



## MARKING CRITERIA

<b>Document Title</b>	Marking Criteria
<b>Approved by</b>	Management Committee
<b>Date Approved</b>	21/08/23
<b>Last Reviewed</b>	New Document
<b>Next Review Due</b>	February 2025
<b>Staff Member Responsible</b>	Director of Training
<b>Related Policies</b>	Assessment Policy and Procedure

## Amendment History

<b>Revision Summary</b>	<b>Date Approved</b>	<b>Author</b>
Updated the UG marking criteria for 2.1, 2.2 and 3 <sup>rd</sup> categories with Strong Pass, Pass and Weak Pass (instead of Merit, Pass and Pass)	25/2/25	DE

## **UNDERGRADUATE MARKING CRITERIA**

The criteria offer descriptions of standards of achievement relating to four types of learning outcome, and four separate charts of these appear below:

- Knowledge and understanding
- Cognitive skills
- Practical or professional skills
- Communication skills.

There are various descriptors under these headings, describing different aspects of understanding or skill. Assessors use the ones that apply to the particular outcomes you should demonstrate: if the learning outcomes of your module do not require (for example) practical skills, then those criteria do not apply.

## HONOURS DEGREES

Honours Degrees	1st	2.1	2.2	3rd	Fail
	Distinction	Strong Pass	Pass	Weak Pass	Fail
<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>	Excellent command of highly relevant, extensively-researched material; very sound understanding of complexities.	Clear, sound understanding of subject matter; breadth and depth of material, accurate and relevant.	Basic knowledge sound but may be patchy; reasonable range of source material.	Limited consistency of depth and accuracy of detail; background material relevant but over-reliant on few sources.	Content may be thin or irrelevant; scant evidence of background investigation.
<b>Cognitive skills</b>	Convincing ability to synthesise a range of views or information and integrate references sophisticated perception, critical insight & interpretation; logical, cogent development of argument.	Ability to synthesise a range of views or information and incorporate references; perceptive, thoughtful interpretation; well- reasoned discussion; coherent argument.	Evidence of drawing information together; ideas tend to be stated rather than developed; attempt made to argue logically with supporting evidence, although some claims may be unsubstantiated.	Limited perspective or consideration of alternative views largely descriptive; some ability to construct an argument but may lack clarity or conviction, with unsupported assertion.	Superficial use of information; explanations may be muddled at times; poorly structured, little logic; may have unsubstantiated conclusions based on generalisation.
<b>Practical or professional skills</b>	Expert demonstration and accomplished and innovative application of specialist skills; very high level of professional competence.	Good performance; capable and confident application of specialist skills; substantial level of professional competence.	Mostly competent and informed application of specialist skills; sound level of professional competence.	Sufficient evidence of developing specialist skills; satisfactory level of professional competence.	Little evidence of skill development or application; questionable level of professional competence.
<b>Communication skills</b>	Very clear, fluent, sophisticated and confident expression; highly effective vocabulary and style; near perfect spelling, punctuation and syntax.	Clear, fluent, confident expression; appropriate vocabulary and style; high standard of accuracy in spelling, punctuation and syntax.	Clearly written, coherent expression; reasonable range of vocabulary and adequate style; overall competence in spelling, punctuation and syntax.	Expression, vocabulary and style reasonably clear but lack sophistication; inaccuracies in spelling, syntax and punctuation do not usually interfere with meaning.	Expression of ideas insufficient to convey clear meaning; inaccurate or unprofessional terminology; many errors in spelling, punctuation and syntax.

## KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING

	Range and relevance of reading and research	Breadth and depth of knowledge	Understanding of subject matter and theory	Textual studies	Contextual studies
<b>90-100 (First class)</b>	Far-reaching investigation and insight	Develops new knowledge or novel perspective going beyond the literature	Work produced could hardly be bettered when produced under parallel conditions	Outstanding engagement with text	Outstanding understanding of artistic or critical context
<b>80-89 (First class)</b>	Comprehensive research and coverage of topic integrating wide range of academic sources	Extensive subject knowledge with detailed insight into and understanding of relevant theory	Sophisticated understanding of complexities of key theoretical models, concepts and arguments	Sophisticated engagement with text	Sophisticated understanding of artistic or critical context
<b>70-79 (First class)</b>	Excellent command of highly relevant, extensively- researched material	Extensive, thorough coverage of topic, focused use of detail and examples	Excellent, very sound understanding of complexities of key theoretical models, concepts and arguments	Excellent, consistent engagement with text	Comprehensive understanding of artistic or critical context
<b>60-69 (Upper second)</b>	Wide range of core and background reading, effectively used	Breadth and depth of coverage, accurate and relevant in detail and example	Clear, sound understanding of subject matter, theory, issues and debate	Good, careful engagement with text	Good understanding of artistic or critical context
<b>50-59 (Lower second)</b>	Reasonable range of reading; references to relevant but not wide variety of sources	Content generally relevant and accurate, most central issues identified; basic knowledge sound but may be patchy	Reasonable level of understanding of subject matter, theory and ideas; main issues satisfactorily understood	Reasonably good ability to respond to text	Sound, but may be limited, understanding of artistic or critical context
<b>40-49 (Third class)</b>	Background reading mostly relevant but over- reliant on few sources	Fairly basic knowledge, limited consistency of depth and accuracy of detail; not all aspects addressed, some omissions	Partial understanding of subject matter, core concepts and relevant issues; basic reference to theory	Some ability to respond to the text	Adequate but partial understanding of artistic or critical context
<b>30-39 (Fail)</b>	Scant evidence of background reading; weak investigation	Contains very slight detail; content may be thin or irrelevant; issues poorly identified	Very little understanding of subject matter, ideas and issues; may be issue of misreading/ misinterpretation of question	Inadequate familiarity with the text	Weak understanding of artistic or critical context
<b>20-29 (Fail)</b>	No evidence of relevant reading	Little relevance of content; unacceptably weak or inaccurate knowledge base	Significant weaknesses and gaps in understanding of subject matter, ideas and issues; misunderstanding of question	Little awareness of text	Lack of understanding of artistic or critical context
<b>10-19 (Fail)</b>	No evidence of reading	Knowledge base extremely weak; content almost entirely irrelevant or erroneous	Devoid of understanding of subject matter, ideas and issues	Misunderstanding of text	Inaccurate reference to artistic or critical context
<b>0-9 (Fail)</b>	No use of sources	Material not relevant or correct; no evidence of knowledge	No relevant understanding evident; response to question virtually nil	No reference to text	No awareness demonstrated of artistic or critical context

## COGNITIVE SKILLS

	<b>Selection and use of information</b>	<b>Interpretation of information</b>	<b>Critical analysis using theory</b>	<b>Structure and argument</b>	<b>Awareness of self-development, and /or personal engagement</b>
<b>90-100 (First class)</b>	Outstanding level of original synthesis, analysis, argument and evaluation	Work produced could hardly be bettered when produced under parallel conditions	Work produced could hardly be bettered when produced under parallel conditions	Work produced could hardly be bettered when produced under parallel conditions	Thorough and sophisticated appreciation of learning gained and impact on self; pertinent personal analysis; imaginative, insightful, creative
<b>80-89 (First class)</b>	Creative, innovative synthesis of ideas	Sophisticated perception, critical insight and interpretation	Challenging, comprehensive critical analysis sustained throughout	Authoritative and persuasive argument	Thorough and sophisticated appreciation of learning gained and impact on self; pertinent personal analysis; imaginative, insightful, creative
<b>70-79 (First class)</b>	Convincing ability to synthesise a range of views or information and integrate references	Excellent perception, critical insight and interpretation	Very good depth and breadth of critical analysis; sustained, thorough questioning informed by theory	Excellent organisation of ideas; clear, coherent structure and logical, cogent development of argument	Thorough appreciation of learning gained and impact on self; pertinent personal analysis; imaginative, insightful, creative
<b>60-69 (Upper second)</b>	Ability to synthesise a range of views or information and incorporate references	Perceptive, thoughtful interpretation	Consistent development of critical analysis and questioning, using theory	Logically structured; good organisation of ideas; well- reasoned discussion; coherent argument	Good awareness of learning and self-development; pertinent personal comment; some freshness of insight, some creative thinking and imagination
<b>50-59 (Lower second)</b>	Evidence of drawing information together	Sound explanation; this may be partly descriptive and factual; ideas tend to be stated rather than developed	Some attempt at critical analysis using theory; may be limited and lack consistency or conviction	Reasonable structure; organisation may lack some logical progression; attempt made to argue logically with supporting evidence, although some claims may be unsubstantiated	Reasonable awareness of learning and self- development; may show a little indication of originality or personal engagement
<b>40-49 (Third class)</b>	Little discrimination in use of material; limited perspective or consideration of alternative views	Some interpretation or insight; may be largely descriptive, or superficial; over- reliance on narrative or anecdote for explanation	Some evidence of rationale; minimal attempt to examine strengths and weaknesses of an argument	Basic structure; may be some repetition or deviation; some ability to construct an argument but may lack clarity or conviction, with unsupported assertion	Some awareness of learning and self-development; personal engagement only very slight
<b>30-39 (Fail)</b>	Superficial use of information, minimal association; references not integrated	Little attempt to interpret material, or merely descriptive; explanations may be muddled at times	Limited breadth and depth of analysis, inadequate critical skills; shallow and superficial	Poorly structured, little logic; may have unsubstantiated conclusions based on generalisation	Little or muddled awareness of learning and self- development; minimal appraisal

