



BISHOP GROSSETESTE UNIVERSITY

Document Administration

Document Title:	Code of Practice for Assessment
Document Category:	Code of Practice
Version Number:	5.0
Status:	Approved
Reason for development:	This Code sets out the procedures to be followed for the process of Assessment of Students at Bishop Grosseteste University and assigns responsibility for carrying out various tasks.
Scope:	This Code applies to staff and students.
Author / developer:	Chief Quality and Compliance Officer
Owner	Registrar and University Secretary
Assessment: (where relevant)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Equality Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Information Governance <input type="checkbox"/> Legal <input type="checkbox"/> Academic Governance
Consultation: (where relevant)	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff Trade Unions via HR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students via Bishop Grosseteste University Students' Union <input type="checkbox"/> Any relevant external statutory bodies
Authorised by (Board):	Senate
Date first authorised:	8 December 2015
Date current version authorised:	18 October 2023
Date current version effective from:	October 2023
Date next review due to commence:	September 2024
Document location:	University website
Document dissemination / communications plan	University website, SharePoint, Staff Portal, Student Portal.
Document control:	All printed versions of this document are classified as uncontrolled. A controlled version is available from the Staff Portal.
Alternative format:	If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact governance@bishopg.ac.uk

*Please note this document remains valid until formally revoked or replaced by the University.



Introduction

1. This Code of Practice sets out the terms under which students of Bishop Grosseteste University undertake assessment of their programme(s) of study.
2. It should be read with reference to the following University Regulations, Codes of Practice and Guidance:
 - *Regulations for Undergraduate Awards*
 - *Regulations for Post Graduate and Professional Graduate Certificate in Education*
 - *Regulations for Taught Masters*
 - *Regulations Governing Research Degrees*
 - *Code of Practice on Academic Misconduct*
 - *Code of Practice for Collaborative Provision*
 - *Code of Practice for the Conduct of Boards of Examiners*
 - *Code of Practice for External Examining*
 - *Code of Practice for the Periodic Review of Academic Provision*
 - *Code of Practice for Students with Access Needs*
 - *Code of Practice for the Validation of Programmes*
 - *Code of Practice for Work-based Learning*
 - *Guidance on Marking and Moderation* should also be considered.
3. The *Code of Practice for the Assessment of Students* is designed to secure academic standards are consistent with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) and, where relevant, meet the requirements of professional, statutory or regulatory bodies (PSRBs). It also ensures that judgements made regarding students' work are reliable, consistent and free from bias, and that they accord with clear criteria.
4. The *Code* seeks to establish close links between summative assessment (which contributes directly to the grade for a module) and the University's strategy on Learning, Teaching and Assessment. Assessment should be regarded as an integral part of the learning opportunities offered to students and should also provide students with clear guidance on the progress that they have made and on the areas in which further development of their knowledge and skills is desirable.
5. In Higher Education, assessment describes any processes that appraise knowledge, understanding, abilities or skills. There are many different forms of assessment, serving a variety of purposes, which include:
 - evaluating a student's knowledge, understanding, abilities or skills,
 - providing a mark or grade that enables a student's performance to be established, and may also be used to make progress decisions,
 - promoting student learning by providing the student with feedback, normally to help improve a student's performance,
 - enabling the public (including employers) and Higher Education providers to know that an individual has attained an appropriate level of achievement that reflects the academic

standards set by the awarding institution, the FHEQ and PSRBs where relevant.

Approval of Schemes of Assessment

6. When preparing programmes of study for validation or revalidation, a scheme of assessment is required that is in accordance with the *Code of Practice for the Validation of Programmes*. Staff should consider a range of assessment methods to promote effective learning and specific strategies that might be required (e.g, management of any group and/or peer assessment).. Information regarding Schemes of Assessment is contained within Appendix 1.

Publication of Schemes of Assessment

7. The details of the scheme of assessment must be made available to all students. The assessment scheme must correspond exactly and in all respects to the validated programme documentation. Reference should be made to the *Regulations for the award* where appropriate.
8. Schemes of Assessment should include a description of the different types of assessment that are in use and provide an explanation of their primary purpose in measuring academic achievement or transferable skills.

