

**The assessment elements and level statements for the assessment of units
in the Education MA Programmes
The assessment elements**

Overall

Scholarship: The extent of knowledge and depth of analysis.
Perspective: The breadth of view, critical perception and insight.
Coherence: The synthesis and control of material and the persuasiveness of arguments.

Content Relevance of the topic to the content of the unit and the participant's experience.

Structure The structure and the way it enables arguments to develop logically and lead to reasoned conclusion.

Presentation

Clarity: Communication of ideas, use of syntax and typographical presentation.
Style: Use of language.
Appearance: Visual impression and clarity of layout.
Length Number of words specified for the assignment.
Referencing: Accuracy in citation and attribution, and the application of academic conventions.

Analysis

Argument: The line of argument within an appropriate conceptual framework.
Interpretation: The development of a perspective through a reflective consideration within an appropriate conceptual framework.
Evaluation: The weighing of evidence, exploration of other options, and the basis of judgements.
Application Where appropriate, the application of findings and arguments in a reflective manner to the improvement of educational practices.

Use of sources

Scope and number: Familiarity with a range of literature germane to the topic.
Types of sources: The range of different types of sources used.

Methodology and methods (For dissertations and assignments based on empirical study)

Methodology: The explanation of the kind of study undertaken and the justification of the methodology.
Design: The explanation and justification of the chosen methods and the overall design.
Critique: The consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of methodology, design and underpinning theories.

**The assessment elements and level statements for the assessment of units
in the Education MA Programmes
The level statements**

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

70% -100% (Distinction):

Overall. 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.

Content. The topic identified is clearly and directly relevant to the content of the module and the participant'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.

Structure. The assignment is well structured so that arguments develop logically and lead to a well-reasoned and original conclusion.

Presentation. 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.

Analysis. 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.

Use of sources. The assignment clearly demonstrates considerable familiarity with and uses a wide range of literature germane to the topic.

Methodology and methods. 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.

60% - 69% (Merit):

Overall. 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.

Content. The topic identified is relevant to the content of the unit and the participant's experience. An appropriate and well-grounded conceptual framework is established. A thoughtful discussion takes place within the conceptual framework.

Structure. The assignment is well structured so that arguments develop logically and lead to a well-reasoned conclusion.

Presentation. 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.

Analysis. 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.

Use of sources. The assignment demonstrates familiarity with and uses a wide range of literature germane to the topic.

Methodology and methods. 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.

50% - 59% (Good Pass):

Overall. 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.

Content. The topic identified is relevant to the content of the unit and the participant's experience. An appropriate conceptual framework is established that is adequately grounded. A discussion takes place within the conceptual framework.

Structure. The assignment is adequately structured and arguments develop logically and lead to a reasoned conclusion.

Presentation. 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.

Analysis. 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.

Use of sources. The assignment demonstrates familiarity with and uses a range of literature germane to the topic.

Methodology and methods. 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.

40% - 49% (Pass):

Overall. 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.

Content. The topic identified is relevant to the content of the module and to the participant's experience. A conceptual framework is established that is in the main adequately grounded. The discussion draws upon the conceptual framework.

Structure. The assignment is generally soundly structured. Arguments develop and there is an appropriate conclusion.

Presentation. 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.

Analysis. 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.

Use of sources. The assignment demonstrates sufficient familiarity with and uses of a range of literature germane to the topic.

Methodology and methods. 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.

Less than 40% (Fail):

The assignment may have strengths but in one or more ways, it has significant weaknesses.

Overall. Significantly, 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.

Content. The topic identified may not be directly relevant to the content of the module and to the participant's experience. An appropriate conceptual framework may not be established and discussion is therefore weak and lacking in focus.

Structure. The assignment may be poorly structured so that arguments fail to develop logically and there is no reasoned conclusion.

Presentation. 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.

Analysis. 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

Use of sources. The assignment may not demonstrate familiarity with a range literature germane to the topic, or inappropriate literature may be analysed. It may inappropriately use only a narrow range of literature.

Methodology and methods. 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.