


Academic Policy and Procedures



[] South Devon College

HIGHER EDUCATION

**(HEACRP6) HE Assessment Practice Policy and
Procedure v5.0**



APPENDIX A

Document Control

Document Approved by: HEAB	Date of Approval: June 21
Review by: HETLAG	Review Date: May 2022
Date of Implementation: 01/09/21	CPD to support Implementation: July 21(HE CPD Conference)
Version: 5.0	Author: A Wilson

REVISION HISTORY

Ver	Date	Author	Description
1.0	May 17	A Wilson	Conception
2.0	4 th May 2018	A Wilson	Updated to reflect Turnitin and anonymity in marking
3.0	May 2019	L Hardman	Updated to reflect clearer terminology of draft feedback templates
4.0	June 2020	I Hallam	Updated to reflect clear terminology in the Module Guide and Assessment Brief; QAA guidance; equity statement and updated links and terms.
5.0	Feb 2021	I Hallam	To clarify elements related to scheduling, draft submission and referral

APPROVAL

Ver	Committee	Date Approved	Comments
1.0	CHEBOS	19 th May 2017	Approved
2.0	CHEBOS	24 th May 2018	Approved
3.0	CHEBOS	10 th June 2019	Approved
5.0	HEAB	June 2021	Approved

Contents

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Threshold and Aspiration of Assessment and Feedback Commitment for Higher Education at South Devon College.....	4
3.	Assessment Planning	6
4.	Guidance for the Submission of Coursework.....	10
5.	Inclusive Exams or Tests.....	13
6.	Marking	13
7.	Moderation	15
8.	Assessment Criteria	16
9.	Assessment methods and their modified assessment provision (MAP) implications	17
10.	Appendix A: Module Guide including Assessment Brief template	19
	Table of Contents.....	21
	Welcome and Introduction.....	22
	Teaching and Assessment Team	22
	Module Aim.....	23
	Module Learning Outcomes.....	23
	Teaching and Learning Strategy.....	24
	Assessment	24
	Regulations	25
	Module Rules	25
	Scheme of Work.....	26
	Assessment Brief 1.....	27
	Assessment Brief 2.....	28
	Reading list.....	29
	Generic Grading Criteria	30
11.	Appendix B: HE Module and Assessment IV	36
12.	Appendix C: Three Examples to Providing Quick Feedback on Draft work	38
13.	Appendix D: Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ).....	41
14.	Appendix E: SEEC Level Descriptors.....	45
15.	Appendix F: Example generic grading criteria	50
16.	Appendix G: Analytical, Constructive and Empowering	56

"Students can escape bad teaching but they cannot escape bad assessment" (Boud, 1995)

1. Introduction

The purpose of assessment at South Devon College for Higher Education Programmes, is to:

- Help students perform to the best of their abilities through assessment that's [inclusive](#) and supports their learning and future employment
- Encourage, motivate and involve students in extensive learning
- Provide a fair and reliable measure of students' performance, knowledge and skills against the learning outcomes and discipline pedagogy
- Help students to develop, through timely and constructive [feedback](#)
- Give our stakeholders confidence that a student has achieved the necessary level of achievement, giving a reliable and consistent basis for their award.

In order to achieve enhancement of assessment planning, feedback and moderation these standards have been produced for use across all Foundation Degrees, Honour Degrees and HNC provision within the University Centre South Devon (UCSD) at South Devon College.

This policy is primarily focused on UCSD and University of Plymouth awarded Foundation Degrees. Honour Degrees and HNC provision. Some of the assessment detail, for example credits, word counts, assessment briefs, module guides and marking criteria, do not apply to programmes externally regulated by other awarding bodies. However, many of the principles could be applied to other Level 4 to Level 7 provision delivered at UCSD.

The standards were originally developed in 2010 and were updated annually. In 2013/14 the HE Manager, with the UPSU Rep and UCSD Engagement Coordinator led on the Assessment and Feedback Enhancement Project. This project sought to explore good practice in assessment and feedback and worked with students and academics at UCSD to establish a new set of shared standards agreed between students and staff. These standards were informed by the NUS Assessment and Feedback Benchmarking Tool.

The Quality Assurance Agency developed a series of Advice and Guidance documentation, this policy and procedure has been updated to reflect the practice identified within, and should be read in conjunction with this. [A link can be found here.](#)

This document sets out how assessment and feedback is operationalised at University Centre South Devon though our response and commitment to students and ensuring compliant practice of other awarding institutions.

Fundamentally it is important to note that marking, second marking (where needed), moderation and external scrutiny of assessment is carried out in accordance with the requirements of this commitment and associated policies.

2. Threshold and Aspiration of Assessment and Feedback Commitment for Higher Education at South Devon College.

(The threshold was established as a result of a consultative process between students, academic and professional support staff during 2014, and amended within UCSD in 2020)

	Threshold	Aspiration
Diverse assessments	Assessments are planned and developed reflecting employment practice and developing skills for work	Students have choice in assessments, and are involved in the assessment design
Assessment criteria	Assessment criteria explain what a student needs to demonstrate to achieve the learning outcomes. How they do this is broken down in the marking criteria.	Assessment criteria are designed with students.
Grading criteria	Grading criteria relate to classification of degrees and explain what a student needs to demonstrate to achieve a certain classification.	Assessment criteria are designed with students.
Marking criteria	Marking criteria are formed explicitly for each assessment and clearly indicates how students achieve grades	Assessment criteria are designed with students
Submission process	Submission of work is via Turnitin (integrated in Moodle) where possible with auto receipts issued, grades are visible at all times online after the post-date. The assessment brief explains the submission process	All feedback is stored online for students to access throughout the academic year. Students are advised in training to download feedback.
Work load distribution	Deadlines are agreed with students at the beginning of the year with an up to date calendar visible to students at all times. There will usually be 2 summative assessments per 20 credit module	There is a formalised approach for assessment date changes which is agreed with students, but are exceptional to practice
Anonymity and externality	Anonymous marking is undertaken when possible	Anonymity of marking is agreed with students
Marking consistency	Marking criteria are clear for all students, marked work is returned	The full range of marks are used, staff are supported with

	having been moderated within 20 working days	making use of the range of marks
Feedback	Individual feedback is provided for all assessments and made clear, how and when this will happen for students in the module guide	Students have the opportunity to discuss feedback with the module leader
Formative and Draft Assessments	Students have the opportunity for formative assessments within modules. Students will have the opportunity for draft summative work to be reviewed as per the assessment brief, and the use of originality checking software	There are opportunities for students to develop their own formative assessments
Self and Peer learning	Peer learning is encouraged and common	Formative feedback regularly involves peer feedback and how this will happen is clear in the assessment briefs

3. Assessment Planning

- 3.1 Programme Quality Handbooks outline the element and mode of assessment for each module in the programme.
- 3.2 Module guides provide students with a more detailed overview of how the module will be assessed.

The use of module guides is essential in providing students with a clear document demonstrating essential information about the module, schedule of teaching and learning, assessments, specific assessment criteria and supportive reading. An example of a module guide can be found in Appendix A.

- 3.3 Programme draft and summative assessments schedule planning should be done to ensure only one summative assessment deadline a week, where possible. This avoids bunching of assessments and placing undue pressure on students and academic staff.
- 3.4 Programme assessment schedule planning should enable the summative submission of an early assessment within the first five of the academic year to enable students to receive early feedback and academic study skills support.
- 3.5 Assessments be they Coursework, Practical, Exam or Test should be inclusive. The University of Plymouth has developed a [7 step guide to inclusive assessment](#).
- 3.6 Assessment briefs should be used to provide all assessment specific information

An example assessment brief and feedback can be seen in [Appendix A](#).

- 3.7 [Assessment Criteria](#) will be used to inform and interpret the module aims and outcomes

Assessment criteria should provide a clear indication to the student about how the assessment task is broken down and where emphasis should be placed on the assessment and have grading criteria for different categories of pass

- 3.8 Assessment should not exceed 4000 words of equivalent effort for a 20 credit module, and will be assessed by **2 summative assessments**.

To prevent over assessment and to recognise the difference between 10 and 20 credit modules, when planning assessments the maximum required effort should not exceed that of 4000 words of assessment for a 20 credit module.

There is no nationally accepted model of equivalence and word count. There is much varied practice. London South Bank has established equity through equivalences to a 1000 word as cited below.

Assessment -coursework	1,000 words – equivalent
Examination	1 hour
Essay in foreign language	200-500 words
Group essay	750-1,000 words/member
Unstructured reflective journal	2,000-3,000 words
Verbal presentation	20 minutes
Group presentation	10 minutes/member
Clinical /practicum assessment	10 minutes

- 3.9 Assessment will be linked to module aims and outcomes

[Assessment briefs](#) should clearly show which module learning outcomes are being addressed by the assessment, and reference appropriate [SEEC level indicators](#).

- 3.10 Assessments will reflect the Graduate Attributes and Skills, and the Benchmark statements

Assessments should reflect the Graduate Attributes and Skills as presented in the Programme Specification. By ensuring this it should demonstrate [subject Benchmark coverage](#), [Foundation Degree Benchmark](#) and the Framework for [Higher Education Qualifications at descriptor level](#).

- 3.11 Assessment will be explicit, clear and equitable

Assessments should be written in language that is understandable and should present equality of opportunity to all students undertaking the assessment.