Setting Assignments and Examination Papers

9. All assessment tasks should be reviewed each academic year, and across the whole academic year if delivery of modules is repeated. It is expected that for most types of assessment the specific assessment tasks will be varied for each module delivery occurrence unless assessment tasks are specific to each individual's learning context (e.g., final year project topic, reflective task based on work-based learning).
10. For all modules that contribute to the degree classification the retrieval assessments should normally use different specific tasks from the original assessment unless they are specific to learning contexts (see paragraph 9).
11. The details of every assessed assignment (including re-assessment) must be set out in a separate assignment brief. The brief must be issued to students in the approved format at the start of the module.
12. The external examiner system should be used for providing advice and feedback on the setting of assessment briefs that contribute to a final degree classification for taught degree awards. The deadline for the preparation of assessments will allow sufficient time for this external review to take place. An exception may be made for small scale exercises and tests even though these may contribute to a final classification. The external examiner should, however, be briefed about the function of such forms of assessment in the overall scheme and may ask for further details including examples of such exercises/tests and/or related student work.
13. Programme teams should, so far as possible, minimise the 'bunching' of submission dates to help spread students' workload. Care is particularly important where two or more subjects contribute to a programme or where students are undertaking workplace learning or part time study. Reasonable adjustments are made for students who need special assessment arrangements (see *Code of Practice for Students with Access Needs*).

Time constrained assignments

14. Time constrained assessments require students to attend an assessment at a specific time and for a specific duration (e.g., examinations, class-tests, presentations, skills-focused practical demonstrations, performances).
15. Examinations must be held during the designated exam weeks, normally at the end of each semester. Details must be provided of any special equipment which may be needed for the examination and any material which may be consulted.
16. The Programme Leader is responsible for advising the Faculty Administration Manager at the start of each semester of any examinations that will take place during the following assessment period. The Faculty Administration Manager will prepare an examination timetable and make arrangements for the invigilation of the examinations. Students must be advised of the exact time, date and location of the examination, typically four weeks in advance by the Faculty Administration Manager.
17. Following consultation with the External Examiner, the examination papers must be lodged with the Faculty Administration Manager for secure keeping at least four weeks before the examination.
18. After the examination is completed scripts will be returned by the invigilator to the Faculty Administration Manager from whom programme tutors will collect and sign for them for marking.
19. In setting assessment tasks care should be taken to avoid replication (e.g., essay titles, examination questions) which would allow students to answer on the basis of research conducted for previously submitted assessed work.
20. Resit assignment briefs will normally be made available at the end of the academic semester involved.

Arrangements for the submission of summative coursework.

21. It is the responsibility of students to follow the instructions for the submission of their work for assessment. Coursework work may be submitted up to five working days in advance through the university's electronic systems (except where a longer period has been stated). Guidance on the formatting of assessed work will be provided in the assignment brief.
22. In submitting work for assessment or reassessment students are agreeing to the following statement:

I declare that the work submitted for assessment contains no section copied in whole or in part from any other source, including work I have submitted previously at BGU or another university, unless it is explicitly identified by means of quotation marks and accompanied by detailed references in the approved format. I understand that unidentified and unreferenced copied material or purchased assignments constitute plagiarism which is considered academic misconduct and could result in investigation by the Academic Misconduct Panel. I declare that the work is entirely my own.
17. Work submitted electronically will be screened to check against other material on the web, other submitted work and for the inappropriate use of AI. . It will also be stored electronically and may be shared with other institutions for the purposes of plagiarism

detection. Work stored in the system used with originality detection software may be held by the University for periods that are longer than the normal lengths of time indicated in the University's Records Retention Schedule.

19. Assignments are submitted electronically and students should refer to the 'Turnitin Help Guides' which are available on Blackboard.

