

## MA Unit Criteria (September 2015)

The level statements given below are illustrative rather than absolute requirements. They reflect the assessment elements.

<b>Overall</b> Scholarship Perspective Coherence	The extent of knowledge and depth of analysis. The breadth of view, critical perception and insight. The synthesis and control of material and the persuasiveness of arguments.
<b>Content</b>	The relevance of the topic to the content of the unit and the student's experience.
<b>Structure</b>	The structure and the way it enables arguments to develop logically and lead to reasoned conclusion.
<b>Presentation</b> Clarity Style Appearance Length Referencing	Communication of ideas, use of syntax and typographical presentation. Use of language. Visual impression and clarity of layout. Number of words specified for the assignment. Accuracy in citation and attribution, and the application of academic conventions.
<b>Analysis</b> Argument Interpretation Evaluation Application	The line of argument within an appropriate conceptual framework. The development of a perspective through a reflective consideration within an appropriate conceptual framework. The weighing of evidence, exploration of other options, and the basis of judgements. Where appropriate, the application of findings and arguments in a reflective manner to the improvement of educational practices.
<b>Use of sources</b> Scope and number Types of sources Scope and number	Familiarity with a range of literature germane to the topic. The range of different types of sources used.
<b>Methodology, methods and ethics</b> Methodology Design Critique	(For dissertations and assignments based on empirical study) The explanation of the kind of study undertaken and the justification of the methodology. The explanation and justification of the chosen methods, including ethical procedures, and the overall design. The consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of methodology, design, ethical procedures and underpinning theories.

	<b>70% -100% (Distinction)</b> <b>[72 75 78 82 85 88 95 100]</b>	<b>60% - 69% (Merit)</b> <b>[62 65 68]</b>	<b>50% - 59% (Good Pass)</b> <b>[52 55 58]</b>	<b>40% - 49% (Pass)</b> <b>[42 45 48]</b>
<b>Overall</b> Scholarship Perspective Coherence	The assignment shows extensive knowledge and considerable depth of analysis. It clearly demonstrates breadth of view and shows significant insight. Material is controlled well and is synthesised effectively and creatively. Arguments are sound and persuasive. Shows originality.	The assignment shows a broad knowledge and considerable depth of analysis. It clearly demonstrates breadth of view and shows considerable insight. Material is synthesised effectively and controlled well. Arguments are sound.	The assignment shows knowledge and a depth of analysis. It demonstrates a breadth of view and shows insight. Material is controlled well. Arguments are sound.	The assignment displays sufficient knowledge and an adequate depth of analysis. It shows sufficient breadth of view and insight. Material is generally controlled adequately. Arguments are generally sound.
<b>Content</b>	The topic identified is clearly and directly relevant to the content of the unit and the student's experience. An appropriate and well-grounded conceptual framework is securely established. A sophisticated discussion takes place within the conceptual framework and, in the better assignments, the discussion develops the framework.	The topic identified is relevant to the content of the unit and the student's experience. An appropriate and well-grounded conceptual framework is established. A thoughtful discussion takes place within the conceptual framework.	The topic identified is relevant to the content of the unit and the student's experience. An appropriate conceptual framework is established that is adequately grounded. A discussion takes place within the conceptual framework.	The topic identified is relevant to the content of the unit and to the student's experience. A conceptual framework is established that is in the main adequately grounded. The discussion draws upon the conceptual framework.
<b>Structure</b>	The assignment is well structured so that arguments develop logically and lead to a well-reasoned and original conclusion.	The assignment is well structured so that arguments develop logically and lead to a well-reasoned conclusion.	The assignment is adequately structured and arguments develop logically and lead to a reasoned conclusion.	The assignment is generally soundly structured. Arguments develop and there is an appropriate conclusion.
<b>Presentation</b> Clarity Style Appearance Length Referencing	Ideas are communicated exceptionally clearly. Appropriate syntax is consistently used. There are very few, if any, typographical errors. The writing is fluent and succinct which, together with the prudent use of language, gives scholarly style. The length of the assignment is acceptable. The visual presentation is of a high standard and the layout is clear. Referencing is accurate in citation and attribution. There is consistent application of academic conventions.	Ideas are communicated clearly. Appropriate syntax is consistently used. There are very few typographical errors. The writing is fluent and succinct and has a scholarly style. The length of the assignment is acceptable. The visual presentation is of a high standard and the layout is clear. Referencing is accurate in citation and attribution. There is consistent application of academic conventions.	Ideas are communicated clearly. Appropriate syntax is generally consistently used with very few typographical errors. There are only a small number of typographical errors. The writing is fluent and succinct and generally has an appropriately scholarly style. The length of the assignment is acceptable. The visual presentation is of good standard and the layout is clear. Referencing is accurate in citation and attribution. There is consistent application of academic conventions.	Generally, ideas are communicated clearly. Appropriate syntax is generally used. There are some typographical errors but not a significant number. The writing is generally fluent and succinct and the style is appropriate. The length of the assignment is acceptable. The visual presentation is adequate. The layout is sufficiently clear. Referencing is generally accurate in citation and attribution. Application of academic conventions is generally consistent.