Every student has an equal opportunity to demonstrate their achievement through the assessment process, with no group or individual disadvantaged. In designing assessments, the needs of students are considered, including those studying at different locations, from different cultural/ educational backgrounds, with additional learning needs, or with protected characteristics. Assessment procedures and methods are flexible enough to allow adjustments to overcome any substantial disadvantage that individual students could experience.

- 3.12 Assessments will clearly indicate the submission process

Assessment will include details of time and date for the submission of work, in addition to the form of submission (electronic or paper based), and upload where appropriate.

- 3.13 Assessment will take the form of formative, draft, and summative process

When planning assessments a variety of formative, draft and summative forms will be used.

3.14 Assessment will take a variety of forms within the programme

Assessments are planned and developed reflecting employment practice and developing skills for work, this should be reflected in the assessment plan on Moodle. Consideration should be given to incorporating [authentic assessments](#) into the programme. Authentic assessments can be described as ‘an assessment requiring students to use the same competencies, or combinations of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that they need to apply in the criterion situation in professional life’ (Gulikers, Bastiaens and Kirschner, 2004, p. 69). They should be applicable to real-life, student-structured and might involve performing a task and using direct evidence.

3.15 Assessments briefs should indicate a requirement for academic research and grading should take this into account.

Within the marking criteria a specific requirement for academic research and referencing should be clearly shown to encourage research and referencing in all assessments.

3.16 Assessment briefs will be Internally Quality Assured (IQA) demonstrating all assessment for the module at the time of IQA.

IQA will be conducted for all assessment briefs for a module prior to the start of the academic year and will be IQA at the same time to show coverage of all learning outcomes and the range of assessments for the module. An example of the HE IV form can be seen in [Appendix B](#)

3.17 Students should have opportunities for formative and draft assessment during the module. Formative assessment is assessment for learning, and should be embedded into module teaching and can involve peer assessment. Draft assessment should take place two-weeks before summative assessment to give students an opportunity to get one-to-one feedback from the module leader on their developing assessment.

There is no one-size fits all approach to draft assessment procedures but programme teams are encouraged to develop an agreed and consistent approach across all modules. If modules are shared across different programmes, the teams should work together to ensure there is consistency of approach to draft assessments. There are examples of draft feedback templates in the appendices.

Other consideration on assessment design

3.18 Use diverse methods within the module choices; individual or a group assessment, an oral presentation or visual poster, an e-portfolio or a written reflective journal.

- 3.19 Is the assessment method suited to individual, group work or both?
- 3.20 Is the assessment authentic and aligned with workplace environments?
- 3.21 Will the assessment focus students' attention on productive learning activities and lead them away from cramming and surface learning?
- 3.22 Has there been opportunities for pre-assessment activities designed to help students understand what the assessment is, how it works and the skills needed to fulfil the assessment task? For example, if the assessment asks the students to create an academic poster, has there been opportunities to learn the technical IT skills and best practice within the module?
- 3.23 Could marks be awarded for student engagement in formative activities? (e.g. seminar or tutorial presentations and discussion or participation in a blog, wiki, or online discussion forum)
- 3.24 When assessing large groups, consider holding a team marking session enabling prompt marking, moderation and feedback. Detailed assessment criteria will assist uniformity of marking.
- 3.25 Have the assessment tasks been checked to ensure there is no inherent bias that may disadvantage particular groups of students?
- 3.26 Has the assessment been developed to limit the need for Modified Assessment Provision (MAP), example of MAP free assessments can be found in section 9 of this policy.
- 3.27 By offering a choice of assessment methods will this reduce the numbers of complex modified assessments required. Students have different strengths, learning preferences, time commitments these effect their performance in assessment. Some simple modified assessment provisions may still be required (e.g. the use of computers in written exams and extra time in tests). Consider offering all students a choice of typing or handwriting in examinations.
- 3.28 Are the assessment methods commensurate and equitable? Consider the equity of hours, effort and standards.
- 3.29 Are the assessments designed to minimise plagiarism and academic dishonesty?
- 3.30 Are students familiar with using Turnitin to check their originality report and how to remedy elements that it highlights?
- 3.31 Does the module have detailed assessment criteria which can be used across the different methods?

- 3.32 Ensure there is a marking and feedback sheet that can be used in all assessment methods?
- 3.33 If offering assessment choice what is the ‘default’ assessment method? This can be used if students fail to inform staff of their assessment choice.

4. Guidance for the Submission of Coursework

4.1 Scope

This section covers the submission of summative assessment for all taught modules. This should also be considered good practice for draft assessment and should be followed where appropriate.

4.2 Deadlines

Submission and marking deadlines will be published on the module guide and assessment brief, available at the start of the module. Electronic deadlines will be visible via Turnitin on Moodle, on the module guide and assessment calendar. Paper coursework submissions will be logged through the HE Faculty Office and either provided with an instant paper receipt or electronic receipt to the student email.

Deadlines should be typically set during normal term-time working hours, Monday to Thursday at 1200 hours. Deadlines should not be set during weekends, bank holidays and vacation periods. Exceptionally deadlines planned to occur within the UCSD vacation periods e.g. during field visits, must be approved by the Head of Higher Education, prior to these being finalised.

Students would not normally be expected to work on assessments during the vacation periods so the time allowed to complete assessments could exclude vacation periods.

4.3 Submission

The method of submission must be detailed in the assessment brief and published in the module guide, available on Moodle. Submission deadlines should be set up before the start of the semester, including Turnitin where applicable and students can submit the work as soon as it is ready.

Students should submit work in line with the instructions provided within the module guide.

It is anticipated that most assessments will be submitted via Turnitin via Moodle. But some assessments may be handed to the HE Faculty Office. If submitted via paper to the HE Faculty Office, students will either receive an instant paper receipt or an electronic receipt emailed to their student emails. Submissions would not normally consist of both electronic and paper submission for the same assessment, submissions are to be electronic wherever possible.

Electronic (e-submission)

Electronic submission via Turnitin within Moodle is the preferred method of submission for all suitable assessments.

All summative submissions via Moodle must be bound to a component of assessment, aligned to a component on the module record.

Occasionally an assessment will require a double upload, for example a video presentation MP4 file to a Moodle hand-in submission area and the PowerPoint, notes, script or reference list to Turnitin. Both submission areas need to be set up in accordance with the [Moodle guidance](#). Students should also be advised of the submission requirements on the Assessment Brief and given technical advice on creating, saving and uploading the different elements of their assessment within the module.

Where assessments are set up for electronic submission, students cannot submit a paper copy as well as or instead of.

Paper copy submission

Where the assessment does not lend itself to electronic submission, for example art work, academic posters, field notebooks, workbooks etc paper submission can be arranged. All work for paper submission is to be handed in to the HE Faculty Office and provided with either a paper or electronic receipt.

The HE Faculty Office is situated on the first floor of the University Centre; opening hours are 8:30am to 5.00pm Monday to Thursday and 8:30am to 4:30pm Friday. There is a drop box next to the doors of the HE Faculty Office where students can post their assessments through the 'hole in the wall' to receive an electronic receipt the next working day. This drop box can be used when the HE Faculty Office is not open.

All assessments should include a front sheet with their student name and number. There may be some instances where submissions are not suitable for the HE Faculty Office such as practical assessments, in these circumstances programme teams should have appropriate mechanisms to record these assessments and whether the deadline was met.

Postal

With the exception of referred work, postal submission is not normally permitted.

Referred work submitted by post should be sent by special delivery, allowing sufficient time before the deadline, in accordance with the instructions provided with the transcript of results.

Email

Email submission is not permitted.

4.4 Marking and return of work

There is a requirement that marked work with feedback will be returned to students within 20 working days. Please note that 20 working days does not include weekends, Bank holidays and the vacation periods for academic staff.

Electronic (e-submission)

Feedback and marked work will be returned to students via Turnitin (integrated in Moodle). Work submitted electronically will not normally be printed.

Paper

Work can be collected from the HE Faculty Office or academic staff can arrange to return the work during taught sessions. Students will need to show their ID Card to collect work. The Faculty Office will send an email to students when the work is available for collection.

Work should not be left in open offices, corridors etc for students to pick up, this includes after the programme has concluded.

4.5 Uncollected work

Work will be kept by programme teams until the end of the academic year, there should be an opportunity for students to collect any uncollected work on the day of transcript publication.

4.6 Late work and extensions

Students have up to 24 hours after the deadline time to submit work and it will be capped at 40%. After this period, work will be classed as a non-submission unless extenuating circumstances have been deemed valid.

The regulations on extenuating circumstances (EC) can be [found here](#). Extensions cannot be agreed by individual members of staff; students who require an extension to their deadline should be directed to the dedicated [EC webpage](#) and [EC policy](#). Student can also receive guidance from the HE Student Support Hub.

4.7 Problems

Students must take responsibility for submitting the correct piece of work by the deadline. Students can submit updated versions before the deadline, both to the HE Faculty Office and online; the latest version received by the deadline will be marked. Please be aware that at a busy times Turnitin can take up to 24 hours to create a similarity report and students may not be able to submit update versions whilst the similarity report is being generated. Therefore, care should be taken by students if they are close to their summative deadline, only uploading their final

version as they may not be able to revise it again. If students need to upload a new version of an assessment but Turnitin will not accept it, they should contact the HE Study team or their module leader for assistance.