Extensions and Late Submission

20. Students may apply to for an extension of 5 days. A longer period may be negotiated in the light of professional commitments in the case of students registered on part-time postgraduate programmes.
21. An application for extension must be received before the day of submission, made on the standard pro forma available on the University's website, and accompanied by corroborating evidence (e.g., doctor's note).
22. The Programme Leader (or delegated colleague) should record their decision on the standard pro forma and inform the student in writing of the outcome. Students will be contacted by the Faculty Administration Office to confirm the acceptance of an extension request and the revised date of submission. If the claim is accepted and the work is submitted by the new deadline, it will be marked without penalty. The documentation relating to all such claims will be retained and made available to the Board of Examiners if required.
23. An extension of up to three days may be given if submission via originality detection software is disrupted by technical issues.
24. Where assessed work, is submitted for submission after the deadline, the late submission shall lead automatically to the imposition of a penalty following the marking process:
 - up to and including 24 hours after the deadline, a penalty of 10 marks will be deducted from the mark awarded for that component of the module;
 - if the 10 mark penalty takes the mark below the pass mark, the pass mark will be awarded in recognition that the work met the University's threshold standard for the award (i.e. 40%);
 - for undergraduate programmes where the mark achieved by the student for the component of the module falls in the compensatable range of 39%-35%, the penalty will be the lowest compensatable mark (i.e. 35%);
 - work submitted later than 24 hours after the deadline will receive a mark of 0%.

Extenuating Circumstances

25. If work is submitted late the student may ask the Board of Examiners to take into account extenuating circumstances which prevented submission on time. The claim must be presented on the appropriate pro form available on the website, and be accompanied by corroborating evidence. The claim will be considered by the Board of Examiners and, if it is accepted, the student will be deferred and permitted to submit the assignment with access to the full range of marks. If the claim is not accepted:
- The 10 mark penalty will be applied if the lateness is up to (and including) 24 hours – see paragraph 24.
 - If the lateness is more than 24 hours, the student will be referred in that assessment component and may resubmit on a maximum of two further occasions subject to approved extenuating circumstances. The resubmission will be eligible to receive a mark no higher than the minimum required for a pass.

Other Claims Relating to Extenuating Circumstances

26. A student may ask the Board of Examiners to take into account extenuating circumstances if they are absent from an examination. Such claims must be accompanied by corroborating evidence. If the claim is accepted the student will be deferred and will be given the opportunity to resit the examination as though for the first time. Extenuating circumstances may also be brought to the attention of the Board of Examiners where a student believes that the quality of work in an assignment or examination has been adversely affected.

Arrangements for the Retrieval of Failure and Completion of Deferred Modules

27. All work undertaken to retrieve failure or to complete the requirements for modules in which a student has been deferred must be undertaken after the confirmation of the outcome by the Board of Examiners. A date for the submission of assignments and for any formal examinations will be set by the Board and the outcomes will be considered by a Retrieval Board before the start of the relevant academic session. An exception may be made in the case of a student who fails to complete a placement satisfactorily. In such cases, a sub-committee of the Board of Examiners may decide that the placement may be extended or retaken in its entirety during the same academic session. However, the sub-committee should take care to satisfy itself that these arrangements will not be such as to affect adversely the student's performance in other elements of the programme. The student should always be offered the option of deferring the completion of the placement until after the end of the current session.

There is an opportunity for final year students to be offered in-programme retrieval following Semester 1 Module Boards. Any other possibilities for in-programme retrieval will normally be specific to particular programmes of study. The relevant *regulations for the award* will specify any such opportunities related to particular programmes.

Arrangements for Marking and Returning Assignments

28. Assignments must be marked within the advertised timeframe and in accordance with the published criteria. It is the responsibility of the module tutor to ensure that these criteria are available to all internal markers.
29. Appropriate feedback should be provided electronically on the standard proforma adopted for the programme. The feedback should be linked to the learning outcomes and assessment

criteria. It should be designed to promote the student's learning by giving a clear indication of areas of strength as well as advice on how further improvement might be secured. If any targets have been previously identified to the student then feedback should be aligned to those targets as appropriate.

30. Marked assignments should be available to students by the date indicated on the assignment brief, which should not normally be more than 20 working days + 72 hours after the deadline or submission date (whichever is later).
31. A longer period may sometimes be appropriate e.g. in the case of part-time postgraduate in-service programmes to enable the work to be returned in person to the student or if technical issues have occurred when assignments have been submitted via originality detection software (see paragraph 20). Exceptionally, where it is not possible to adhere to the published timetable, students must be informed of the delay and a new date should be set.
32. Provisional marks are communicated to students by the Faculty Administration Office and are confirmed by the Module Board of Examiners. A sample of work is made available for scrutiny by external examiners and for future reviews and may in the case of reviews be retained by the University for periods that are longer than the normal lengths of time indicated in the University's Records Retention Schedule. Students must also be informed that any original assignments returned to them must be made available if required for consideration by the external examiner or other purposes (period of retention to be 12 months following completion of assignment).
33. The University does not normally hold meetings of Boards of Examiners at the end of the first semester and marks for both semesters are confirmed at the end of each academic session. Student should be informed of their overall mark for each module after the final assessment of that module.