## COGNITIVE SKILLS CONT...

	Selection and use of information	Interpretation of information	Critical analysis using theory	Structure and argument	Awareness of self-development, and /or personal engagement
<b>20-29 (Fail)</b>	Incorrect use of material or information	Purely descriptive; very limited discussion	Lacking or erroneous analysis; negligible evidence of thought	Structure confused or incomplete; poor if any relationship between introduction, middle and conclusion; lack of evidence to support views expressed	Discussion of own learning and development incoherent ; issues are not appraised
<b>10-19 (Fail)</b>	Little or no use of material or information	Any attempt at discussion limited to personal view; no discernible insight	Isolated statements indicating lack of thought	Lack of recognisable structure or reference to argument; no related evidence or conclusions	Very little evidence of self-awareness
<b>0-9 (Fail)</b>	Little or no use of material or information	No interpretation of information	Isolated statements indicating lack of thought	Lack of evidence of reasoning	No evidence of self-awareness

## PRACTICAL OR PROFESSIONAL SKILLS

	Specialist skills	Integration of theory and practice	Professional competence	Reflective practice	Technical understanding and use of materials	Relationship between content, form and technique	Analysis of performance
<b>90-100 (First class)</b>	Outstanding expertise and flair in the application of specialist skills	Skilled integration of theory and practice	Extremely high level of professional competence	Sophisticated reflection on personal and professional practice	Excellent technical understanding and judgement; work produced could hardly be bettered when produced under parallel conditions	Work produced could hardly be bettered when produced under parallel conditions	Outstanding critical analysis of performance
<b>80-89 (First class)</b>	Sophisticated expertise and flair in the application of specialist skills	Skilled integration of theory and practice	Extremely high level of professional competence	Sophisticated reflection on personal and professional practice	Excellent technical understanding and judgement; exceptional level of competence in use of materials and appropriate application of working processes and techniques	Excellent design and sophisticated relationship between content, form & technique	Sophisticated critical analysis of performance
<b>70-79 (First class)</b>	Expert demonstration, accomplished and innovative application of specialist skills	Skilled integration of theory and practice	Very high level of professional competence	Clear and insightful reflection on personal and professional practice	Thorough technical understanding and judgement; excellent level of competence in use of materials and appropriate application of working processes and techniques	Excellent design; strong relationship between content, form & technique	Strong and thorough critical analysis of performance
<b>60-69 (Upper second)</b>	Good performance; capable and confident application of specialist skills	Useful links drawn between theory and practice	Substantial level of professional competence	Clear understanding, reflection and evaluation of implications for personal and professional practice	Accurate technical understanding and judgement; good level of competence in use of materials and appropriate application of working processes and techniques	Good design; meaningful relationship between content, form & technique	Good critical analysis of performance
<b>50-59 (Lower second)</b>	Mostly competent and informed application of specialist skills	Consideration of related theory and practice	Sound level of professional competence	Sound reflection on personal and professional practice	Mostly accurate technical understanding and judgement; satisfactory level of competence in use of materials and appropriate application of working processes and techniques	Fair design; generally sound relationship between content, form & technique	Sound analysis of performance
<b>40-49 (Third class)</b>	Sufficient evidence of developing specialist skills	Consideration of both theory and practice, which may be uneven	Satisfactory level of professional competence	Adequate but limited reflection on personal and professional practice issues	Adequate though only partially accurate technical understanding and judgement; adequate level of competence in use of materials and application of working processes and techniques	Adequate evidence of some relationship between content, form & technique	Adequate analysis of performance