Updated versions submitted late but within 24 hours of the assessment deadline will be marked and capped in accordance with the regulations on penalties for late work. Please refer to relevant [Assessment Regulations](#).

The summative submission of a draft assessment in error cannot be used in mitigation for an assessment offence allegation. Computer or IT problems are not generally considered an extenuating circumstance.

5. Inclusive Exams or Tests

For subjects where examination or test is an essential requirement, consideration should be made to design inclusive exams. Ways of making exams more inclusive include: scheduling, i.e. time of exams; choice of exam method (open or closed book, take home exam); length of exam; weighting of the exam; the structure of exam questions (open or closed questions, multiple choice questions); enabling all students to type exams; and providing opportunities for students to practice exam. Have a set of shorter exams rather than one long exam. Providing additional time for all students, so long as there is no material advantage for students who do not have a disability, thus preventing the need for extra time for students with disabilities.

6. Marking

Marking is a process indivisible from assessment and embedded within particular disciplines, therefore the marking process for any particular piece of student work needs to be understood within that context. Some assessments can be benchmarked to an established set of marking criteria, or ‘correct’ or ‘model’ answers. Some assessments require objective marking of a student’s performance through the academic and/or professional judgment of student performance against broad marking criteria.

6.1 Students will have the opportunity to submit /discuss draft work/plan

Students will have an opportunity to submit a draft of assessment for review, depending on the nature of assessment a date for draft submission should be indicated for this on the assessment brief. An example of structured feedback for draft work can be seen in [Appendix C](#)

6.2 Draft work submitted by the draft deadline will be returned to students in a timely manner

6.3 Module leaders will engage with [Feed-forward](#) to support students development

- 6.4 Summative feedback will be timely (within 20 working days)

Turnaround of summative feedback will be within 20 working days. Examples of techniques for providing timely feedback can be seen in Appendix [C](#)

- 6.5 Feedback will make use of assessment criteria and level descriptors to ensure standards

- 6.6 Feedback should make use of marking criteria and appropriate headings. Headings can be formed by using the [SEEC level indicators](#) as established areas for assessment. See Appendix E for Benchmark Statements and SEEC level indicators. Appendix A for an example of a Feedback Sheet

- 6.7 Feedback can follow the Analytical, Constructive and Empowering (ACE) framework

An example of ACE feedback criteria can be seen in [Appendix G](#)

- 6.8 Students should be penalised for infringement of word limits or equivalent.

Infringement of word/time limits should be penalised, as laid out in the [Academic Style Guide](#) for students.

- 6.9 A copy of the summative feedback should be provided to students (ideally within Turnitin)

To help students reflect and give them opportunities to reflect on their work, students should be given a copy of their feedback, if handwritten it should be legible.

- 6.10 Marked hand-copy work should remain within UCSD until after relevant Award Assessment Board for the relevant programme.

- 6.11 All grades are subject to internal and external scrutiny; therefore all marked work should remain within module Turnitin accounts until after the Award Assessment Board for the relevant programme.

- 6.12 When engaging with employer's for assessment purpose, employer's feedback can be taken into account when marking, however the academic judgement of making a grading decision must remain with the academic team as identified on the Module Record.

Exception exists in the following cases:- Competency document (where training has been given and staff mentorship is in place) – these are pass/fail assessment elements confirming the student's competency for a task. Where the employer is a module

team member and has been approved as such and is subject to the same CPD requirements as UCSD staff

7. Moderation

Moderation is the process which should make sure that the marking of assessments is fair, reliable and is consistent with the marking criteria. Please see the [Marking and Moderation Procedure](#).

8. Referral assessment

Referral assessments maybe required if a student does not pass a module and will be agreed at the relevant Award Assessment Board. Please see the [UCSD Assessment Regulation](#) for details.

Details on how to pass a module and the procedures in the event of failure, can be found within the relevant [Assessment Regulation](#).

9. Assessment Criteria

To ensure equity the different assessment methods need to share similar assessment and marking criteria. Assessment criteria are descriptions of what the learner has to do in order to demonstrate that the learning outcomes have been achieved.

Examples of equitable assessment criteria for a range of assessment methods:-

Essay	Group presentation	Individual reflective assessment
Articulate understanding Originality of argument Clear structure Use of theory Coherence / Clarity Evidence a range of reading Relevance Correct length Grammar and spelling accurate with fluent language.	Articulate understanding Originality of argument Clear structure Use of theory Coherence / Clarity Evidence a range of reading Relevance Correct length Presentation skills Use of resources	Articulate understanding Originality of argument Clear structure Use of theory Coherence / Clarity Evidence a range of reading Relevance Correct length Grammar and spelling accurate with fluent language. Insights – reflection

Group poster or presentation
Clear structure and organisation Enhancements to assist in communication (visual/audio/ physical) Verbal delivery : clarity and coherence Evidence of appropriate depth and breadth of research onto topic Evidence of group's comprehension of this topic. Ability of group to suggest improvements for future work and for being a better team Ability of group to give 'constructive' feedback to other student group(s).

Exam, essay or coursework
Analytical and clear conclusions well-grounded in theory and literature, showing development of new concepts. Clear evidence of application of theory/critical analysis. Consistent understanding demonstrated in a logical, coherent and lucid manner. Thoughts and ideas clearly expressed. Grammar and spelling accurate with fluent language.

10. Assessment methods and their modified assessment provision (MAP) implications.

Simple or MAP free	Complex MAP implications
Exhibition Portfolio Oral presentation – group Project work Performance	Individual oral presentation to a large group

Assessing -Knowledge and understanding

Recalling, describing, reporting, recounting, recognising, identifying, relating & interrelating

Simple or MAP free	Complex MAP implications
Short answer questions Multiple Choice Questions (Paper or computer aided) Weekly short tests Essay Report (individual or group) Report of data analysis encyclopaedia entry A-Z of... Wiki or website Viva voce Group discussion or debate Mooting (law assessment)	Examinations: unseen , open book, seen, case study, problem centred (formative or summative) In class tests

Assessing -Thinking critically & making judgements

Developing arguments, reflecting, evaluating, assessing, judging

Simple or MAP free	Complex MAP implications
Essay Report/portfolio Journal or reflective diary Present a case to an interest group Briefing / conference paper Literature review Written newspaper article Letter of advice to..... Oral presentation to a small or large group or on camera	Examinations: unseen , open book, seen, case study, problem centred (formative or summative) In class tests Individual oral presentation to a large group

Assessing - Problem solving & developing plans Identifying, posing or defining problems, analysing data, reviewing, designing experiments, planning, applying information

Simple or MAP free	Complex MAP implications
Report on cause and effect Research bid Field work report Case study analysis Analysis of a problem Action plan Oral presentation to a small or large group or on camera	Examinations: unseen , open book, seen, case study, problem centred (formative or summative) When a student is unable to participate in field trips

Group plan, report and presentation Laboratory practical & report Group or individual poster Simulation exercise	Individual oral presentation to a large group
---	---

Assessing- Designing, creating performing

Imagining, visualising, designing, producing, creating, innovating, performing

Assessing -Procedures and techniques

Working co-operatively, independently, being self-directed, managing time or tasks, organising

Simple or MAP free	Complex MAP implications
Laboratory practical & report (group or individual) Field work report (group or individual) Illustrated manual (group or individual) Produce a leaflet or poster (group or individual) Portfolio Observation of real or simulated practice Viva voce Video/podcast Demonstration Website or Wiki	When a student is unable to participate in field trips Role play

Assessing -Accessing and managing information

Researching, investigating, interpreting, organising information, reviewing and paraphrasing information, collecting data, searching and managing information sources, observing and interpreting

Simple or MAP free	Complex MAP implications
Report on data interpretation Report on applied problem/task Essay Task report Annotated bibliography	Examinations: unseen , open book, seen, case study, problem centred (formative or summative) In class tests

Assessing -Managing and developing oneself

Recalling, describing, reporting, recounting, recognising, identifying, relating & interrelating

Simple or MAP free	Complex MAP implications
Reflective journal/portfolio/diary Group oral presentation Report on group activity	Individual oral presentation to a large group

Website/wiki E-journal Podcast Blogs	
---	--

Assessing -Communicating

One, two-way, group, verbal, written and non-verbal communication. Arguing, describing, advocating, interviewing, negotiating and presenting.

Simple or MAP free	Complex MAP implications
Discussion/debate	Role play
Oral presentation to a small group or on camera	Individual oral presentation to a large group
Real or simulated practice	
Court of enquiry	
Story boards	
Viva voce	

11. Appendix A: Module Guide including Assessment Brief template

Please Note

- Text in red is guidance and should be deleted when you have completed the section.
- Text in italics is an example and need to be deleted when you have completed the section.
- Text in black non-italics needs to be included.

OR



UNIVERSITY
CENTRE
SOUTH DEVON



UNIVERSITY OF
PLYMOUTH



UNIVERSITY
CENTRE
SOUTH DEVON

Module Title and Code

Programme Title

Module Leader:

Other Module Staff:

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	21
Welcome and Introduction	22
Teaching and Assessment Team	22
Module Aim	23
Module Learning Outcomes.....	23
Teaching and Learning Strategy.....	24
Assessment.....	24
Regulations	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Module Rules.....	25
Scheme of Work	26
Assessment Brief 1	27
Assessment Brief 2	28
Reading List.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Specific Grading Criteria.....	30

Welcome and Introduction

Use this section to give a broad overview of the module, incorporating your Short Module Description from page 1 of the Definitive Module Record.