Examination Scripts

34. Examination scripts will be returned to students after their results are announced. Samples will be copied and kept for External Examiners and review purposes. Feedback will also be provided.

Confidentiality

35. Module marks obtained by individual students are regarded as confidential.
36. Assessment results must not be communicated by telephone. E-mail may be used, where the student has e-mailed from their University email address requesting their results. For work submitted electronically, marks will be communicated via "Gradebook" on Blackboard.

Marking and Moderation

37. Marking must be undertaken in accordance with the detailed written criteria outlined in the assignment brief.
38. The University policy is that all assignments are marked anonymously wherever possible and in accordance with the Code of Practice for Anonymous Marking. Instructions on how to title

assignments are available on the VLE.

39. Programme Leaders must take adequate steps to satisfy themselves that assignments and examination questions are relevant and appropriate, and that the outcomes of assessment, which should be available to all internal and external examiners (and, where appropriate, to placement mentors), are consistent and reliable. Newly appointed staff with limited experience of higher education should be appropriately supported through the assessment process and outcomes should be moderated by an experienced marker.
40. Double or second marking enables a second perspective and commentary on assessments. Unlike moderation (see paragraph 41), this process may involve individual grades being modified. Detailed instructions on double or second marking can be found in *Guidance on Marking and Moderation*. The following guidelines set out the minimum requirements for second marking.
 - (i) any single assignment at Levels 4, 5 or 6 contributing more than 30 credits will be subject to open second marking.
 - (ii) any single assignment at Level 7 contributing more than 30 credits will be subject to blind second marking.
 - (iii) Once second marking has been completed, the marks should be compared with the first marker and the arrangements for moderation apply if there is not agreement, within 3% of the first marker (see 41 (iv) below).

Level of Study	Module Credit Value	Moderation*	Open Second Marking**	Blind Second Marking**	Moderation Sample***
L4	all	✓			10% (at least 6 pieces including a sample of all classifications and most borderlines)
L5	30 credits or fewer	✓			20% (at least 6 pieces including a sample of all classifications and borderline marks)
	more than 30 credits		✓		all assignments
L6	30 credits or fewer	✓			20% (at least 6 pieces including a sample of all classifications and borderline marks)
	more than 30 credits		✓		all assignments
L7	30 credits or fewer	✓			20% (at least 6 pieces including a sample of all classifications and borderline marks)
	more than 30 credits			✓	all assignments

Moderation

41. Moderation is the process whereby the standard of assessment task, the application of assessment criteria, the effectiveness of the task in testing the learning outcomes, and the quality and appropriateness of the feedback are assured. Moderation does not change the mark of individual students and is not restricted to those who delivered the module. Detailed instructions on moderation can be found in *Guidance on Marking and Moderation*. The following guidelines and summary table set out the minimum requirement for moderation:

- (i) on undergraduate programmes, assessments which do not contribute to the final degree classification will be subject to moderation involving a sample of 10%, at least six pieces including a sample of all classifications and most borderline marks.

- (ii) assessments in stages which contribute to the final degree classification of an undergraduate programme, or Level 7 modules of 30 credits or fewer, will normally be subject to a moderation exercise of a sample of all award classifications.
- (iii) the assessment of a sample of student performances and presentations will be moderated in the same proportions as written assignments. In addition, appropriate evidence, including the use of video recordings, will be used as part of the moderation and external examining processes.
- (iv) Providing the second marker is within 3 marks of the original marker for each piece of work, no changes will be made to the original marks. In the event of an agreement not being reached a scaling of up to +5 or -5 across the whole set of marks may be recommended in accordance with the Guidance on Marking and Moderation.
- (v) the outcome of all school placements will be moderated.

Staff Development

- 42. All newly appointed staff and visiting tutors must be provided with information and training on the University's assessment practices by their Line Manager.. Sampling of the marking standards of new staff must, therefore, be undertaken regularly.
- 43. Academic staff must be supported by Programme Leaders and Heads of Programmes to participate in appropriate staff development activities relating both to existing, new and innovative assessment and marking practices.
- 44. All sections of this *Code* apply to programmes delivered by collaborative partners, whether the marking is done by BGU staff or staff at the collaborative partner (as specified in the relevant Memorandum of Cooperation).

