

Generic assessment criteria and grade descriptors for the Queen Mary Academy Taught Programmes

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 85%, 75%, 65%, 55%, 45%, 35% (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 (85%)	Distinction (75%)	Merit (65%)	Pass (55%)	Refer (45%)	Refer (35%)
Critical Analysis	You explicitly justify a range of pedagogical choices underpinning your practice and evaluate the implications for all relevant key stakeholders, including diverse learner needs and differences.	You explicitly consider and justify the conceptual choices behind your practice, evaluating the implications for key stakeholders (students, staff/faculty, institution, discipline, sector), including diverse learner needs and differences.	You provide some informed judgements about your practice, analysing the needs of only one or two of the key stakeholders mentioned in the Distinction descriptor.	You provide some rationale for your practice but do not explicitly address the implications of this for stakeholders.	You may summarise aspects of your practice and pedagogical choices, but do not consider their implications.	There is no discussion of the pedagogical choices underpinning your practice nor of their implications for stakeholders
Evaluation of practice	<p>You evaluate the effectiveness and inclusivity of your practice using evidence from a full range of sources. You clearly define the aims and criteria of the evaluation, and key measures indicating success.</p> <p>You justify these in relation to any prior or current challenges in your practice.</p> <p>You discuss the outcomes from your</p>	<p>You evaluate the effectiveness and inclusivity of your practice using evidence from a full range of sources. You clearly define the aims and criteria of the evaluation, and key measures indicating success.</p> <p>You justify these in relation to any prior or current challenges in your practice.</p> <p>You discuss the outcomes from your</p>	<p>The work contains evaluation of the effectiveness and inclusivity 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).</p> <p>The outcomes from your evaluation and their</p>	<p>The work contains some evaluation of your practice against broadly defined criteria for effectiveness and inclusivity.</p> <p>The outcomes from your evaluation, and their implications for your future practice, are discussed only briefly.</p>	<p>The work contains little explicit evaluation of the effectiveness and inclusivity of your practice.</p> <p>Evaluation outcomes and their implications for your practice are not discussed.</p> <p>Any planned changes to practice are not linked to evidence from evaluation.</p>	<p>The work contains no evaluation of the effectiveness and inclusivity of your practice and there are no planned changes to practice identified.</p>

	evaluation and their implications for practice in multiple domains (e.g. individual, departmental, disciplinary, institutional, sector-wide).	evaluation, and their implications for practice, in at least 2 domains (e.g. individual, departmental, disciplinary, institutional, sector-wide).	implications for practice are discussed only in the context of your individual practice.			
Learning from others	<p>Evidence of learning from others and collaboration with colleagues is embedded throughout the work.</p> <p>You integrate dissemination of your good practice with your reflection or enhancement plans.</p> <p>You demonstrate learning from a wide range of sources including beyond your discipline and institution, and engagement in communities of practice</p>	<p>There is evidence of learning from others and collaboration. You show explicitly how you have disseminated your practice to others.</p> <p>You give examples of learning from a range of sources included including discussions with colleagues, peers and tutors on CILT/PGCAP, students, and contexts beyond your own discipline/ institution.</p> <p>You also identify aspects of others' practice that you can modify and implement in order to enhance your own practice.</p>	<p>The work shows that you have collaborated with others and learnt from their practice, but is either not explicit or not consistent.</p> <p>The discussion extends beyond your own department; you provide some examples from other contexts (disciplinary or institutional).</p>	<p>The work presents some evidence that you have collaborated with others or learnt from their practice.</p> <p>The discussion is limited to your own disciplinary or institutional context.</p>	<p>There is little or no evidence in the work that you have collaborated with others or learnt from their practice.</p> <p>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).</p>	<p>No examples of learning from others or collaboration with others.</p>
Reflection & application to own practice	<p>Exemplary reflection on your practice throughout in which you critically</p>	<p>Throughout the work you analyse relevant, detailed and specific</p>	<p>You share relevant examples of successes and challenges from</p>	<p>You share examples from your practice (e.g. experiences, activities,</p>	<p>The work may mention examples from your practice (e.g.</p>	<p>Few or no examples from your practice are discussed in the work,</p>

	<p>analyse examples of successes and challenges from your practice in relation to educational research and theory.</p> <p>The reflection has clear aims throughout the work, and you use these as a focus for enhancing the effectiveness and inclusivity of your practice.</p>	<p>examples of successes and challenges from your practice in light of educational research and theory. This reflection on your practice provides a basis of evidence for enhancing the effectiveness and inclusivity of your practice.</p>	<p>your practice throughout the work, reflecting on them and linking them to theory or research. However, this reflection on your practice does not draw examples together to make a case for enhancing the effectiveness and inclusivity of.</p>	<p>techniques) 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 enhancing the effectiveness and inclusivity of your practice.</p>	<p>experiences, activities, techniques) but does not explicitly link them to educational theory or research, and does not make a reflective case for enhancing the effectiveness and inclusivity of practice.</p>	<p>with no links to educational research. No discussion of potential enhancements to practice.</p>
Engagement with scholarship & literature	<p>The work demonstrates close, critical engagement with a wide range of research and scholarship. It shows independent research into generic and discipline-specific literature, including across disciplines.</p> <p>Secondary sources are critically analysed in relation to your own practice. You explore the limitations of the evidence and position yourself within scholarly pedagogical debates.</p>	<p>The work engages with a wide range of research and scholarship, including disciplinary pedagogies or scholarly debates within educational research.</p> <p>Secondary sources are critically analysed and evaluated in the light of your own practice. You explicitly consider the limitations of the evidence.</p>	<p>The work engages with research and scholarship from beyond the core module readings.</p> <p>Secondary sources are applied to your own practice and may be briefly evaluated or analysed.</p>	<p>The work engages with core readings or scholarship from the programme.</p> <p>Secondary sources are mainly paraphrased and some are analysed. There is limited critical analysis and evaluation of their application to your practice.</p>	<p>The work does not show engagement with relevant scholarship.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>There is little or no reference to scholarship in the work.</p> <p>Secondary sources are not discussed at all, or may be misinterpreted. Key concepts, terms and theories may be misused or misrepresented.</p>
Quality of academic writing	<p>The work meets all six sub-criteria (see 'Refer' descriptors) and is of a publishable standard.</p>	<p>The work meets all six sub-criteria (see 'Refer' descriptors) and is exemplary for academic writing at Level 7.</p>	<p>The work meets at least 5 of the sub-criteria (see 'Refer' descriptors) and is a good example of writing at Level 7.</p>	<p>The work meets at least 4 of the sub-criteria (see 'Refer' descriptors), including consistency of referencing. It meets</p>	<p>The work meets 3 of the following criteria for academic writing at Level 7:</p>	<p>The work meets fewer than 3 of the following criteria for academic writing at Level 7:</p>

	References are accurate and demonstrate a command of relevant literature.	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).	References are accurate and exceed the minimum.	threshold standards for academic writing at Level 7. References are accurate but do not exceed the minimum or go beyond core module readings.	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.	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	The work meets all six sub-criteria (see 'Refer' descriptors) and is of a publishable standard. References are accurate and demonstrate a command of relevant literature.	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	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	Meets 3 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,	Meets fewer than 3 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

		of literature review (including referring to some relevant scholarship within the discipline).		minimum or go beyond core module readings.	abbreviations made clear.	accessible slides, abbreviations made clear.
--	--	--	--	--	---------------------------	--