, theories and/or practice and their main implications and applications; Understanding of more abstract aspects sometimes less developed.	Adequate understanding of the main concepts, theories and/or practice. Limited ability to deal with abstract or unfamiliar ideas and their implications and applications.	Engagement with unfamiliar/abstract ideas or implications and applications is slight. Understanding of main concepts, theories and/or practice not wholly accurate.	Substantial errors in understanding of concepts, theories and/or practice, or none; Fails to engage with/address complex/abstract/unfamiliar ideas or their implications.

GENERIC CRITERIA LEVEL 5						
SUBJECT SPECIFIC						
100/90/85/80	75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/45/42	35	20/5/0
Applies and refines appropriate methods to address/solve complex, unfamiliar	Selects and applies appropriate methods to address/solve complex, unfamiliar and	Applies appropriate methods to address/ solve complex issues /problems, some	Uses appropriate (largely given) methods to analyse unfamiliar/unpredictable and complex	Uses appropriate given methods to analyse unfamiliar/unpredictable issues/problems,	Superficial analysis of unfamiliar/unpredictable issues/problems, lacking in evaluation; Little	Relies on description, no analysis or evaluation.

GENERIC CRITERIA LEVEL 5						
SUBJECT SPECIFIC						
100/90/85/80	75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/45/42	35	20/5/0
and unpredictable problems.	unpredictable issues/problems.	unfamiliar/unpredictable.	issues /problems, with some evaluation and reformatting of information.	with limited evaluation.	attempt to apply prior learning to new contexts.	
Exceptional critical judgement in analysis, evaluation and reformatting of information and application of prior learning in differing contexts.	Critical judgement in analysis, evaluation and reformatting of information and application of prior learning in different contexts.	Largely consistent and critical judgement in analysis, evaluation and reformatting of information and application of prior learning in different contexts.	Applies some aspects of prior learning to different contexts.	Limited application of prior learning to new contexts.		Fails to apply learning to different contexts.
Excellent investigative skills, and research skills beyond expectations for this level.	Systematic and thorough investigation generates well-founded conclusions/practical solutions showing some originality or creativity.	Thorough investigation generates well-founded conclusions /practical solutions with some aspect of creativity or originality.	Investigation generates satisfactory conclusions/practical solutions with limited creativity/originality.	Tendency to description and reliance on familiar /given material or approaches.	More descriptive than analytical and tends to rely on familiar/given material or approaches.	Poor investigation with erroneous conclusions/practical solutions, or none, inadequately argued or evidenced.
Creative/original conclusions or practical solutions are convincingly	Explores and evaluates information from a wide range of	Locates and explores a wide range of information/evid	Locates and organises a satisfactory range of	Basic investigation generates adequate,	Basic investigation generates few or partial and often	Relies on inadequate range of poor-quality information, inaccurately

GENERIC CRITERIA LEVEL 5						
SUBJECT SPECIFIC						
100/90/85/80	75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/45/42	35	20/5/0
justified/ argued/evidenced.	sources, both primary and secondary (some may be at the forefront of knowledge /practice).	ence with some use of primary sources.	information/evidence, with limited use of primary sources.	mainly derivative conclusions/practical solutions, adequately argued/evidence d.	derivative conclusions/practical solutions, insufficiently argued/evidenced .	understood/ organised.
Exemplary exploration and evaluation of information/ideas from an extensive range of sources, including primary sources (may be at the forefront of knowledge/practice) .	Competence, within broad parameters, in all the required specialised practical, technical, creative, scholarly or work-related skills, exceeds level expectations in some aspects and shows awareness of professional contexts and expectations.	Competence, within broad parameters, in all the required specialised practical, technical, creative, scholarly or work-related skills, with indications of more developed ability in some areas and an awareness of professional contexts and expectations.	Achieves a basic level of competence in all the required specialised practical, technical, creative, scholarly or work-related skills, with more developed capability in at least one area and an awareness of professional contexts and expectations.	Locates and organises an acceptable range of information/evidence often from given/ familiar secondary sources.	Range of information /evidence limited, mostly from familiar /given secondary sources, sometimes poorly organised.	Fails to achieve basic competence in the required specialised practical, technical, creative, scholarly or work-related skills; no awareness of professional contexts /expectations.