Appendix 1

Schemes of Assessment

1. The scheme of assessment must specify the elements of assessment that students are required to complete in each module and the weighting that is accorded to each element.
2. The scheme of assessment must clearly state the volume of assessed work that a student is required to undertake (e.g. by stating the length of written assignments and the duration of presentations or examinations). Care should be taken to ensure that the overall assessment load is appropriate, especially in joint schemes which involve the study of more than one subject, and that there is a consistent relationship within the programme between the volume of assessment required and the credit value and level of the module.
3. There should be reasonable consistency between different BGU programmes as regards the volumes of work required when comparing work related to similar types of assessments. Programme teams shall normally conform to University level guidance on this subject. Validation and Revalidation panels should seek clarification regarding the reasons for any significant deviation from such guidelines before giving their approval to the scheme of assessment.
4. The nature of the assessment must be clearly suited to establishing the extent to which the learning outcomes for each module have been met. The overall scheme of assessment must include a rationale showing how the scheme is matched to the learning outcomes for the programme.
5. The scheme of assessment must take account of the provisions of the relevant subject benchmark statements (if any) or benchmark statements for closely related subjects and, where appropriate, the requirements for accreditation by professional bodies.
6. The scheme of assessment must be compatible in all respects with the *regulations for that award*.

Monitoring of Schemes of Assessment

7. Programme teams should keep under review the effectiveness and appropriateness of the scheme of assessment. In particular, they should seek to determine how far it is proving successful in establishing the extent to which students have met the learning outcomes and in discriminating between different levels of performance. Teams should consider the evidence provided by the record of student performance as well as feedback from staff, students and the external examiner. The outcome of this consideration should normally be included as part of the Annual Monitoring Process and, where appropriate, in the response to the External Examiner's report. Where the need for revision is indicated, the necessary action should be pursued promptly through the established procedures for approving changes to validated programmes. Such changes would normally be introduced for new cohorts only.
8. A full consideration of the operation of the scheme of assessment and any changes that have been made to it should be included in the annual monitoring report. This report might be expected to include a consideration of:

- (i) the extent to which there is comparability across the programme between assessment load and credit value, and consistency between the programme and other programmes of the University in this respect;
- (ii) the correspondence between learning outcomes and assessment methods; the range of assessment methods that students experience, any issues arising from the adoption of innovative modes of assessment, and how any such issues are managed (e.g. articulating any specific team strategies that have been required, for instance for the management of any group and/or peer assessment of learning if applicable);
- (iii) the possibility of assessment overload or underload;
- (iv) the extent to which students are able to assimilate and reflect on their learning;
- (v) the distribution of assessment tasks across semesters;
- (vi) experience of using assessment methods that take account of individual learning needs.

Appendix 2

Grade Descriptors for all Undergraduate Provision

These descriptors are inter-related: with regard to marks of 40% and above there is an assumption that in awarding marks in one band work will have met **most** of the criteria of the band; with regard to marks of 39% and below there is an assumption that in awarding marks in one band work will **not** have met **most** of the criteria of the next higher band.

A mark below 40% indicates a Fail grade (the shaded boxes).

Mark range	Criteria
90-100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responds to all of the assessment criteria for the task • Displays exceptional degree of originality • Exceptional analytical, problem-solving and/or creative skills • No fault can be found with the work other than very minor errors, for example minor typographical issues
80-89%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responds to all of the assessment criteria for the task • Work of outstanding quality, evidenced by an ability to engage critically and analytically with source material • Likely to exhibit independent lines of argument • Highly original and/or creative responses • Extremely wide range of relevant sources used where appropriate
70-79%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responds to all of the assessment criteria for the task • An extremely well developed response showing clear knowledge and the ability to interpret and/or apply that knowledge • An authoritative grasp of the subject, significant originality and insight, • Significant evidence of ability to sustain an argument, to think analytically, critically and/or creatively and to synthesise material • Evidence of extensive study, appropriate to task
60-69%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responds to most of the assessment criteria for the task • A detailed response demonstrating a thorough grasp of theory, understanding of concepts, principles, methodology and content • Clear evidence of insight and critical judgement in selecting, ordering and analysing content • Demonstrates ability to synthesise material, to construct responses and demonstrate creative skills which reveal insight and may offer some originality • Draws on an appropriate range of properly referenced sources
50-59%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responds to most of the assessment criteria for the task • An effective response demonstrating evidence of a clear grasp of relevant material, principles and key concepts • An ability to construct and organise arguments • Some degree of critical analysis, insight and creativity

