Generic assessment criteria and grade descriptors (grading scheme) for the QM Academy Taught Programmes - PGCAP

Disclaimer: These are subject to review and can be modified before the start of scheduled September and / or January starts of programmes

Submitted assignments are awarded set marks of either 75%, 65%, 55% or 45% (except in case of late work where penalties are applied). The overall pass mark for the programme and to successfully meet the requirements for Fellowship is 50%.

Criteria	Distinction (75%)	Merit (65%)	Pass (55%)	Refer (45%)
Critical Analysis UKPSF: A5, K1-6, V3-4, D2.i, D2.ii, D2.iii, D2.v	You explicitly consider and justify the conceptual choices behind your practice in the light of their respective implications for key stakeholders (students, staff, institution, discipline).	You provide some informed judgements about your practice, with explicit consideration of the needs of only one or two of the key stakeholders mentioned in the Distinction descriptor.	You consider the implications of your practice in general but do not explicitly address the implications of this for key stakeholders.	You may summarise aspects of your practice and pedagogical choices, but do not consider their implications.
Evaluation of practice UKPSF: K5-6, V3-4, D2.ii, D2.iii, D2.vi	In the work you evaluate your practice using evidence from a range of sources (e.g. self-reflection, student feedback and/or assessment performance, observation of teaching, external examination reports). You clearly define the aims and criteria of the evaluation, and key measures indicating success. You justify these in relation to any prior or current challenges in your practice. You discuss the outcomes from your evaluation, and their implications for practice, in multiple domains (e.g. departmental, disciplinary, institutional, sector-wide).	The work contains evaluation of your practice with clearly defined aims and criteria and based on evidence from one or two sources (e.g. self-reflection, student feedback and/or assessment performance, observation of teaching, external examination reports). The outcomes from your evaluation and their implications for practice are discussed only in the context of your individual practice.	The work contains some evaluation of your practice against broadly defined criteria for effectiveness. The outcomes from your evaluation, and their implications for your future practice, are discussed only briefly.	The work contains little or no explicit evaluation of the effectiveness of your practice. Evaluation outcomes and their implications for your practice are not discussed. Any planned changes to practice are not linked to evidence from evaluation.

Criteria	Distinction (75%)	Merit (65%)	Pass (55%)	Refer (45%)
Learning from others UKPSF: A5, V3, D2.i, D2.iii, D2.vi	Throughout the work, you show explicitly how you have disseminated and/or discussed your practice with others and learnt from their work. You give examples of learning from a range of sources included including discussions with colleagues, peers on CILT/PGCAP, and contexts beyond your own discipline/ institution. You also identify aspects of others' practice that you can modify and implement in order to enhance your own practice.	The work shows that you have discussed your practice with others and learnt from their practice, but is either not explicit or not consistent. The discussion extends beyond your own department; you provide some examples from other contexts (disciplinary or institutional).	The work presents some evidence that you have discussed your practice with others or learnt from their practice. The discussion is limited to your own disciplinary or institutional context.	There is little or no evidence in the work that you have discussed your practice with others or learnt from their practice. You do not provide specific examples of work from colleagues teaching in your own context (e.g. departmental) or in other contexts (disciplinary or institutional).
Reflection & application to own practice UKPSF: A1-4, K1-4, V1-3, D2.i, D2.ii, D2.iii, D2.iv	Throughout the work you analyse relevant, detailed and specific examples from your practice in light of educational research and theory. This reflection on your practice provides a clear vision and basis of evidence for improving your practice.	You share relevant examples from your practice throughout the work and link them to theory or research. However, this reflection on your practice does not draw examples together to make a case for improvement.	You share examples from your practice in the work. While they may briefly link theory and research to practice, this reflection is surface-level only and/or is not explicitly focused on improving your practice.	The work may mention examples from your practice but does not explicitly link them to educational theory or research, and does not make a reflective case for improving practice.
Engagement with scholarship & literature UKPSF: V3, D2.iii, D2.v	The work engages with a wide range of research and scholarship, including disciplinary pedagogies or scholarly debates within educational research. Secondary sources are critically analysed and evaluated in the light of your own practice. The work draws on a broad range of	The work engages with research and scholarship from beyond the core module readings. Secondary sources are applied to your own practice and may be briefly evaluated or analysed.	The work engages with core readings or scholarship from the programme. Secondary sources are mainly paraphrased and some are analysed. There is limited critical analysis and evaluation of their application to your practice.	The work does not show engagement with relevant scholarship. Secondary sources may be paraphrased here but are not critically analysed and evaluated for their application to your practice. Key concepts, terms and theories may be misused or misrepresented.

Criteria	Distinction (75%)	Merit (65%)	Pass (55%)	Refer (45%)
	scholarship from your own and other disciplines and explicitly considers the limitations of the evidence.			
Quality of academic writing UKPSF: A5, V3, V4, D2.v, D2.vi	The work meets all six sub-criteria (see 'Refer' descriptor) and is exemplary for academic writing at Level 7. The references are accurate and exceed the minimum; they demonstrate significant and up-to-date breadth of literature review (including referring to some relevant scholarship within the discipline).	The work meets at least 5 of the sub-criteria (see 'Refer' descriptor) and is a good example of writing at Level 7. References are accurate and exceed the minimum.	The work meets at least 4 of the sub-criteria (see 'Refer' descriptor), including consistency of referencing. It meets threshold standards for academic writing at Level 7. References are accurate but do not exceed the minimum or go beyond core module readings.	The work meets 3 or fewer of the following criteria for academic writing at Level 7: 1) aims and argument are clearly stated and sustained; 2) content is clear and concise, logically organised and relevant to the brief; 3) word limits or timings are observed; 4) references are consistent and accurate, following academic integrity principles; 5) at least **five** scholarly references are included; 6) the work is presented accurately: terminology is used correctly; figures/diagrams/tables are accurate and relevant; writing has been proof-read and abbreviations made clear.
Quality of academic presentation UKPSF: A5, V3, V4, D2.v, D2.vi	The work meets all six sub-criteria (see 'Refer' descriptor) and is exemplary for academic presentation at Level 7. The references are accurate and exceed the minimum; they demonstrate significant and up-to-date breadth of literature review (including referring to some relevant scholarship within the discipline).	The work meets at least 5 of the sub-criteria (see 'Refer' descriptor) and is a good example of presentation at Level 7. References are accurate and exceed the minimum.	The work meets at least 4 of the sub-criteria (see 'Refer' descriptor), including consistency of referencing. It meets threshold standards for academic presentation at Level 7. References are accurate but do not exceed the minimum or go beyond core module readings.	Meets 3 or fewer of the following: 1) clearly presented aims and arguments; 2) well organised, easy to follow and understand; 3) timings are observed; 4) references consistent & accurate; 5) at least **five** scholarly references; 6) clear and accessible slides, abbreviations made clear.