Delivery of the module materials will be through lectures, workshops, exercises and case studies and you will be required to undertake work in your own time, to ensure that you develop an awareness of how theory relates to working practices. You are also required to develop a series of presentations, which will be based on some of the taught material in addition to handouts, evidence of background reading, fieldwork notes and self-completion exercises. An assessed presentation will form part of the module assessment package and will make use of all the formative tasks and feedback set.

This module is designed to give you a broad understanding of the theoretical and practical aspects of applied sport finance. Key areas include; finance and governance, strategic planning with financial information, using financial statements and interpreting financial information, forecasting financial position and performance. Financial literacy, communicating financial information and effective decision making.

Teaching and Assessment Team

Module leader:	
Location:	
Email:	
Phone number:	
Student meeting times:	

If you have other teaching staff you can include their details here, if not detail the box

Lecturer:	
Location:	
Email:	
Phone number:	
Student meeting times:	

Module moderator:	
--------------------------	--

Please note: As we teach across different programmes and year groups we are not always at our desks. Therefore, if you wish to discuss your learning progress, assessment progress or matters relating to this module then please book an appointment via email.

Module Aim

This module aims to provide you with the opportunity to systematically and creatively apply financial techniques to make decisions about complex management problems. Throughout the module you will develop a critical understanding of financial decision making tools and techniques to solve practical situations and manage change.

This section should come from your Module Aims section from page 1 of your Definitive Module Record in your Programme Quality Handbook

Module Learning Outcomes

By the end of the module you will be able to:

1. *Apply and integrate methods of enquiry and previously acquired subject skills and knowledge to identify and define financial management problems that require resolution in sport;*
2. *Critically evaluate and apply financial tools to solve complex management problems;*
3. *Acquire, classify, organise and evaluate financial information to provide management decision making in a relevant format;*
4. *Reflect critically upon the way individuals cooperate with others and how to optimise the outcomes of these processes.*

This section should come from your Module Learning Outcomes section from page 1 of your Definitive Module Record in your Programme Quality Handbook

Teaching and Learning Strategy

Scheduled Delivery	24hrs
Guided independent Study	126hrs
Total	150hrs

Higher Education follows the SDC Teaching and Learning Framework. UCSD develops Module Guides which should reference the TL Framework and the principals within. Therefore this Section should demonstrate your strategy of the 'Evidenced Informed Teacher' and 'The Responsive Teacher'.

*You will be supported in your learning, to achieve the above outcomes, in the following ways:
Lectures will be used to present key financial theory based on both the first principles of finance as well as the literature-based evidence on the subject. As the module develops, case studies will be used as the basis of group work and it will become increasingly interactive with you being required to report back to formal sessions and to make presentations on you, and your student support groups, findings.*

Assessment Activities during the taught aspect of the course will help you to progress your knowledge, understanding and application of finance. A number small group tasks, during and after lectures, will be set and you will be required to and present your findings to the group.

Student-Directed Learning will take the form of your own self-selected activities. There will be a wide range of resources available on Moodle which you may choose to use to develop your skills and application of theory.

Assessment

Task No.*	Short Description of Task	Weighting	Draft date	Summative date	Return date
1	<i>Group Case Study Presentation</i>	50%			
2					

Regulations

You must ensure that you are fully up to date with the UCSD student assessment rights and rules, which are updated regularly, and can be found via the [following link](#).

Normal operating assessment regulations apply (e.g. word count limits, authenticity of work, appropriate writing style), please see the [Academic Style guide](#) for details. By submitting your assessment for marking you are declaring that that, except where indicated through the proper use of citations and references, the assessment is all your own original work.

Provisional marks and written feedback will be provided promptly within 20 working days.

Module Rules

This section may need adapting to account for any physical distancing measures that are put in place before September 2020.

You are expected to engage fully with your learning. This includes attendance to all of your lectures and seminars, the completion of any directed study, and submission of formative as well as summative assessment activities. It is also expected that you participate positively in all activities. See [link](#) for more details.

Scheme of Work

Session Number	Date	Content	Supporting Activity

The content and supporting activities subheadings here can be adapted for different curriculum areas. It is good practice to include the draft and summative deadlines in the SoW to allow students to picture the whole module.

Please also note this schedule of work is subject to amendments, please check Moodle.

Assessment Brief 1

Element	Coursework, Practical, Exam or Test	
Mode	Give details of the mode e.g.: lab report, dissertation, presentation, video presentation, seminar, policy, briefing paper, essay, open-book test, take-home test etc.	
Title	State the title that you expect students to use on their assessment, or state that students will need to create their own title	
Assessed Learning Outcomes	Include both the numbers and the details	
Word Count	State the word limit plus 10% or the time limit for a presentation etc.	
Draft date and process	Give details of how draft submissions will be reviewed and when feedback will be received by.	
Summative Submission Date	State the date and time	
Submission process	Give details of how this should be submitted, e.g. via Turnitin, Moodle hand-in or in hard copy to the HE Faculty Office	
Brief	<p>Your Assessment Brief should be student-centered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • written in a language that is understandable before module teaching • using the correct command or action for the level of study • explicitly stating your expectations of the structure, scope, and content. 	
Marking Criteria	Description	Weighting
	Break down the marking criteria into elements of the assessment, use command or action verbs that reflect the level of study and avoid repeating the LOs	15%
	Consider giving marks reading and synthesis of ideas, academic presentation and referencing at the appropriate academic level	20%
		25%
		30%
	10%	

Assessment Brief 2

Element	Coursework, Practical, Exam or Test	
Mode	Give details of the mode e.g.: lab report, dissertation, presentation, video presentation, seminar, policy, briefing paper, essay, open-book test, take-home test etc.	
Title	State the title that you expect students to use on their assessment, or state that students will need to create their own title	
Assessed Learning Outcomes	Include both the numbers and the details	
Word Count	State the word limit plus 10% or the time limit for a presentation etc.	
Draft date and process	Give details of how draft submissions will be reviewed and when feedback will be received by.	
Summative Submission Date	State the date and time	
Submission process	Give details of how this should be submitted, e.g. via Turnitin, Moodle hand-in or in hard copy to the HE Faculty Office	
Task brief	<p>Your Task Brief should be student-centered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • written in a language that is understandable before module teaching • using the correct command or action verbs for the level of study • explicitly stating your expectations of the structure, scope and content. 	
Marking Criteria	Description	Weighting
	Break down the marking criteria into elements of the assessment, use command or action verbs that reflect the level of study and avoid repeating the LOs	15%
	Consider giving marks reading and synthesis of ideas, academic presentation and referencing at the appropriate academic level	20%
		25%
		30%
	10%	

Reading list

Please find below a list of essential and recommended reading specific to this module, this can also be accessed through the Library Resources block on your course Moodle page.

Reading lists should be used as a recommended set of readings that can help you understand the content of a module and provide a basis for research for your assessment. The library stocks many other resources (print and online) which should be used alongside the reading list. These can be accessed by searching Heritage, for more information [linked here](#). If you have any questions about accessing and using library resources please contact hestudy@southdevon.ac.uk.

It is essential that the reading list is updated each year, including checking for new editions of core text and that it is written in accordance with your course's referencing system (typically this is CiteThemRight Harvard).

Essential Reading

*Dobson, S. and Goddard, J. (2011) *The Economics of Football*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: University Press.*

*Fried, G., DeShriver, T. and MONDELLO, M. (2013) *Sport Finance*. 3rd edn. Leeds: Human Kinetics.*

Recommended Reading

*Andreff, W. (2011) 'Some comparative economics of the organisation of sports: competition and regulation in north American vs. Europe professional team sports leagues', *The European Journal of Comparative Economics*, 8(1), pp. 3-27.*

*Andreff, W. and Staudohar, P.D. (2000) 'The Evolving Model of Professional Sports Finance', *Journal of Sports Economics*, 1(3), pp. 257-276.*

*Chang, Y-M. and Sanders, S. (2009) 'Pool revenue sharing, team investments and competitive balance in professional sports: a theoretical analysis', *Journal of Sports Economics*, 10(4), pp. 409-428.*

*Downard, P. and Dawson, A. (2001) *The economics of professional team sports*. London: Routledge.*

Study skills guidance is available via this [link](#).

Generic Grading Criteria

*Please use your generic grading criteria for your module level of study, only if you are **not** using the rubrics through Turnitin. If using rubrics through Turnitin, then please delete this section*

LEVEL 4 - "Certificate"	
OUT-STANDING 85-100%	Thorough coverage of relevant issues. Extremely well informed knowledge base relevant to assessment. Very clearly written, logically structured and presented. Critical discussion of current issues and their influence on practice. Excellent application of theory to practice. Evidence of consistently safe and exemplary standard of practice.
EXCELLENT 70-85%	Comprehensive coverage of relevant issues. Well informed knowledge base relevant to assessment. Clearly written, logically structured and presented. Discussion of current issues and their influence on practice. Excellent application of theory to practice. Evidence of consistently safe and high standards of practice.
VERY GOOD* 60-68%	Descriptions based upon a broad range of relevant knowledge and reading. Theory consistently applied to practice. Describes relevant issues. Awareness of current issues and their influence on practice. Written in a clear and logically structured presentation. Incorporates evidence of safe and consistently well applied practice.
GOOD* 50-58%	Utilises appropriate and relevant theory. Consistent application of appropriate theory to practice. Incorporates evidence of safe practice. Well-structured and developed presentation. Clearly written. References generally accurate.
PASS 40-48%	Meets the criteria and requirements of the assessment/examination. Meets module specific criteria. Some appropriate and relevant theory described. References used appropriately and generally accurate. Some relevant knowledge applied to practice. Evidence of safe practice described. Structure and presentation not always clear.
FAIL TO ACHIEVE A PASS GRADE 30-38%	Does not meet the criteria and requirements of the assessment/examination. Does not meet module specific criteria. Limited range of relevant theory. Frequent referencing errors. Inappropriate description and application of theory to practice. Poor understanding of practice issues.