## PRACTICAL OR PROFESSIONAL SKILLS CONT...

	Specialist skills	Integration of theory and practice	Professional competence	Reflective practice	Technical understanding and use of materials	Relationship between content, form and technique	Analysis of performance
<b>30-39 (Fail)</b>	Little evidence of skill development or application	Uneven balance between theory and practice	Questionable level of professional competence, e.g., may be some evidence of unsafe practice	Inadequate reflection on personal and professional practice issues	Slight technical understanding and judgement, with inaccuracies; lack of competence in use of materials and erroneous application of working processes and techniques	Limited or unresolved relationship between content, form & technique	Limited information about performance
<b>20-29 (Fail)</b>	Very little evidence of specialist skill development	Little appreciation of theory in practice	Lack of professional competence	Slight, if any, reflection or reference to personal and professional practice	Feeble technical understanding and judgement; incompetence in use of materials and erroneous application of working processes and techniques	Very limited relationship between content, form & technique	Very limited information about performance
<b>10-19 (Fail)</b>	Minimal evidence of specialist skill development	Relationship between theory and practice not evident	Serious lack of professional competence	Slight, if any, reflection or reference to personal and professional practice	Almost no technical understanding or judgement; serious incompetence in use of materials and erroneous application of working processes and techniques	Minimal evidence of understanding of relationship between content, form & technique	Insufficient evidence of knowledge of performance
<b>0-9 (Fail)</b>	No evidence of skill development	No awareness of theory in practice evident	Professional incompetence	Slight, if any, reflection or reference to personal and professional practice	No technical understanding or judgement; uninformed and arbitrary use of material, methods, processes and techniques	No evidence of understanding of the relationship between content, form & technique	No evidence of knowledge of performance



## COMMUNICATION SKILLS

	Written vocabulary and style	Spelling, punctuation and syntax	Referencing	Presentation skills	Dialogic skills
<b>90-100 (First class)</b>	Exceptional clarity and coherence; highly sophisticated expression; work produced could hardly be bettered when produced under parallel conditions	Near perfect spelling, punctuation and syntax	All sources acknowledged and meticulously presented	Complete accuracy in presentation; highly autonomous, thorough and well-managed approach	Outstanding ability to stimulate and enable discussion
<b>80-89 (First class)</b>	Extremely well- written, with accuracy and flair; Highly sophisticated, fluent and persuasive expression of ideas	Near perfect spelling, punctuation and syntax	All sources acknowledged and meticulously presented	Great clarity and maturity of presentation; independence in extensive planning and preparation	Excellent ability to stimulate and enable discussion
<b>70-79 (First class)</b>	Very clear, fluent, sophisticated and confident expression; highly effective vocabulary and style	Near perfect spelling, punctuation and syntax	All sources acknowledged and meticulously presented	High standard of presentation; evidence of thorough planning, preparation and organisation	Excellent ability to stimulate and enable discussion
<b>60-69 (Upper second)</b>	Clear, fluent, confident expression; appropriate vocabulary and style	High standard of accuracy in spelling, punctuation and syntax	Sources acknowledged and accurately presented	Good standard of presentation; well-organised; relevant planning and preparation	Clear evidence of ability to stimulate and facilitate discussion
<b>50-59 (Lower second)</b>	Clearly written, coherent expression; reasonable range of vocabulary and adequate style	Overall competence in spelling, punctuation and syntax, although there may be some errors	Sources acknowledged and referencing mostly accurate	Presentation generally sound, maybe some weaknesses; fairly good organisation, planning and preparation	Capable attempts at participation in discussion
<b>40-49 (Third class)</b>	Expression, vocabulary and style reasonably clear but lack sophistication	Inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and syntax do not usually interfere with meaning	Sources acknowledged; references not always correctly cited/presented	Some confidence in presentation, with some lapses; adequate organisation, planning and preparation	Adequate participation in discussion
<b>30-39 (Third class)</b>	Expression of ideas insufficient to convey clear meaning; inaccurate or unprofessional terminology	Many errors in spelling, punctuation and syntax	Referencing incomplete or inaccurate	Few presentation skills; weaknesses of organisation, planning and preparation	Little constructive participation in discussion
<b>20-29 (Third class)</b>	Lack of clarity, very poor expression; style inappropriate, terminology inadequate and inappropriate	Many serious errors of spelling, punctuation and syntax	Referencing incomplete or absent	Ineffective presentation skills; serious deficiency in organisation, planning and preparation	Inadequate attention given to discussion
<b>10-19 (Third class)</b>	Inaccuracies of expression and vocabulary render meaning of written work extremely unclear	Many serious errors of even basic spelling, punctuation and syntax	No attempt at referencing	Inadequate presentation skills; almost no evidence of organisation, planning or preparation	No attention given to discussion
<b>0-9 (Third class)</b>	Incoherent expression	Heavily inaccurate; inappropriate use of language	No attempt at referencing	Presentation totally ineffective; no evidence of organisation, planning or preparation	No attention given to discussion