<b>Analysis</b> Argument Interpretation Evaluation Application	<b>Analysis.</b> The assignment develops a well-reasoned line of argument and a perspective clearly develops through significant reflective consideration. Evidence is thoughtfully marshalled and weighed, a wide range of other options is explored, and judgements are soundly based on critical appraisal. Where appropriate, findings and arguments are applied reflectively and with considerable insight and explicit evidence is presented that shows improvement of educational practices.	<b>Analysis.</b> The assignment develops a well-reasoned line of argument and a perspective clearly develops through substantial reflective consideration. Evidence is thoughtfully marshalled and weighed, a range of other options is explored, and judgements are based on critical appraisal. Where appropriate, findings and arguments are applied reflectively and with some insight and there is evidence showing improvement of educational practices.	<b>Analysis.</b> The assignment develops a well-reasoned line of argument and a perspective develops through sufficient reflective consideration. Evidence is thoughtfully marshalled and weighed, some other options are explored, and judgements are based on critical appraisal. Where appropriate, findings and arguments are applied reflectively and there is evidence showing improvement of educational practices.	<b>Analysis.</b> The assignment develops an adequately reasoned line of argument and a perspective develops through some reflective consideration. Evidence is marshalled and weighed with some thought, and some other options are explored, and judgements are generally based on critical appraisal. Where appropriate, findings and arguments are applied reflectively to the improvement of educational practices.
<b>Use of sources</b> Scope and number Types of sources	<b>Use of sources.</b> The assignment clearly demonstrates considerable familiarity with and uses a wide range of literature germane to the topic.	<b>Use of sources.</b> The assignment demonstrates familiarity with and uses a wide range of literature germane to the topic.	<b>Use of sources.</b> The assignment demonstrates familiarity with and uses a range of literature germane to the topic.	<b>Use of sources.</b> The assignment demonstrates sufficient familiarity with and uses of a range of literature germane to the topic.
<b>Methodology, methods and ethics</b> Methodology Design Critique	<b>Methodology and methods.</b> For dissertations and assignments based on empirical study, it is clear what kind of study was undertaken. The methodology is fully justified. There is a thorough explanation and justification of the chosen methods. There is a full consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of the methodology, design and underpinning theories. Ethical issues have been considered.	<b>Methodology and methods.</b> For dissertations and assignments based on empirical study, it is clear what kind of study was undertaken. The methodology is well justified. There is a sound explanation and justification of the chosen methods. There is a wide-ranging consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of the methodology, design and underpinning theories. Ethical issues have been considered.	<b>Methodology and methods.</b> For dissertations and assignments based on empirical study, it is clear what kind of study was undertaken. The methodology is adequately justified. The chosen methods are adequately explained and justified. There is a sound consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of the methodology, design and underpinning theories. Ethical issues have been considered.	<b>Methodology and methods.</b> For dissertations and assignments based on empirical study, it is more or less clear what kind of study was undertaken. The methodology is adequately justified. The chosen methods are explained and justified. The strengths and weaknesses of the methodology, design and underpinning theories are adequately considered. Ethical issues have been considered.

