

Generic Criteria for Assessment for RQF Level 7 (Masters Programmes)

Marks	0-39 (Fail)	40-49 (Condonable Fail)	50-59 (Pass)	60-69 (Merit)	70-85 (Distinction)	86-100 (Distinction)
Assessment categories						
Knowledge & understanding of subject	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ demonstrates little knowledge or understanding of the field ~ demonstrates significant weaknesses in the knowledge base, and/or simply reproduces knowledge without evidence of understanding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ demonstrates knowledge of the field and awareness of current evidence and issues, but with some notable weaknesses ~ lacks knowledge and understanding of some key areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ demonstrates a sound knowledge and understanding of material within a specialised field of study ~ demonstrates an understanding of current theoretical and methodological approaches and how these affect the way the knowledge base is interpreted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ produces work with a well-defined focus ~ demonstrates a systematic knowledge, understanding and critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of the academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ produces work of exceptional standard, reflecting outstanding knowledge and understanding of material ~ displays exceptional mastery of a complex and specialised area of knowledge and skills, with an exceptional critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights at the forefront of the field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ This work meets and often exceeds the standard for distinction, as described in the 70-85 band, across <i>all</i> sub-categories of criteria: knowledge and understanding of subject; cognitive skills; research skills; use of research-informed literature; and skills for life and professional employment.
Cognitive/ intellectual skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ very little or no critical ability ~ poor, inconsistent analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ some appropriate analysis, but some significant inconsistencies which affect the soundness of argument and/or conclusions ~ demonstrates very limited critical ability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ provides evidence of relevant and sound analysis within the specialised area, with some ability to evaluate critically ~ is able to analyse complex issues and make appropriate judgements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ is able to evaluate methodologies critically and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses ~ is able to deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, making sound judgements in the absence of complete data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ shows outstanding ability to evaluate methodologies critically and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses ~ is able to deal with a range of complex issues both systematically and creatively, making excellent judgements in the absence of complete data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ This work is of publishable quality, with only very minor amendments, and would be likely to receive that judgement if submitted to a peer-reviewed journal.
Research skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ demonstrates little or no skill in selected techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship ~ lacks any understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ demonstrates some skill in selected techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship, but with significant areas of weakness ~ lacks sufficient understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ demonstrates understanding of and skills in selected techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship ~ shows some originality in the application of knowledge, and some understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ displays a comprehensive understanding of and skills in techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship ~ shows originality in the application of knowledge, together with a good understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ employs advanced skills to conduct research and, where appropriate, advanced technical or professional activity, accepting accountability for related decision making ~ displays an exceptional grasp of techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship ~ shows originality in application of knowledge, and excellent understanding of how established techniques of enquiry create and interpret knowledge in the discipline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Work is of such a quality that the student is clearly highly capable of doctoral research in the discipline and, in principle, should be prioritised for a postgraduate research grant.
Use of research-informed literature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ failure to evidence or discuss/apply appropriate examples of literature relating to current research and advanced scholarship in the field ~ references to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ can evidence and discuss/apply examples of literature relating to current research but lacks critical engagement ~ references to appropriate literature/ evidence and use of academic conventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ can evaluate critically examples of literature relating to current research and advanced scholarship in the field ~ makes consistently sound use of appropriate academic conventions and academic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ is able to evaluate critically a range of literature relating to current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline ~ makes consistently good use of appropriate academic conventions and academic honesty ~ able to communicate very 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ is able to evaluate critically, with exceptional insight, a range of literature relating to current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline ~ makes consistently excellent use of appropriate academic conventions and academic honesty 	

	<p>literature/ evidence and use of academic conventions are flawed, and/or inconsistent ~ argument absent, or lacking any clarity and/or logic</p>	<p>are insufficient and/or inconsistent ~ argument is attempted, but lacks in clarity and/or logic</p>	<p>honesty ~ able to communicate argument, evidence and conclusions clearly to specialist and non-specialist audiences</p>	<p>effectively arguments, evidence and conclusions to specialist and non-specialist audiences</p>	<p>~ able to communicate at a very high level arguments, evidence and conclusions to specialist and non-specialist audiences</p>	<p>~ This work meets and often exceeds the standard for distinction, as described in the 70-85 band, across <i>all</i> sub-categories of criteria: knowledge and understanding of subject; cognitive skills; research skills; use of research-informed literature; and skills for life and professional employment.</p>
<p>Skills for life and professional employment</p>	<p>~ significant weaknesses evident in key areas such as communication , problem-solving and project management ~ inability to adapt ~inability to work flexibly, independently and/or as part of a team</p>	<p>~ demonstrates generally effective employability skills, including communication and problem-solving, but with some problematic areas of weakness ~ limited ability to adapt ~ ability to work flexibly, independently and/or as part of a team, but with areas of weakness</p>	<p>~ shows a consistently good level of employability skills, including team working, project management, IT/computer literacy, creativity and flexibility ~ demonstrates capabilities to support effective communication in a range of complex and specialised contexts ~ shows consistent ability in tackling and solving demanding problems ~ can plan and direct own learning ~ demonstrates ability to advance own knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills ~ demonstrates the independent learning ability required for continuing professional development</p>	<p>~ shows a high level of employability skills, including team working, project management, IT/computer literacy, creativity and flexibility ~ demonstrates very effective communication in a range of complex and specialised contexts ~ demonstrates self-direction and some originality in tackling and solving demanding problems ~ can act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks at a professional or equivalent level ~ demonstrates the skills and attitudes needed to advance own knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills ~ demonstrates the independent learning ability required for continuing professional development</p>	<p>~ shows a very high level of employability skills, including team working/leadership, project management, IT/computer literacy, creativity and flexibility ~ demonstrates very high level communication skills in a range of complex contexts, and ability to write at publishable standard ~ demonstrates autonomy and notable originality in tackling and solving demanding problems ~ shows a high level of consistency and autonomy in planning and implementing tasks at a professional or equivalent level ~ demonstrates the skills and attitudes needed to advance own knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills to a high level ~ demonstrates the independent learning ability required for continuing professional development</p>	<p>~ This work is of publishable quality, with only very minor amendments, and would be likely to receive that judgement if submitted to a peer-reviewed journal.</p> <p>~ Work is of such a quality that the student is clearly highly capable of doctoral research in the discipline and, in principle, should be prioritised for a postgraduate research grant.</p>
<p>Marks for level 7</p>	<p>0-39 (Fail)</p>	<p>40-49 (Condonable fail)</p>	<p>50-59 (Pass)</p>	<p>60-69 (Merit)</p>	<p>70-85 (Distinction)</p>	<p>86-100 (Distinction)</p>