GENERIC CRITERIA LEVEL 5						
SUBJECT SPECIFIC						
100/90/85/80	75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/45/42	35	20/5/0
Consistent competence, within broad parameters, in all the required specialised practical, technical, creative, scholarly or work-related skills, with indications of exceptional ability in some and understanding of professional contexts and expectations.				Achieves basic competence in all the required specialised practical, technical, creative, scholarly or work-related skills, with little awareness of professional contexts and expectations.	Marginally fails to achieve basic competence in (some of) the required specialised practical, technical, creative, scholarly or work-related skills, with only slight awareness of professional contexts and expectations.	

GENERIC CRITERIA LEVEL 5						
TRANSFERABLE SKILLS						
100/90/85/80	75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/45/42	35	20/5/0
Excellent presentation and organisation of work and lucid communication in all contexts.	Excellent presentation and organisation of work and lucid communication in most contexts.	Presentation and organisation of work appropriate to context and purpose, communication clear.	Satisfactory organisation and presentation of work, communications mostly appropriate to the context/purpose.	Organisation and presentation of work and communications adequate in most contexts, with some mistakes/irrelevancies.	Elements of disorganisation/poor presentation/poor or inappropriate communication or expression.	Work is disorganised, poorly presented with poor/inappropriate expression/communication.

GENERIC CRITERIA LEVEL 5						
TRANSFERABLE SKILLS						
100/90/85/80	75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/45/42	35	20/5/0
Exemplary referencing/citation.	Referencing/citation on comprehensive.	Referencing/citation consistent and accurate.	Referencing/citation largely consistent /accurate.	Some errors in referencing/citation.	Errors/omissions in referencing/citation, or none.	Substantial errors in referencing/citation, or none.
Work demonstrates autonomy and initiative in setting challenging objectives and taking accountability for outcomes.	Work demonstrates independence and some initiative in setting challenging objectives and taking accountability for outcomes.	Work demonstrates independence and occasional initiative in setting objectives beyond those given and taking accountability for outcomes.	Work demonstrates satisfactory independence in addressing objectives (some beyond those given) and taking responsibility for outcomes.	Work demonstrates adequate independence in addressing given objectives and taking some responsibility for outcomes; Tendency to rely on support /direction from others.	Work demonstrates insufficient independence in attempting to address given objectives and taking responsibility for outcomes; Over-reliance on support/direction from others.	Work lacks independence, does not address objectives and fails to take responsibility for outcomes.
Evidences sustained team-working and clear leadership skills.	Evidences developed team-working and some leadership skills.	Evidences a high level of team-working and some leadership skills.	Evidences team-working and basic leadership skills.	Limited team working skills.	Underdeveloped team working skills.	Fails to engage in/shows deficiencies in team-working.
Critical reflection and self-evaluation sustained and exceptionally insightful.	Reflection and self-evaluation frequently critical and insightful.	Sustained reflection and self-evaluation generates a number of critical insights.	Satisfactory self-evaluation and reflection with some critical insights.	Self-evaluation and reflection limited with few insights.	Very limited self-evaluation/reflection lacks insight.	Self-evaluation and reflection inadequate/absent with no insight.

LEVEL 6

GENERIC CRITERIA LEVEL 6						
KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING						
100/90/85/80	75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/45/42	35	20/5/0
Exceptional depth in breadth; Contributes new knowledge to the subject/field of practice.	Accurate and coherent in breadth and depth and generates an element of new knowledge in some aspect(s) of the subject/field.	Accurate and coherent in breadth, with depth in most areas.	Accurate, with depth in many aspects.	Largely accurate across most areas, with limited depth.	Accuracy limited in breadth and depth; Some inaccuracies /omissions.	Superficial/partial , with significant inaccuracies / omissions /irrelevancies.
Advanced critical understanding of abstract concepts, theories and/or cutting-edge practice, their implications and applications, exceeds expectations for undergraduate work.	Excellent understanding of abstract concepts, theories and/or cutting-edge practice; their implications and applications.	Thorough understanding of abstract concepts, theories and/or cutting-edge practice and several of their implications and applications	Satisfactory understanding of the relevant concepts, theories and/or practice and their main implications and applications; Understanding of more abstract aspects sometimes less developed.	Adequate understanding of the main concepts, theories and/or practice; Limited ability to deal with abstract or unfamiliar ideas and their implications and applications.	Largely but not wholly accurate understanding of the main concepts, theories and/or practice; Engagement with abstract/unfamiliar ideas or implications and applications is slight.	Conceptual and theoretical understanding inadequate with significant errors; Fails to deal with complex/ abstract/unfamiliar ideas or their implications /applications.