	Lacking in logical structure and sequencing.
CLEAR FAILURE TO ACHIEVE A PASS GRADE 29% and below	<p>Unreferenced.</p> <p>Lacking any relevant theoretical content.</p> <p>Poorly organised presentation.</p> <p>Difficult to read and follow.</p>

Note: These are attributes across all academic levels that indicate the work would not meet the required standard for a pass grade - Unsafe and insensitive practice described; Very poor sentence construction, grammar and spelling throughout; Incoherent; Illegible; Discriminatory and judgmental content; Unreferenced throughout; Exceeds assessment word count by more than 10%; Anonymity/confidentiality breached. In cases of Proven Academic Dishonesty and late submission specific penalties apply.

*It is implicit in this grading structure that higher levels of attainment also incorporate the positive attributes as described in lower categories of a pass.

LEVEL 5 - "Diploma"	
OUT-STANDING 85-100%	Consistently logical and critical analysis throughout. Exemplary linkage of recent research to practice. Demonstrates consistent independent thought on contemporary issues. Extensive and wide-ranging knowledge of relevant theory and contemporary issues. Incorporates evidence of consistently safe and the highest standards of practice. Incorporates a reasoned ethical dimension throughout the work.
EXCELLENT 70-85%	Well-argued presentation and critical analysis throughout. Identifies and discusses relevant ethical issues. Excellent relationship of recent research to practice. Evidence of independent thought on contemporary issues. Comprehensive and wide-ranging knowledge base of relevant theory. Incorporates evidence of consistently safe and high standards of practice. Advocacy and sensitivity for clients and colleagues demonstrated.
VERY GOOD* 60-68%	Balanced arguments and presentation. Accurate application of relevant theory to practice issues. Evidence of safe and good practice. Provides a sound rationale for interventions. Evidence of ability to critically analyse information. Advocacy for clients and colleagues demonstrated. Well-structured and logical presentation.
GOOD* 50-58%	Sound knowledge of subject matter. Evidence of ability to apply knowledge to new situations. Analysis of current issues. Some argument introduced. Demonstrates understanding of safe clinical / professional practice. Sensitive empathy with clients, carers and colleagues demonstrated. Correct citation of references and literature used effectively. Structured and clear presentation.
PASS 40-48%	Meets the criteria and requirements of the assessment/examination. Meets module specific criteria. References and bibliography used appropriately and generally accurate. Some appropriate and relevant theory utilised. Some evidence of analysis. Safe and relevant practice described. Structure and presentation not always clear.
FAIL TO ACHIEVE A PASS GRADE 30-38%	Does not meet the criteria and requirements of the assessment/examination. Does not meet module specific criteria. Limited evidence of reading and underpinning knowledge. Frequent referencing errors. Poor understanding of practice issues. Lacking evidence of analysis.

	Misconceptions and basic errors of underpinning theory. Lacks structure and difficult to follow.
CLEAR FAILURE TO ACHIEVE A PASS GRADE 29% and below	Limited and inaccurate referencing. Absence of analysis. Lacking structure and difficult to follow. Serious misconceptions and basic errors of underpinning theory.
<p>Note: These are attributes across all academic levels that indicate the work would not meet the required standard for a pass grade - Unsafe and insensitive practice described; Very poor sentence construction, grammar and spelling throughout; Incoherent; Illegible; Discriminatory and judgmental content; Unreferenced throughout; Exceeds assessment word count by more than 10%; Anonymity/confidentiality breached.</p> <p>In cases of Proven Academic Dishonesty and late submission specific penalties apply.</p>	

*It is implicit in this grading structure that higher levels of attainment also incorporate the positive attributes as described in lower categories of a pass.

LEVEL 6 - "Degree"	
OUT-STANDING 85-100%	Critical analysis and synthesis of the possibilities and limitations of methodology and theory. Extremely well-constructed and logically presented argument throughout. Sound ethical reasoning consistently demonstrated. Able to select and apply specific theories to generate innovative solutions to complex situations. Outstanding comprehension of contemporary issues. Excellent application of recent research to practice. Incorporates evidence of consistently safe and highest standards of practice. Leadership and assertive advocacy for clients and colleagues demonstrated where appropriate
EXCELLENT 70-85%	Identifies limitations of methodology and theory. Well-constructed and logically presented argument. Sound ethical reasoning demonstrated. Able to select and apply specific theories to complex situations. Excellent comprehension of contemporary issues. Excellent relationship of recent research to practice. Incorporates evidence of consistently safe and best standards of practice. Assertive advocacy for clients and colleagues demonstrated where appropriate
VERY GOOD* 60-68%	Evidence of ethical reasoning. Evidence of wide knowledge base and critical reading. Evidence of critical reasoning to solve problems. Critical understanding of the research process. Argument founded on the basis of evidence. Safe and evidence-based practice consistently described. Good range of sources used appropriately.
GOOD* 50-58%	Well referenced and cited. Applies relevant research to current practice issues. Capacity to analyse concepts and balance arguments. Selects specific and appropriate theory to enhance arguments. Sensitive and insightful empathy demonstrated. Consistently safe practice described with reference to evidence based rationale
PASS 40-48%	Meets the criteria and requirements of the assessment/examination. Meets module specific criteria. Some appropriate and relevant theory described. Arguments and issues not always clearly focused. Safe practice described with some reference to evidence-based underpinning. References and bibliography used appropriately and generally accurate. Structure and presentation not always clear.
FAIL TO ACHIEVE A PASS GRADE 30-38%	Does not meet the criteria and requirements of the assessment/examination. Does not meet module specific criteria. Limited analysis or synthesis. Poorly developed argument.

	<p>Restricted range and understanding of underpinning theory.</p> <p>Inappropriate application of theory to practice.</p> <p>Frequent referencing errors.</p> <p>Poor understanding of practice issues</p>
<p>CLEAR FAILURE TO ACHIEVE A PASS GRADE 29% and below</p>	<p>Few or no source references used.</p> <p>Lacking in analysis and synthesis.</p> <p>Poorly informed knowledge base.</p> <p>Limited and inappropriate links between theory and practice.</p>
<p>Note: These are attributes across all academic levels that indicate the work would not meet the required standard for a pass grade - Unsafe and insensitive practice described; Very poor sentence construction, grammar and spelling throughout; Incoherent; Illegible; Discriminatory and judgmental content; Unreferenced throughout; Exceeds assessment word count by more than 10%; Anonymity/confidentiality breached.</p> <p>In cases of Proven Academic Dishonesty and late submission specific penalties apply.</p>	

*It is implicit in this grading structure that higher levels of attainment also incorporate the positive attributes as described in lower categories of a pass.

12. Appendix B: HE Module and Assessment IV

Programme	
Module Code and Title	
Module Leader	
Moderator	
Moderation date	

Module Guide

	Moderate	Notes
The 2020-21 Module template has been used	No	
The correct UCSD or UCSD and UoP logo on the front page for the programme validation	No	
Module title and code are correct	No	
Welcome and Introduction reflects the short module descriptor from the Definitive Module Record (DMR) in the Programme Quality Handbook	No	
Module leader contact details are correct	No	
Student meeting times are included (or your working days if part-time)	No	
Module Aims and Learning Outcomes match those on the DMR	No	
The Teaching & Learning Strategy break down of scheduled learning hours match the DMR	No	
The T&L strategy blurb demonstrates your strategy of the 'Evidenced Informed Teacher' and 'The Responsive Teacher' from the SDC T&L Framework	No	
Assessment dates match the programme Assessment Schedule	Yes	
Assessment dates are consistent throughout the MG	No	
The weighting of the assessment match the DMR	No	
The hyperlinks work	No	
The SoW is realistic and outcome-focused	No	
The reading list is up to date, includes ebooks available on Heritage and/or Primo, and is written accurately in Cite Them Right Harvard (or the referencing system used by the programme)	No	
The correct Generic Grading Criteria has been used for the level of study	No	

Assessment 1

	Moderate	Notes
The element match those in the DMR	Yes	
The mode of assessment gives enough detail	Yes	
There is a clear title or an instruction to students to create their own title	Yes	
The Learning Outcomes match those in the DRM against the assessment type	Yes	

There is a word count or time limit that has equivalent to the credits and weighting	Yes	
There is a clear draft process and the dates match the Assessment table and SoW	Yes	
The summative process is clear and the dates match the Assessment table and SoW	Yes	
The task brief uses student-centred language and the correct command verbs for the level of study	Yes	
The marking criteria adds to 100%	Yes	
The marking criteria is not a repeat of the Learning Outcomes, and uses command/action words	Yes	
The marking criteria is broken down to give credit for academic presentation and referencing at the appropriate academic level	Yes	

Assessment 2

	Moderate	Notes
The element match those in the DMR	Yes	
The mode of assessment gives enough detail	Yes	
There is a clear title or an instruction to students to create their own title	Yes	
The Learning Outcomes match those in the DRM against the assessment type	Yes	
There is a word count or time limit that has equivalent to the credits and weighting	Yes	
There is a clear draft process and the dates match the Assessment table and SoW	Yes	
The summative process is clear and the dates match the Assessment table and SoW	Yes	
The task brief uses student-centred language and the correct command verbs for the level of study	Yes	
The marking criteria adds to 100%	Yes	
The marking criteria is not a repeat of the Learning Outcomes, and uses command/action words	Yes	
The marking criteria is broken down to give credit for academic presentation and referencing at the appropriate academic level	Yes	

Any other moderator comments:

Confirmation that changes have been made by the Module Leader

Notes	NA
Module Leader	
Date	Click or tap to enter a date.