	<b>35-39% (Condonable Fail)</b> <b>[35 38]</b>	<b>30-34 % (Fail)</b> <b>[32]</b>	<b>0-29% (Fail)</b> <b>[0 15 25]</b>
<b>Overall</b> Scholarship Perspective Coherence	The assignment is not securely at the standard required for a pass at Masters level. The assignment may display some knowledge and some analysis. However, it shows limited breadth of view and insight. There may be some effort to control material and to present an argument. Arguments may be partially convincing.	The assignment has significant weaknesses. The assignment displays limited knowledge and lacks analysis. It shows little breadth of view and does not display insight. Material is poorly used and the arguments lack persuasion. The assignment is largely descriptive.	The assignment has significant weaknesses and would need major work or rewriting to reach a passing standard. The assignment is under length and/or draft or non-scholarly in style. The assignment displays limited knowledge and lacks analysis. It shows little breadth of view and does not display insight. Material is poorly used and there is little argument; any argument lacks persuasion. The assignment is largely descriptive.
<b>Content</b>	The topic identified may to some extent be relevant to the content of the unit and to the student's experience. A conceptual framework may be presented, but this may not be adequately grounded. The discussion may not be adequately developed.	The topic identified may not be directly relevant to the content of the unit and to the student's experience. An appropriate conceptual framework may not be established and discussion is therefore lacking in focus.	It may not be clear how the content is related to the unit and/or the student's experience. A conceptual framework is absent or inappropriate. The discussion is weak and lacking in focus.
<b>Structure</b>	The assignment may not be very well structured. Arguments may be underdeveloped and may not be clearly linked to the conclusion.	The assignment may be poorly structured so that arguments fail to develop logically and there is no reasoned conclusion.	The assignment has no evident or clear structure; there may be no conclusion.
<b>Presentation</b> Clarity Style Appearance Length Referencing	Ideas may be communicated, although not always clearly. Syntax may not be used adequately. There may be some typographical errors. The writing may be of limited fluency and the style may be inappropriate in some places. The assignment may not be of an acceptable length. The visual impression may be poor and the layout may be not fully clear. Referencing may be inaccurate and/or inadequate in some places.	Ideas may not be communicated clearly. The syntax may be weak and there may be a significant number of typographical errors. The writing may not flow and the style and use of language may be inappropriate. The length of the assignment may not be acceptable. The visual impression may be inadequate and the layout unclear. Referencing may be inaccurate in citation and attribution and there may be inconsistent application of academic conventions.	There are significant weaknesses in presentation to do with one or more of: Clarity (ideas not communicated clearly; writing errors evident) Style (not fluent or scholarly; inappropriate use of language) Appearance (poor visual impression and layout) Length (under length) Referencing (significant errors evident)
<b>Analysis</b> Argument Interpretation Evaluation Application	There is some attempt to develop a line of argument and a perspective, but this may be limited and lacking in reflective consideration. There is some limited attempt to marshal and weigh evidence, but insufficient consideration is given to other options. Judgements are based on limited critical appraisal. Where appropriate, some limited attempt is made to reflect and apply findings and arguments to the improvement of educational practices.	The assignment may not develop a reasoned line of argument. A perspective may fail to develop because there is little or no reflective consideration. Evidence may be neither marshalled nor weighed and other options may not be explored. Judgements may not be adequately based on critical appraisal. Even where appropriate, findings and arguments may not be applied reflectively to the improvement of educational practices. The assignment may be largely descriptive.	There is limited analysis or coherent argument. The assignment is largely descriptive with little or inappropriate reflective consideration and limited use of evidence. Any judgements are not justified or inappropriately justified. There are few, limited or inappropriate links to educational practice.

<b>Use of sources</b> Scope and number Types of sources	The assignment may demonstrate only a limited familiarity with and uses a limited range of literature germane to the topic.	Although some literature has been used the assignment may not demonstrate familiarity with a range of literature germane to the topic, or inappropriate literature may be analysed.	The assignment may inappropriately use only a narrow range of literature. There are significant weaknesses in the use of sources to do with one or both of: Scope and number (none or narrow range) Types of sources (inappropriate literature)
<b>Methodology, methods and ethics</b> Methodology Design Critique	For dissertations and assignments based on empirical study, it is not completely clear what kind of study was undertaken. The methodology may be justified to a limited extent. The chosen methods may not be sufficiently explained or justified. The strengths and weaknesses of the methodology, design and underpinning theories may be inadequately considered. There may be limited consideration of ethical issues.	For dissertations and assignments based on empirical study, it may not be clear what kind of study was undertaken and the methodology may not be adequately justified. The explanation and justification of the chosen methods may be inadequate. The strengths and weaknesses of the methodology, design and underpinning theories may not be considered. Ethical issues may not be considered.	There are significant weaknesses in methodology and methods to do with one or more of: Methodology (not explained justified or inappropriate) Design (not explained/justified or inappropriate) Critique (not included or inappropriate). Ethics (not considered or inappropriate).