GENERIC CRITERIA LEVEL 6						
SUBJECT SPECIFIC						
100/90/85/80	75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/45/42	35	20/5/0
Designs methods that convincingly address/solve complex, unfamiliar and unpredictable issues/problems.	Applies and refines appropriate methods to address/solve complex, unfamiliar and unpredictable issues/problems.	Selects and applies appropriate methods to address/solve complex, unfamiliar /unpredictable issues/problems.	Uses appropriate (often given) methods to analyse complex/unfamiliar and/or unpredictable issues/problems, with some evaluation and synthesis of information.	Uses appropriate methods to analyse complex issues /problems, with little evidence of evaluation or synthesis.	Superficial analysis of complex issue/problems, lacking in evaluation or synthesis.	Relies on description rather than analysis with no evidence of evaluation or synthesis.
Exceptional critical judgement in analysis, evaluation, synthesis and application /transformation of prior knowledge to differing contexts.	Sustained critical judgement in analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information and application/transformation of prior learning in different contexts.	Largely consistent and critical judgement in analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information and application/transformation of prior learning in different contexts.	Applies some aspects of prior learning to new contexts.	Limited transfer/application of prior learning to new contexts; Tendency to description and reliance on familiar /given material or approaches.	Little attempt to transfer and apply prior learning to new contexts; More descriptive than analytical and tends to rely on familiar/given material or approaches.	Fails to transfer/apply prior learning to new contexts.
Systematic and extensive research which exceeds expectations for undergraduate work.	Systematic and extensive research.	Effective and wide-ranging research.	Satisfactory research.	Limited range of research.	Limited research.	Lack of research.
Exemplary creative /original/compelling conclusions or practical solutions; convincingly justified/argued/evidenced	Insightful conclusions/practical solutions closely argued/evidenced showing originality	Conclusions/practical solutions logically argued/evidenced , with some aspect of insight,	Mostly relevant argument/evidence supports logical conclusions/practical solutions showing some	Few conclusions /practical solutions sparsely argued /evidenced, mainly derivative	Sparse conclusions /practical solutions insufficiently argued /evidenced and mostly derivative, with	Conclusions/practical solutions absent/superficial/flawed, insufficiently argued/evidenced

GENERIC CRITERIA LEVEL 6						
SUBJECT SPECIFIC						
100/90/85/80	75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/45/42	35	20/5/0
enced; exploration and critique of information /ideas from a comprehensive range of sources (primary and secondary), many at the forefront of knowledge/practice.	and creativity in several aspects.	creativity or originality.	critical insight and limited creativity or originality.	and with little critical insight.	marginally insufficient critical insight or creativity or originality.	and lacks critical insight or creativity or originality.
Consistent high-level competence in all the required specialised practical, technical, creative, scholarly or work-related skills, with mastery in many areas and developed understanding of professional contexts and expectations.	Explores and critiques information from a wide range of sources (primary and secondary), some at the forefront of knowledge/practice.	Explores and deploys information, including some aspects of new knowledge, from a wide range of secondary and several primary sources.	Locates and explores a satisfactory range of information/evidence, with some use of primary sources.	Locates and organises an acceptable range of information/evidence often from given /familiar secondary sources.	Range of information /evidence limited, mostly from familiar /given secondary sources, occasionally poorly organised.	Relies on restricted range of poor quality /given information /evidence, inaccurately understood/organised.
	Consistent competence in all the required specialised practical, technical, creative, scholarly or work-related skills, with indications of mastery in some areas and clear understanding of	Competence in all the required specialised practical, technical, creative, scholarly or work-related skills, with indications of more developed ability in some areas	Achieves a basic level of competence in all the required specialised practical, technical, creative, scholarly or work-related skills, with more developed capability in at	Basic competence in all the required specialised practical, technical, creative, scholarly or work-related skills, and partial awareness of professional contexts and expectations.	Marginally fails to achieve basic competence in (some of) the required specialised practical, technical, creative, scholarly or work-related skills, and little awareness of professional	Fails to achieve basic competence in the required specialised practical, technical, creative, scholarly or work-related skills, and lacks awareness of professional contexts and expectations.