Upload both the Module Guide and the moderation form to the External Examiner section of Moodle and the Module Guide to your module Moodle page.

13. Appendix C: Three Examples to Providing Quick Feedback on Draft work

Before each summative assessment deadline students will be given the opportunity to submit draft work. Provided the draft is submitted on time (e.g. by 9am on the date stated on the assessment brief), students will receive written feedback within one week of their draft submission, or via a one2one with the tutor where written feedback will also be provided.

There are three examples for providing feedback on draft work. In programme teams, you should decide which is more appropriate to adopt across the programme for consistency.

First example of providing feedback on draft work:

Student Name:.....

Checklist:

Additional Factors to consider	v
You have used language appropriate to the assessment requirements, avoiding vague and/or judgmental terms	
You have used the words 'elicit', 'effect' and 'affect' correctly	
Your work is specific, concise and evidence based	
You have used a clear and logical structure	
You have checked your spelling, grammar and punctuation. For example, use of apostrophes and tense	
You have taken responsibility for what you write and identified when work has been completed by someone else	
You have used appropriate referencing	
You have used the correct phonetic symbols and brackets	
You have written an accurate word count	
Other Module specific	
Comments:	

Second example of providing feedback on draft work:

Students will receive developmental feedback against each draft assessment criteria within one week of draft submission.

Assessment plan A range of formats are accepted for the plan (e.g. bullet points, spider diagrams). Feedback could include comments on content, structure and sources of information that the student intends to use throughout the whole assessment.	Feedback...
Assessment criteria Feedback can indicate whether the first 20% of the assessment appears to be addressing assessment criteria and whether some criteria need further attention.	Feedback...
Academic writing Feedback should focus on the use of an appropriate title and reference to that title in the work. Structure, spelling, punctuation, grammar, paragraphs, 1.5 line spacing, consistent use of paragraphs and linking sentences can also be considered.	Feedback...
Referencing Feedback should enable the student to develop consistent use of in text citations. It may also refer to use of appropriate sources and accurate presentation of the reference list.	Feedback...

Third example of providing feedback on draft work:

Suggestions for providing feedback quickly to students in situations where meeting the deadline is difficult. Options include:

- Statement banks, from which to draw often-needed feedback explanations form a collection of frequently used comments which apply to the work of many students
- Building an overall general collection of feedback comments to the class as a whole, based on common errors and frequent difficulties, posting this on an electronic discussion board which each student can view prior to them receiving their individual feedback. This would comply with feedback being provided within the 4 working week turnaround time for those extensive assessments that are difficult to second mark and moderate within the timescale
- Using pre-printed feedback sheet that clearly states the assessment criteria/learning outcomes and other prompts as recommended in point 18 above
- Consider the use of tables which identify levels/depth of student achievement against the marking criteria and which are made available to students as well as used by staff. These can help students to see where they are on the scale, what else they need to do to improve in future and help you to be consistent in your approach when awarding marks. Examples of table formats for marking criteria are available in appendices E and F. To ensure the level is correct when producing marking schemes refer to the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) descriptors (appendix C)
<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/academicinfrastructure/FHEQ/default.asp> and benchmark statements.

14. Appendix D: Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ)

<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/qualifications-frameworks.pdf>

Descriptor for a higher education qualification at level 4: Certificate of Higher Education

(Level of an HNC and first year of an FD)

The descriptor provided for this level of the FHEQ is for any Certificate of Higher Education which should meet the descriptor in full. This qualification descriptor can also be used as a reference point for other level 4 qualifications.

Certificates of Higher Education are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

- Knowledge of the underlying concepts and principles associated with their area(s) of study, and an ability to evaluate and interpret these within the context of that area of study
- An ability to present, evaluate and interpret qualitative and quantitative data, in order to develop lines of argument and make sound judgements in accordance with basic theories and concepts of their subject(s) of study.

Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

- Evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems related to their area(s) of study and/or work
- Communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably, and with structured and coherent arguments
- Undertake further training and develop new skills within a structured and managed environment.

And holders will have:

- The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility.

Holders of a Certificate of Higher Education will have a sound knowledge of the basic concepts of a subject, and will have learned how to take different approaches to solving problems. They will be able to communicate accurately and will have the qualities needed for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility. The Certificate of Higher Education may be a first step towards obtaining higher level qualifications.

Descriptor for a higher education qualification at level 5: Foundation Degree

(Level of final year of Foundation Degree and HND)

The descriptor provided for this level of the FHEQ is for any Foundation Degree which should meet the descriptor in full.

This qualification descriptor can also be used as a reference point for other level 5 qualifications, including Diplomas of Higher Education, Higher National Diplomas, etc.

Foundation Degrees are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

- Knowledge and critical understanding of the well-established principles of their area(s) of study, and of the way in which those principles have developed
- Ability to apply underlying concepts and principles outside the context in which they were first studied, including, where appropriate, the application of those principles in an employment context
- Knowledge of the main methods of enquiry in the subject(s) relevant to the named award, and ability to evaluate critically the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems in the field of study
- An understanding of the limits of their knowledge, and how this influences analyses and interpretations based on that knowledge.

Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

- Use a range of established techniques to initiate and undertake critical analysis of information, and to propose solutions to problems arising from that analysis
- Effectively communicate information, arguments and analysis in a variety of forms to specialist and non-specialist audiences, and deploy key techniques of the discipline effectively
- Undertake further training, develop existing skills and acquire new competences that will enable them to assume significant responsibility within organisations.

And holders will have:

- The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and decision-making.

The Foundation Degree is an example of a qualification that meets, in full, the expectations of the qualification descriptor (and the *Foundation Degree qualification benchmark* accessed at:

www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews/foundationDegree/benchmark/FDQB.asp)

Holders of qualifications at this level will have developed a sound understanding of the principles in their field of study, and will have learned to apply those principles more widely. Through this, they will have learned to evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems. Their studies may well have had a vocational orientation, for example HNDs, enabling them to perform effectively in their chosen field. Holders of qualifications at this level will have the qualities necessary for employment in situations requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and decision-making.

Descriptor for a higher education qualification at level 6: Bachelor's degree with honours

The descriptor provided for this level of the FHEQ is for any bachelor's degree with honours which should meet the descriptor in full. This qualification descriptor can also be used as a reference point for other level 6 qualifications, including bachelor's degrees, graduate diplomas etc.

Bachelor's degrees with honours are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

- A systematic understanding of key aspects of their field of study, including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of defined aspects of a discipline
- An ability to deploy accurately established techniques of analysis and enquiry within a discipline
- Conceptual understanding that enables the student:
 - To devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems, using ideas and techniques, some of which are at the forefront of a discipline
 - To describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research, or equivalent advanced scholarship, in the discipline
- An appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge
- The ability to manage their own learning, and to make use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (for example, refereed research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the discipline).

Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

- Apply the methods and techniques that they have learned to review, consolidate, extend and apply their knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects
- Critically evaluate arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), to make judgements, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution - or identify a range of solutions - to a problem
- Communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to both specialist and non-specialist audiences.

And holders will have:

- The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring:
 - The exercise of initiative and personal responsibility
 - Decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts
 - The learning ability needed to undertake appropriate further training of a professional or equivalent nature.

Holders of a bachelor's degree with honours will have developed an understanding of a complex body of knowledge, some of it at the current boundaries of an academic discipline. Through this, the holder will have developed analytical techniques and problem-solving skills that can be applied in many types of employment. The holder of such a qualification will be able to evaluate evidence, arguments and assumptions, to reach sound judgements and to communicate them effectively.

Holders of a bachelor's degree with honours should have the qualities needed for employment in situations requiring the exercise of personal responsibility, and decision-making in complex and unpredictable circumstances.

Bachelor's degrees with honours form the largest group of higher education qualifications. Typically, learning outcomes for these programmes would be expected to be achieved on the basis of study equivalent to three full-time academic years and lead to awards with titles such as Bachelor of Arts, BA (Hons) or Bachelor of Science, BSc (Hons). In addition to bachelor's degrees at this level are short courses and professional 'conversion' courses, based largely on undergraduate material, and taken usually by those who are already graduates in another discipline, leading to, for example, graduate certificates or graduate diplomas.

15. Appendix E: SEEC Level Descriptors

<http://www.seec.org.uk>

Level 4 – (HNC Level)

SETTING

Operational context	Operates in a range of varied but predictable contexts that require the use of a specified range of techniques and information sources.
Autonomy and responsibility for actions	Acts with limited autonomy, under direction or supervision, within defined guidelines. Takes responsibility for the nature and quality of outputs..

KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING

Knowledge & Understanding	Has a broad understanding of the knowledge base and its terminology or discourse. Demonstrates awareness that areas of this knowledge base are open to ongoing debate and reformulation.
---------------------------	--

COGNITIVE SKILLS

Conceptualisation and	Identifies principles and concepts underlying theoretical frameworks and begins to identify their strengths and weaknesses.
Critical Thinking	
Problem Solving,	
Research & Enquiry	Identifies a well-defined focus for enquiry, plans and undertakes investigative strategies using a limited and defined range of methods, collects data from a variety of sources, and communicates results effectively in an appropriate format
Synthesis and Creativity	Collects information from a variety of authoritative sources to inform a choice of solutions to standard problems in familiar contexts
Analysis and evaluation	Judges the reliability of data and information using pre-defined techniques and/or criteria.

PERFORMANCE AND PRACTICE

Adaptation to Context	Relates own role to specified and externally defined parameters.
Performance	Undertakes performance tasks that may be complex and non-routine engaging in self-reflection.
Team and organisational working	Works effectively with others and recognises the factors that affect team performance.
Ethical awareness & application	Demonstrates awareness of ethical issues and is able to discuss these in relation to personal beliefs and values.

PERSONAL AND ENABLING SKILLS

Personal evaluation and development	Is aware of own capabilities in key areas and engages in development activity through guided self-direction.
-------------------------------------	--

Interpersonal and communication skills	Uses interpersonal and communication skills to clarify tasks and identify and rectify issues in a range of contexts.
--	--

Level 5 (Foundation Degree Level)

SETTING

Operational context	Operates in situations of varying complexity and predictability requiring the application of a wide range of techniques and information sources.
Autonomy and responsibility for actions	Acts with limited supervision and direction, within defined guidelines accepting responsibility for achieving personal and/or group outcomes and/or outputs.

KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING

Knowledge & Understanding	Has detailed knowledge of well-established theories and concepts. Demonstrates an awareness of different ideas, contexts and frameworks and recognises those areas where the knowledge base is most/least secure.
---------------------------	---

COGNITIVE SKILLS

Conceptualisation and	Identifies analyses and communicates principles and concepts recognising competing perspectives.
Critical Thinking	Undertakes research to provide new information and/or explores new or existing data to identify patterns and relationships.
Problem Solving, Research & Enquiry	Uses appropriate theoretical models to judge the significance of the data collected recognising the limitations of the enquiry.
Synthesis and Creativity	Collects and synthesises information to inform a choice of solutions to problems in unfamiliar contexts.
Analysis and evaluation	Analyses a range of information comparing alternative methods and techniques.
	Selects appropriate techniques/criteria for evaluation and discriminates between the relative relevance and significance of data/evidence collected.

PERFORMANCE AND PRACTICE

Adaptation to Context	Identifies external expectations and adapts own performance accordingly.
Performance	Undertakes complex and non-routine performance tasks. Analyses performance of self and others and suggests improvements.
Team and organisational working	Interacts effectively within a team, giving and receiving information and ideas and modifying responses where appropriate. Recognises and ameliorates situations likely to lead to conflict.
Ethical awareness & application	Is aware of personal responsibility and professional codes of conduct.

PERSONAL AND ENABLING SKILLS

Personal evaluation and development Assesses own capabilities using justifiable criteria set by self and others taking the wider needs of the context into account.

Uses feedback to adapt own actions to reach a desired aim and reviews impact.

Interpersonal and communication skills Adapts interpersonal and communication skills to a range of situations, audiences and degrees of complexity.

Level 6 (Honours Degree Level)

SETTING

Operational context	Operates in complex and unpredictable contexts, requiring selection and application from a range of largely standard techniques and information sources.
Autonomy and responsibility for actions	Acts with minimal supervision or direction, within agreed guidelines taking responsibility for accessing support and accepts accountability for determining and achieving personal and/or group outcomes.

KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING

Knowledge & Understanding Has a systematic understanding of the knowledge base and its inter-relationship with other fields of study. Demonstrates current understanding of some specialist areas in depth.

COGNITIVE SKILLS

Conceptualisation and	Works with ideas at a level of abstraction, arguing from competing perspectives. Identifies the possibility of new concepts within existing knowledge frameworks and approaches.
Critical Thinking	Demonstrates confidence and flexibility in identifying and defining complex problems. Identifies, selects and uses investigative strategies and techniques to undertake a critical analysis, evaluating the outcomes.
Problem Solving,	
Research & Enquiry	
Synthesis and Creativity	Applies knowledge in unfamiliar contexts, synthesising ideas or information to generate novel solutions. Achieves a body of work or practice that is coherent and resolved.
Analysis and evaluation	Analyses new, novel and/or abstract data using an appropriate range of established subject specific techniques. Judges the reliability, validity and significance of evidence to support conclusions and/or recommendations suggests reasons for contradictory data/results.

PERFORMANCE AND PRACTICE

Adaptation to Context	Locates own role within poorly defined and/or flexible contexts requiring a level of autonomy.
Performance	Seeks and applies new techniques and processes to own performance and identifies how these might be evaluated.

Team and organisational working	Works effectively within a team, supports or is proactive in leadership, negotiates in a professional context and manages conflict. Proactively seeks to resolve conflict.
Ethical awareness & application	Is aware of personal responsibility and professional codes of conduct and incorporates this into their practice.

PERSONAL AND ENABLING SKILLS

Personal evaluation and development	Takes responsibility for own learning and development using reflection and feedback to analyse own capabilities, appraises alternatives and plans and implements actions.
Interpersonal and communication skills	Sets criteria for, and is effective in, professional and interpersonal communication in a wide range of situations.

16. Appendix F: Example generic grading criteria

**	LEVEL 4 - "Certificate"	LEVEL 5 - "Diploma"	LEVEL 6 - "Degree"
OUT-STANDING 85-100%	<p>Thorough coverage of relevant issues.</p> <p>Extremely well informed knowledge base relevant to assessment.</p> <p>Very clearly written, logically structured and presented.</p> <p>Critical discussion of current issues and their influence on practice.</p> <p>Excellent application of theory to practice.</p> <p>Evidence of consistently safe and exemplary standard of practice.</p>	<p>Consistently logical and critical analysis throughout.</p> <p>Exemplary linkage of recent research to practice.</p> <p>Demonstrates consistent independent thought on contemporary issues.</p> <p>Extensive and wide-ranging knowledge of relevant theory and contemporary issues.</p> <p>Incorporates evidence of consistently safe and the highest standards of practice.</p> <p>Incorporates a reasoned ethical dimension throughout the work.</p>	<p>Critical analysis and synthesis of the possibilities and limitations of methodology and theory.</p> <p>Extremely well-constructed and logically presented argument throughout.</p> <p>Sound ethical reasoning consistently demonstrated.</p> <p>Able to select and apply specific theories to generate innovative solutions to complex situations.</p> <p>Outstanding comprehension of contemporary issues.</p> <p>Excellent application of recent research to practice.</p> <p>Incorporates evidence of consistently safe and highest standards of practice.</p> <p>Leadership and assertive advocacy for clients and colleagues demonstrated where appropriate</p>

EXCELLENT 70-85%	<p>Comprehensive coverage of relevant issues.</p> <p>Well informed knowledge base relevant to assessment.</p> <p>Clearly written, logically structured and presented.</p> <p>Discussion of current issues and their influence on practice.</p> <p>Excellent application of theory to practice.</p> <p>Evidence of consistently safe and high standards of practice.</p>	<p>Well-argued presentation and critical analysis throughout.</p> <p>Identifies and discusses relevant ethical issues.</p> <p>Excellent relationship of recent research to practice.</p> <p>Evidence of independent thought on contemporary issues.</p> <p>Comprehensive and wide-ranging knowledge base of relevant theory.</p> <p>Incorporates evidence of consistently safe and high standards of practice.</p> <p>Advocacy and sensitivity for clients and colleagues demonstrated.</p>	<p>Identifies limitations of methodology and theory.</p> <p>Well-constructed and logically presented argument.</p> <p>Sound ethical reasoning demonstrated.</p> <p>Able to select and apply specific theories to complex situations.</p> <p>Excellent comprehension of contemporary issues.</p> <p>Excellent relationship of recent research to practice.</p> <p>Incorporates evidence of consistently safe and best standards of practice.</p> <p>Assertive advocacy for clients and colleagues demonstrated where appropriate</p>
VERY GOOD* 60-68%	<p>Descriptions based upon a broad range of relevant knowledge and reading.</p> <p>Theory consistently applied to practice.</p> <p>Describes relevant issues.</p> <p>Awareness of current issues and their influence on practice.</p> <p>Written in a clear and logically structured presentation.</p> <p>Incorporates evidence of safe and consistently well applied practice.</p>	<p>Balanced arguments and presentation.</p> <p>Accurate application of relevant theory to practice issues.</p> <p>Evidence of safe and good practice.</p> <p>Provides a sound rationale for interventions.</p> <p>Evidence of ability to critically analyse information.</p> <p>Advocacy for clients and colleagues demonstrated.</p> <p>Well-structured and logical presentation.</p>	<p>Evidence of ethical reasoning.</p> <p>Evidence of wide knowledge base and critical reading.</p> <p>Evidence of critical reasoning to solve problems.</p> <p>Critical understanding of the research process.</p> <p>Argument founded on the basis of evidence.</p> <p>Safe and evidence-based practice consistently described.</p> <p>Good range of sources used appropriately.</p>