## POSTGRADUATE MARKING CRITERIA

### **Explanatory Notes**

Postgraduate degrees and diplomas are classified at Level 7 Postgraduate with Distinction, Merit and Pass. Classifications are made at the point of award.

The criteria offer descriptions of standards of achievement relating to three types of learning outcomes:

1. Knowledge and Understanding of the academic discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice
2. Critical Analysis & Interpretation
3. Communication Skills: Creative, Written & Presented

## POSTGRADUATE MARKING CRITERIA

	<b>Knowledge</b>  <b>Knowledge and understanding of the academic discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice.</b>  SCOPE: critical engagement with the primary and secondary sources used to answer the question.	<b>Analysis</b>  <b>Critical analysis and interpretation.</b>  SCOPE: appropriate analytical discussion and interpretation of source material.	<b>Communication</b>  <b>Communication skills: creative, written and presented.</b>  SCOPE: communication of intent, adherence to academic subject discipline protocols.
<b>Distinction</b> 90-100% Evidence of ...	Insightful and sophisticated engagement with research and/or practice pertaining to field(s) and disciplines of study;  Sophisticated demonstration and application of knowledge, offering innovative and/or original insights, possibly unparalleled in their application;  A sophisticated degree of synthesis, quite likely of complex and disparate material.	A sophisticated command of imaginative, insightful, original or creative interpretations;  An unparalleled level of analysis and evaluation;  A sophisticated cogent argument offering new and original contributions to knowledge.	A sophisticated response, the academic form matches that expected in published and professional work;  Mastery and command of specialist skills pertaining to the academic form;  Idiomatic and highly coherent, scholarly expression.
<b>Distinction</b> 80-89% Evidence of ...	Advanced engagement with research and or practice pertaining to the field(s) and disciplines of study;  Accomplished demonstration of knowledge, contributing towards innovative and/or original insights;  Extremely high degree of synthesis of research material.	Advanced command of imaginative, insightful, original or creative interpretations;  Accomplished level of analysis and evaluation;  A highly developed cogent argument with the potential to bring new and original contributions to knowledge.	Persuasive articulation, where the academic form largely matches that expected in published work;  Accomplished command of specialist skills pertaining to the academic form, discipline and context(s);
<b>Distinction</b> 70-79% Evidence of ...	A high degree of engagement with research and/or practice pertaining to field(s) and disciplines of study;  Excellent demonstration of knowledge, with the possibility for new insights;  A high degree of synthesis relating to research material.	An excellent command of imaginative, original or creative interpretations;  A high degree of analysis and evaluation;  A sustained argument with the possibility for new insights to knowledge.	A high degree of skill, the academic form shows exceptional standards of presentation or delivery;  A high command of specialist skills pertaining to the academic form, discipline and context(s).
<b>Merit</b> 60-69% Evidence of ...	Sustained engagement with research and/or practice pertaining to disciplines of study;  An assured understanding of current problems, supported by critical analysis with the potential for new insights;  A sustained application and depth of research material and accuracy in detail.	A convincing and sustained command of accepted critical positions;  A developed conceptual understanding that enables the student to find new meanings in established hypotheses;  A developed and sustained argument with the possibility for new insights to knowledge.	Secure and sustained expression, observing appropriate academic form;  Fluent and persuasive expression of ideas, work shows flair;  Assured interpretation of the style and genre, content, form and technique for specialist and non-specialist audiences as appropriate.