GENERIC CRITERIA LEVEL 6						
SUBJECT SPECIFIC						
100/90/85/80	75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/45/42	35	20/5/0
	professional contexts and expectations.	and awareness of professional contexts and expectations.	least one area, and some awareness of professional contexts and expectations.		contexts and expectations.	

GENERIC CRITERIA LEVEL 6						
TRANSFERABLE SKILLS						
100/90/85/80	75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/45/42	35	20/5/0
Excellent presentation and organisation of work and fluent communication in all contexts.	Excellent presentation and organisation of work and fluent communication in most contexts.	Presentation and organisation of work appropriate to context and purpose, communication clear.	Satisfactory organisation and presentation of work, communications mostly appropriate to the context/purpose.	Organisation and presentation of work and communications adequate in most contexts, with some mistakes/irrelevancies.	Elements of disorganisation/poor presentation/poor communication or expression.	Communications too brief or rambling, inappropriate to context or purpose, with many errors/omissions, inadequately expressed/presented
Exemplary referencing/citation.	Referencing/citation comprehensive.	Referencing/citation consistent and accurate.	Referencing/citation largely consistent/accurate.	Some errors in referencing/citation.	Errors/omissions in referencing/citation, or none.	Substantial errors/omissions in referencing/citation, or none.
Work demonstrates considerable initiative and autonomy in setting challenging objectives and taking	Work demonstrates initiative and autonomy in setting challenging objectives and	Work demonstrates some initiative and autonomy in setting objectives	Work demonstrates satisfactory independence in addressing	Work demonstrates adequate independence in addressing mainly	Work demonstrates insufficient independence in attempting to address given	Work lacks independence, does not address objectives and fails to take

GENERIC CRITERIA LEVEL 6						
TRANSFERABLE SKILLS						
100/90/85/80	75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/45/42	35	20/5/0
accountability for outcomes.	taking accountability for outcomes.	beyond those given and taking accountability for outcomes.	objectives (some beyond those given) and taking responsibility for outcomes.	given objectives and taking responsibility for outcomes.	objectives and taking responsibility for outcomes.	responsibility for outcomes.
Evidences advanced team-working and leadership skills.	Evidences excellent team-working and leadership skills.	Evidences a high level of team-working and leadership skills.	Evidences team-working and some leadership skills.	Limited evidence of team-working /leadership skills.	Underdeveloped team-working/leadership skills.	Ineffective/deficient team-working with no evidence of leadership skills.
Critical reflection and self-evaluation sustained and exceptionally insightful.	Reflection and self-evaluation consistently critical and insightful.	Sustained reflection and self-evaluation generates a number of critical insights.	Satisfactory self-evaluation and reflection with some critical insights.	Some evidence of self-evaluation and reflection but with few critical insights.	Limited self-evaluation and reflection lacks critical insight.	Self-evaluation and reflection minimal or absent, with no critical insights.

LEVEL 7

KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING			
100/90/85/80/75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/42/35/20/5/0
Exceptional analysis of key issues/ concepts/ethics with very clear originality and autonomy.	Outstanding levels of accuracy, technical competence, organisation, and expression.	Shows a reasonable understanding of the major factual and/or theoretical issues involved.	Little development of factual or theoretical issues to demonstrates no knowledge or understanding related to the question set to failure to answer the question or develop a relevant argument.
Demonstrates independence of thought and a very high level of intellectual rigour and consistency.	Very high levels of creativity, originality and independence of thought.	Shows evidence of planning and selection from appropriate sources.	Evidence of misunderstanding to scripts contain clear factual errors or misunderstandings.
Exceptional development of argument and the ability to make informed judgements to develops a sophisticated and intelligent argument.	Shows strong evidence of critical insight and critical thinking.	Demonstrates some knowledge of the literature.	Some evidence of planning is demonstrated, but irrelevant material or arguments are included to demonstrates short answers and incoherent argument.
Shows clear evidence of wide and relevant reading and an engagement with the conceptual issues.	Shows a detailed understanding of the major factual and/or theoretical issues and directly engages with the relevant literature on the topic.	Shows, in places, examples of a clear train of thought or argument.	Demonstrates no knowledge of the key issues in the relevant literature.
Shows a rigorous use and a sophisticated understanding of relevant source materials, balancing appropriately between factual detail and key theoretical issues and are evaluated directly, and their assumptions and arguments challenged and/or appraised.	Develops a focussed and clear argument and articulates clearly and convincingly a sustained train of logical thought.	Introduced and concludes appropriately.	Demonstrates little to no evidence of critical thought or analysis.
Shows original thinking and a willingness to take risks.	Shows clear evidence of planning and appropriate choice of sources		