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrating some conceptual ability, critical analysis and a degree of insight • Accurate, clearly written/presented
40-49%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responds to some of the assessment criteria for the task • A response demonstrating an understanding of basic points and principles sufficient to show that some of learning outcomes/assessment criteria have been achieved at a basic level • Suitably organised work demonstrating a reasonable level of understanding • Covers the basic subject matter and is appropriately presented but is rather too derivative and insufficiently analytical • Demonstrates limited conceptual ability, levels of evaluation and demonstration of creative skills • Demonstrates adherence to the referencing conventions appropriate to the subject and/or task
30-39%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall insufficient response to the assessment criteria • A weak response, which, while addressing some elements of the task, contains significant gaps and inaccuracies • Indicates an answer that shows only weakly developed elements of understanding and/or other skills appropriate to the task • May contain weaknesses in presentation that constitute a significant obstacle in communicating meaning to the assessor
20-29%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall insufficient response to the assessment criteria • A poor response, which falls substantially short of achieving the learning outcomes • Demonstrates little knowledge and/or other skills appropriate to the task • Little evidence of argument and/or coherent use of material
10-19%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall insufficient response to the assessment criteria • A very poor response demonstrating few relevant facts • Displays only isolated or no knowledge and/or other skills appropriate to the task • Little adherence to the task
0-9%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall insufficient response to the assessment criteria • Displays virtually no knowledge and/or other skills appropriate to the task • Work is inappropriate to assessment task given

Appendix 3

Generic postgraduate taught mark descriptors

Modules are marked on a range of 0-100%. Mark descriptors are given in the table below.

A mark below 50% indicates a Fail grade (the shaded boxes).

Mark Range	Criteria
90-100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates an exceptional ability and insight, indicating the highest level of technical competence.• The work has the potential to influence the forefront of the subject, and may be of publishable/exhibitable quality.• Relevant generic skills are demonstrated at the highest possible standard.
80-89%	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates an outstanding ability and insight based on authoritative subject knowledge and a very high level of technical competence.• The work is considered to be close to the forefront of the subject, and may be close to publishable/exhibitable quality.• Relevant generic skills are demonstrated at a very high level.
70-79%	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates an authoritative, current subject knowledge and a high level of technical competence.• The work is accurate and extensively supported by appropriate evidence. It may show some originality. Clear evidence of capacity to reflect critically and deal with ambiguity in the data.• Relevant generic skills are demonstrated at a high level.
60-69%	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates a sound, current subject knowledge. No significant errors in the application of concepts or appropriate techniques. May contain some minor flaws.• The work is well developed and coherent; may show some originality. Clear evidence of capacity to reflect critically.• Relevant generic skills are demonstrated at a good level.
50-59%	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates satisfactory subject knowledge. Some evident weaknesses; possibly shown by conceptual gaps, or limited use of appropriate techniques.• The work is generally sound but tends toward the factual or derivative. Limited evidence of capacity to reflect critically.• Relevant generic skills are generally at a satisfactory level.

<p>40-49%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates limited core subject knowledge. Some important weaknesses; possibly shown by factual errors, conceptual gaps, or limited use of appropriate techniques. • The work lacks sound development. Little evidence of capacity to reflect critically. • The quality of the relevant generic skills do not meet the requirements of the task.
<p>30-39%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates inadequate subject knowledge. • The work lacks coherence and evidence of capacity to reflect critically. • The quality of the relevant generic skills do not meet the requirements of the task.
<p>20-29%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates seriously inadequate knowledge of the subject. • The work contains minimal evidence of awareness of relevant issues or theory. • The quality of the relevant generic skills do not meet the requirements of the task.
<p>10-19%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work is almost entirely lacking in evidence of knowledge of the subject. • No evidence of awareness of relevant issues or theory. • The quality of the relevant generic skills do not meet the requirements of the task.
<p>0-9%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work presents information that is irrelevant and unconnected to the task. • No evident awareness of appropriate principles, theories, evidence and techniques.