## POSTGRADUATE MARKING CRITERIA CONT...

	<b>Knowledge</b>  <b>Knowledge and understanding of the academic discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice.</b>  SCOPE: critical engagement with the primary and secondary sources used to answer the question.	<b>Analysis</b>  <b>Critical analysis and interpretation.</b>  SCOPE: appropriate analytical discussion and interpretation of source material.	<b>Communication</b>  <b>Communication skills: creative, written and presented.</b>  SCOPE: communication of intent, adherence to academic subject discipline protocols.
<b>Pass</b> 50-59% Evidence of ...	Engagement with relevant knowledge pertaining to discipline and key issues;  Satisfactory understanding and conceptual awareness enabling critical analysis;  Response is appropriate and addresses the range of learning outcomes; where the knowledge is accurate. Work may lack sustained depth.	An ability to deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively;  A satisfactory evaluation of current research and critical scholarship in the discipline;  Ability to devise a coherent critical/ analytical argument is supported with evidence.	Good expression, observing appropriate academic form;  Predominantly accurate in spelling and grammar, ideas communicated appropriately and satisfactorily;  Satisfactory application of specialist skills with effective technical control.
<b>Fail</b> 40-49% Evidence of ...	Unsatisfactory engagement with relevant knowledge pertaining to discipline and key issues;  Insufficient understanding and conceptual awareness of knowledge(s) pertaining to the field;  Response does not address the full range of learning outcomes, inaccurate and/or missing knowledge at times.	A lack of ability to deal with complex issues;  Judgements not fully substantiated and understood;  The ability to construct an argument is underdeveloped and not supported fully with evidence.	Unsatisfactory demonstration and application of key communication skills;  Recurring errors in spelling and grammar, ideas limited and underdeveloped, possibly poor paraphrasing;  Skills demonstrated are insufficient for the task and work may lack technical judgement.
<b>Fail</b> 30-39% Evidence of ...	Inadequate coverage of relevant issues, inconsistent understanding shown;  Inadequate understanding of underpinning issues, weak and underdeveloped analysis;  Response does not address learning outcomes, inaccurate and missing knowledge.	A lack of ability to deal with complex issues;  Judgements are not substantiated or understood and the critical position is not made clear;  Weak interpretation of research and work is not supported with evidence.	Significant errors evident in the academic form;  Weaknesses in spelling and grammar, lacks coherence and structure, possibly poor paraphrasing;  Work lacks technical judgement.
<b>Fail</b> 20-29% Evidence of ...	Lack of relevant research and little understanding shown;  Very weak understanding of key issues, work lacks critical oversight;  Substandard engagement with research material, misunderstanding evident.	Very weak analysis, possibly limited to a single perspective;  Substandard argument, work lacks scholarly analysis and interpretation;  Episodes of self-contradiction and/or confusion.	Very weak observation of academic conventions;  Severe deficiencies in spelling and grammar and expression undermines meaning, possibly poor paraphrasing;  Substandard relationship between content, form and technique.

## POSTGRADUATE MARKING CRITERIA CONT ...

	<b>Knowledge</b>  <b>Knowledge and understanding of the academic discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice.</b>  SCOPE: critical engagement with the primary and secondary sources used to answer the question.	<b>Analysis</b>  <b>Critical analysis and interpretation.</b>  SCOPE: appropriate analytical discussion and interpretation of source material.	<b>Communication</b>  <b>Communication skills: creative, written and presented.</b>  SCOPE: communication of intent, adherence to academic subject discipline protocols.
<b>Fail</b> 10-19% Evidence of ...	Severely lacking in relevant research and underpinning knowledge;  Slight understanding of key issues, little attempt at critical analysis;  Slight engagement with research material, inaccurate knowledge and misunderstanding throughout.	Slight indication of ability to deal with key issues;  Slight analytical engagement and reflection, work lacks criticality throughout;  Lacks evidence, work shows self-contradiction and confusion.	Slight observation of academic conventions;  Weak expression, mostly incoherent and fails to secure meaning, poor paraphrasing;  Slight engagement with the work.
<b>Fail</b> 0-9% Evidence of ...	Negligible understanding of key issues, which is likely to show no critical analysis or engagement with the learning brief;  No engagement with research tasks.	Negligible coverage of learning outcomes;  No attempt to interpret research material.	Negligible observation of academic conventions;  Incoherent and confused expression, poor paraphrasing;  No discernible demonstration of key skills (pertaining to the discipline);  No engagement with the work.