	and methodology, and ability of synthesis under exam pressure.		
--	--	--	--

SUBJECT SPECIFIC			
100/90/85/80/75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/42/35/20/5/0
Very significant ability to plan, organise and execute independently a research project or coursework assignment to significant ability to plan, organise and execute independently a research project or coursework assignment.	Ability to plan, organise and execute independently a research project or coursework assignment.	Ability to plan, organise and execute a research project or coursework assignment.	Limited ability to plan, organise and execute a research project or coursework assignment to a very limited ability to plan, organise and execute a research project or coursework assignment to no demonstrable ability to plan, organise and execute a research project or coursework assignment.
Very significant ability to evaluate literature and theory critically and make informed judgements and very significant ability to analyse data critically.	Strong evidence of critical insight and thinking.	A reasonable understanding of the major factual and/or theoretical issues involved.	Some awareness and understanding of the literature and of factual or theoretical issues, but with little development to clear conceptual or factual errors or misunderstandings to Little or no knowledge or understanding related to the assessment.
Very high levels of creativity, originality and independence of thought to significant ability to plan, organise and execute independently a research project or coursework assignment.	A detailed understanding of the major factual and/or theoretical issues and directly engages with the relevant literature on the topic.	Evidence of some knowledge of the literature with correct referencing.	Limited ability to analyse data to fragmentary evidence of critical thought or data analysis to no evidence of critical thought or data analysis.
Very significant ability to evaluate critically existing methodologies and suggest new approaches to current research or professional practice.	Clear evidence of planning and appropriate choice of sources and methodology with correct referencing.	Shows examples of a clear train of thought or argument.	Incomplete referencing to not engaging with the relevant literature or demonstrate a knowledge of the key issues to Little or no knowledge of the relevant literature to major errors in referencing.

Outstanding levels of accuracy, technical competence, organisation, expression with capacity to develop a sophisticated and intelligent argument.	Ability to analyse data critically.	Ability to analyse data.	Limited ability to present a clear and coherent argument to a failure to develop a coherent argument that relates to the research project or assignment to Incoherent argument.
Clear evidence of wide and relevant reading, referencing and an engagement with the conceptual issues.	Capacity to develop a focussed and clear argument and articulate clearly and convincingly a sustained train of logical thought.	Introduced and concludes appropriately.	
Rigorous use and a sophisticated understanding of relevant source materials, balancing appropriately between factual detail and key theoretical issues. Materials are evaluated directly, and their assumptions and arguments challenged and/or appraised			
Original thinking and a willingness to take risks.			

TRANSFERABLE SKILLS			
100/90/85/80/75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/42/35/20/5/0
<p>Exceptional presentation and organisation of work and fluent communication in all contexts.</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,</p>	<p>Presentation and organisation of work appropriate to context and purpose, communication clear to very high-level of communication skills in a range of complex contexts, and ability to write at publishable standard.</p> <p>Demonstrates very effective communication in a range of complex and specialised contexts.</p>	<p>Satisfactory organisation and presentation of work, communications mostly appropriate to the context/purpose.</p> <p>Demonstrates capabilities to support effective communication in a range of complex and specialised contexts.</p>	<p>Organisation and presentation of work and communications adequate in most contexts, with some mistakes/irrelevancies to elements of disorganisation/poor presentation/poor communication or expression to communications being too brief or rambling, inappropriate to context or purpose, with many errors /omissions, inadequately expressed/presented.</p>

