

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

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: A1, A2, K1, K2, V1, V2, V4, D1.i, D1.ii, D1.iii, D1.iv	<p>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).</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>You consider the implications of your practice in general but do not explicitly address the implications of this for key stakeholders.</p>	<p>You may summarise aspects of your practice and pedagogical choices, but do not consider their implications.</p>
Evaluation of practice UKPSF: A1, A2, A3, A5, K1, K2, K4, K5, V3, V4, D1.i, D1.ii, D1.iii, D1.iv, D1.v	<p>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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>You discuss the outcomes from your evaluation, and their implications for practice, in multiple domains (e.g. departmental, disciplinary, institutional, sector-wide).</p>	<p>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).</p> <p>The outcomes from your evaluation and their implications for practice are discussed only in the context of your individual practice.</p>	<p>The work contains some evaluation of your practice against broadly defined criteria for effectiveness.</p> <p>The outcomes from your evaluation, and their implications for your future practice, are discussed only briefly.</p>	<p>The work contains little or no explicit evaluation of the effectiveness 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>

Criteria	Distinction (75%)	Merit (65%)	Pass (55%)	Refer (45%)
<p>Learning from others UKPSF: A1, K1, K2, V3, D1.iii, D1.iv, D1.vi</p>	<p>Throughout the work, you show explicitly how you have disseminated and/or discussed your practice with others and learnt from their work.</p> <p>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.</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 discussed your practice 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 discussed your practice 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 discussed your practice 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>Reflection & application to own practice UKPSF: A1, A2, K1, K2, V3, D1.i, D1.ii, D1.iii, D1.iv, D1.v</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Engagement with scholarship & literature UKPSF: A1, K1, K2, V3, D1.iii, D1.iv, D1.v</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. The work draws on a broad range of scholarship from your own</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>

Criteria	Distinction (75%)	Merit (65%)	Pass (55%)	Refer (45%)
	and other disciplines and explicitly considers the limitations of the evidence.			
Quality of academic writing UKPSF: A1, A2, K1, K2, V1, V2, V3, V4, D1.i, D1.ii, D1.iii, D1.iv, D1.v, D1.vi	<p>The work meets all six sub-criteria (see 'Refer' descriptor) and is exemplary for academic writing at Level 7.</p> <p>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).</p>	<p>The work meets at least 5 of the sub-criteria (see 'Refer' descriptor) and is a good example of writing at Level 7.</p> <p>References are accurate and exceed the minimum.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>References are accurate but do not exceed the minimum or go beyond core module readings.</p>	<p>The work meets 3 or fewer of the following criteria for academic writing at Level 7:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: A1, A2, K1, K2, V1, V2, V3, V4, D1.i, D1.ii, D1.iii, D1.iv, D1.v, D1.vi	<p>The work meets all six sub-criteria (see 'Refer' descriptor) and is exemplary for academic presentation at Level 7.</p> <p>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).</p>	<p>The work meets at least 5 of the sub-criteria (see 'Refer' descriptor) and is a good example of presentation at Level 7.</p> <p>References are accurate and exceed the minimum.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>References are accurate but do not exceed the minimum or go beyond core module readings.</p>	<p>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.</p>