GOOD* 50-58%	<p>Utilises appropriate and relevant theory.</p> <p>Consistent application of appropriate theory to practice.</p> <p>Incorporates evidence of safe practice.</p> <p>Well-structured and developed presentation.</p> <p>Clearly written.</p> <p>References generally accurate.</p>	<p>Sound knowledge of subject matter.</p> <p>Evidence of ability to apply knowledge to new situations.</p> <p>Analysis of current issues.</p> <p>Some argument introduced.</p> <p>Demonstrates understanding of safe clinical / professional practice.</p> <p>Sensitive empathy with clients, carers and colleagues demonstrated.</p> <p>Correct citation of references and literature used effectively.</p> <p>Structured and clear presentation.</p>	<p>Well referenced and cited.</p> <p>Applies relevant research to current practice issues.</p> <p>Capacity to analyse concepts and balance arguments.</p> <p>Selects specific and appropriate theory to enhance arguments.</p> <p>Sensitive and insightful empathy demonstrated.</p> <p>Consistently safe practice described with reference to evidence based rationale</p>
-----------------	---	--	---

(continued)

**	LEVEL 4 - "Certificate"	LEVEL 5 - "Diploma"	LEVEL 6 - "Degree"
PASS 40-48%	<p>Meets the criteria and requirements of the assessment/examination.</p> <p>Meets module specific criteria.</p> <p>Some appropriate and relevant theory described.</p> <p>References used appropriately and generally accurate.</p> <p>Some relevant knowledge applied to practice.</p> <p>Evidence of safe practice described.</p> <p>Structure and presentation not always clear.</p>	<p>Meets the criteria and requirements of the assessment/examination.</p> <p>Meets module specific criteria.</p> <p>References and bibliography used appropriately and generally accurate.</p> <p>Some appropriate and relevant theory utilised.</p> <p>Some evidence of analysis.</p> <p>Safe and relevant practice described.</p> <p>Structure and presentation not always clear.</p>	<p>Meets the criteria and requirements of the assessment/examination.</p> <p>Meets module specific criteria.</p> <p>Some appropriate and relevant theory described.</p> <p>Arguments and issues not always clearly focused.</p> <p>Safe practice described with some reference to evidence-based underpinning.</p> <p>References and bibliography used appropriately and generally accurate.</p> <p>Structure and presentation not always clear.</p>

FAIL TO ACHIEVE A PASS GRADE 30-38%	Does not meet the criteria and requirements of the assessment/examination. Does not meet module specific criteria. Limited range of relevant theory. Frequent referencing errors. Inappropriate description and application of theory to practice. Poor understanding of practice issues. Lacking in logical structure and sequencing.	Does not meet the criteria and requirements of the assessment/examination. Does not meet module specific criteria. Limited evidence of reading and underpinning knowledge. Frequent referencing errors. Poor understanding of practice issues. Lacking evidence of analysis. Misconceptions and basic errors of underpinning theory. Lacks structure and difficult to follow.	Does not meet the criteria and requirements of the assessment/examination. Does not meet module specific criteria. Limited analysis or synthesis. Poorly developed argument. Restricted range and understanding of underpinning theory. Inappropriate application of theory to practice. Frequent referencing errors. Poor understanding of practice issues
	Unreferenced. Lacking any relevant theoretical content. Poorly organised presentation. Difficult to read and follow. .	Limited and inaccurate referencing. Absence of analysis. Lacking structure and difficult to follow. Serious misconceptions and basic errors of underpinning theory.	Few or no source references used. Lacking in analysis and synthesis. Poorly informed knowledge base. Limited and inappropriate links between theory and practice.

Note: These are attributes across all academic levels that indicate the work would not meet the required standard for a pass grade -
Unsafe and insensitive practice described; Very poor sentence construction, grammar and spelling throughout; Incoherent;
Illegible; Discriminatory and judgmental content; Unreferenced throughout; Exceeds assessment word
count by more than 10%; Anonymity/confidentiality breached.

In cases of Proven Academic Dishonesty and late submission specific penalties apply. Consult the current University of Plymouth Student Handbook.

*It is implicit in this grading structure that higher levels of attainment also incorporate the positive attributes as described in lower categories of a pass.

17. Appendix G: Analytical, Constructive and Empowering

A helpful reminder of the key principles of giving feedback is the acronym ACE: feedback must be **analytical, constructive** and **empowering**. The following suggestions may help:

1. **Start with the positive.** Most people need encouragement and to be told when they are doing well. It can really help the receiver to hear first what you liked. Our culture tends to emphasise the negative. The focus is likely to be on mistakes that have been made. If the positive is registered first, the negative is more likely to be listened to and acted upon.
2. **Empower the recipient.** If feedback is intended to strengthen and consolidate learning, we need to make sure it doesn't dampen learning down. This is easier to ensure when feedback is positive of course, but we need to look carefully at how best we can make critical feedback equally empowering to students.
3. **Be specific.** Relate your comments to specific sections or examples in the student's work, and say why these are illustrative. Try to avoid general comments and shortcuts of adjectives alone that are not very helpful. 'Brilliant' may be nice to hear but it does not necessarily help the recipient repeat such a performance. What evidence have you for your statement? Explain why you thought they were brilliant, giving detail. Specific feedback gives greater opportunity for learning by showing the recipient what needs improving and why.
4. **Be clear and articulate.** Students should not have to struggle to make sense of our feedback. Whether our messages are congratulatory or critical, it should be easy for students to work out exactly what we are trying to tell them. They should not have to read each sentence more than once, trying to work out what we are really saying. Use feedback that will be understood.
5. **Own what you say.** Use the personal pronoun 'I' or 'my view'. Avoid generalisations such as 'they say', 'you are'. Generalisations suggest you are offering a universally agreed opinion about that person. All we are entitled to give is our experience of that person at that time. It is important that the giver takes responsibility for the feedback he/she is giving.
6. **Refer to things that could be changed.** It is not helpful to give feedback about something over which the person has no choice, e.g. if they're giving a presentation, the fact that they are nervous or have a strong accent. On the other hand, you can say 'it would be helpful if you could make more eye contact' or 'I would find it clearer if when you started a new point, you could signal that in some way'.
7. **Offer alternatives.** When you need to give negative feedback, it is important that you do not simply criticise. Suggest what the person might have done differently, explain why, and, where appropriate, suggest how this could be done. Turn the negative into a positive suggestion, e.g. 'If I were the patient I think I would feel a bit overwhelmed at this stage. Do you feel it might be helpful to...?'
8. **Leave the recipient with a choice.** Allow the person to accept the feedback he/she found useful.

Feedback that demands change or is imposed heavily may invite resistance. Skilled feedback offers people information about themselves in a way that leaves them with a choice about whether to act on it or not.

9. **Make it developmental.** Feedback should open doors, not close them. In this respect, we have to be particularly careful with the words we use when giving feedback to students. Clearly, words with such ‘final language’ implications as ‘weak’ or ‘poor’ cause irretrievable breakdowns in the communication between assessor and student.
10. **Relate feedback directly to the criteria you published.**
11. **Be selective.** Select points that can have the greatest good effect at this point in time, rather than overwhelming the recipient with too much comment.
12. **Be honest,** but use constructive language.
13. **Personalise the feedback** through the use of names or references to previous work so that it fits each student’s achievement, individual nature, and personality.
14. **Structure your feedback.** The so called critical feedback sandwich starts with positive comments, describes the problems/errors and suggests what can be done about them, and then ends with some encouraging points.
15. **Be aware of disability.** Be careful about correcting spelling/syntax insensitively in case of dyslexia etc.
16. **Improve student performance in assessment by trying the following ideas:**
 - Ensure you explain the assessment criteria clearly. Take this further by using the “90 minute intervention technique” a simplified version of which is to get students to mark an assessment that is based on the criteria they are expected to follow and then feedback in small groups justifying the mark allocated, give your views and discuss with them all, giving an opportunity for students to revisit their grading having heard your reasoning. Providing this detailed opportunity for students to really consider the marking criteria has proven to increase students’ results in all subsequent assessments according to research by the Assessment Standards Knowledge exchange at the Centre of Excellence in Assessment at Oxford Brookes University
 - Provide formative assessment feedback opportunities, planned into the programme
 - Provide students with a list of feedback comments given to a similar assessment prior to them submitting their own.
17. **Make it timely.** Agree return date timescales with your students and stick to them. The quicker the feedback the better it is. Four working weeks is the maximum turnaround time

for feedback to be given within the Plymouth University assessment policy. Two to three weeks is preferable as the longer the student has to forget their thought processes the less effective the feedback will be.

18. **Use pre-printed appropriate headings as prompts on the feedback sheet** to remind you to target your feedback specifically to key areas. For example these prompts could include:
Assessment criteria / learning outcomes
Knowledge base / content / relevance
Use of literature / research / range of sources
Analysis / depth of treatment (sound, consistent and logical argument)
Presentation / style / structure
Future Developments (to encourage developmental feedback that feeds forward to the next assessment highlighting areas where developments could be made to improve the grade of the next assessment.