TRANSFERABLE SKILLS			
100/90/85/80/75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/42/35/20/5/0
in principle, should be prioritised for a postgraduate research grant.			
Exemplary referencing/citation to referencing/citation comprehensive.	Referencing/citation consistent and accurate.	Referencing/citation largely consistent/accurate.	Some errors in referencing/citation to errors/omissions in referencing/citation, or substantial errors/omissions in referencing/citation, or none.
Work demonstrates considerable initiative and autonomy in setting challenging objectives and taking accountability for outcomes to work demonstrating initiative and autonomy in setting challenging objectives and taking accountability for outcomes.	Work demonstrates some initiative and autonomy in setting objectives beyond those given and taking accountability for outcomes to demonstrating the independent learning ability required for continuing professional development.	Work demonstrates satisfactory independence in addressing objectives (some beyond those given) and taking responsibility for outcomes.	Work demonstrates adequate independence in addressing mainly given objectives and taking responsibility for outcomes to demonstration of insufficient independence in attempting to address given objectives and taking responsibility for outcomes to lacking independence, does not address objectives and fails to take responsibility for outcomes.
Evidences advanced team-working and leadership skills to evidence of excellent team-working and leadership skills.	Evidences a high level of team-working and leadership skills.	Evidences team-working and some leadership skills.	Significant weaknesses evident in key areas such as communication, problem-solving and project management. Inability to adapt and to work flexibly, independently and/or as part of a team.
Critical reflection and self-evaluation sustained and exceptionally insightful to Reflection and self-evaluation consistently critical and insightful. Demonstrates a confidence with self-direction and originality in tackling and solving demanding problems.	Sustained reflection and self-evaluation generates a number of critical insights.	Satisfactory self-evaluation and reflection with some critical insights.	

TRANSFERABLE SKILLS			
100/90/85/80/75/72	68/65/62	58/55/52	48/42/35/20/5/0
<p>Confidently acts autonomously in planning and implementing tasks at a professional or equivalent level.</p> <p>Demonstrates the skills and attitudes needed to advance own knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills.</p>	<p>Shows a very high level to high level of employability skills, including team working/leadership, project management, IT/computer literacy, creativity and flexibility.</p> <p>Demonstrates autonomy and notable originality in tackling and solving demanding problems and demonstrates the independent learning ability required for continuing professional development.</p>	<p>Shows a consistently good level of employability skills, including team working, project management, IT/computer literacy, creativity and flexibility</p> <p>Demonstrates ability to advance own knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills.</p> <p>Demonstrates the independent learning ability required for continuing professional development</p>	<p>Demonstrates generally effective employability skills, including communication and problem-solving, but with some problematic areas of weakness to limited ability to adapt to inability to work flexibly, independently and/or as part of a team, but with areas of weakness.</p>



ANNEX B: CALCULATION OF CLASSIFICATION MARK

Classification =
$$\frac{\text{the sum of the weighted marks [mark x relevant credit volume x weight]}}{\text{The sum of credit volume x weighting}}$$

Level	Course Code	Credit	Weighting	Mark	Mark x credit volume x weighting	Credit volume x weighting	
All 120 credits @ Level 6							
6	NCHPH631	30	5	68	68 x 30 x 5 = 10200	30 x 5 = 150	
6	NCHPH632	30	5	73	73 x 30 x 5 = 10950	30 x 5 = 150	
6	NCHPH633	30	5	61	61 x 30 x 5 = 9150	30 x 5 = 150	
6	NCHPH616	30	5	68	68 x 30 x 5 = 10200	30 x 5 = 150	
Best 90 credits @ Level 5							
5	NCHPH513	30	3	60	60 x 30 x 3 = 5400	30 x 3 = 90	
5	NCHPH515	30	3	64	64 x 30 x 3 = 5760	30 x 3 = 90	
5	NCHPH530	30	3	58	58 x 30 x 3 = 5220	30 x 3 = 90	
Best 90 credits @ Level 4							
4	NCHPH407	30	1	67	67 x 30 x 1 = 2010	30 x 1 = 30	
4	NCHPH413	30	1	58	58 x 30 x 1 = 1740	30 x 1 = 30	
4	NCHPH414	30	1	61	61 x 30 x 1 = 1830	30 x 1 = 30	
SUM					62460	SUM	960

$$\text{C Score} = \frac{\text{the sum of the weighted marks}}{\text{The sum of the credit value}} = \frac{62460}{960} = 65\%$$