

Faculty PGT Generic Assessment Criteria Format 1 (Approved: July 2024 for use from AY 2024/25 onwards)

Criteria	Distinction (85-100%)	Distinction (70-84%)	Merit (60-69%)	Pass (50-59%)	Marginal Fail (40-49%)	Fail (20-39%)	Low Fail (0-19%)
<p>Subject knowledge</p> <p>Engagement with appropriate and relevant literature, concepts, models, and ideas which may extend past the unit materials to enhance the students' learning for the assessment</p>	Demonstrates an exceptional depth/breadth of knowledge via exceptional engagement with independent learning outside of unit materials.	Demonstrates an excellent depth/breadth of knowledge of relevant material via significant engagement with independent learning outside of unit materials.	Demonstrates a good/comprehensive depth/breadth of knowledge of relevant material via good engagement with independent learning outside of unit materials.	Demonstrates a sufficient depth/breadth of knowledge of relevant material, although some gaps are evident. Sufficient evidence of engagement with independent learning outside of unit materials.	Demonstrates a superficial knowledge of relevant material. Some but insufficient evidence of engagement with independent learning outside of unit materials.	Demonstrates limited knowledge of relevant material and extremely limited evidence of engagement with independent learning outside of unit materials.	Demonstrates very limited/no knowledge of relevant material and no evidence of independent learning outside of unit materials.
<p>Critical Thinking</p> <p>Ability to synthesise, analyse and/or evaluate to demonstrate criticality of thought. Synthesis refers to integrating multiple sources to generate new insights. Analysis refers to the deconstruction of components of data sources and understanding the interrelationships between them. Evaluation refers to making reasoned judgements about the quality and significance of the analysed information.</p>	Demonstrates an exceptional understanding of relevant information sources from which an exceptionally clear, balanced and a well-substantiated argument has been developed. There are no inaccuracies and/or omissions. Overall, the work contains an exceptional level of criticality and/or originality and develops new and innovative insights. This work is of exemplar quality.	Demonstrates an excellent understanding of relevant information sources from which an extremely clear, balanced and well-substantiated argument has been developed. There are almost no inaccuracies and/or omissions. Overall, the work contains a very high level of criticality and/or originality, demonstrating new insight.	Demonstrates a good/comprehensive understanding of relevant information sources from which a clear, balanced and a well-substantiated argument has been developed. There are no significant inaccuracies and/or omissions. Overall, the work is of a good critical and/or original nature, demonstrating some new insight.	Demonstrates sufficient understanding of relevant information sources from which a clear, balanced, and substantiated argument has been developed, albeit rather limited in scope. The work contains a few inaccuracies and/or omissions. Overall, the work is of a descriptive nature, but elements of criticality and/or originality are present.	Demonstrates some understanding of relevant information sources although the argument presented has not been clearly or sufficiently developed. The work contains some inaccuracies and/or omissions. Overall, the work contains limited criticality and/or originality.	Demonstrates limited understanding of relevant information sources. Consequently, whilst there is an attempt to articulate an argument, this lacks clarity and balance and is largely unsubstantiated. The work contains significant inaccuracies and/or omissions. Overall, the work contains very limited criticality and/or originality.	Demonstrates very limited or no understanding of relevant information sources and consequently no obvious/credible argument has been presented. The work contains significant inaccuracies and/or omissions. Overall, the work does not convey criticality and/or originality.

*In the majority of cases assessments will be graded holistically, and therefore the assigned weightings should be considered as indicative rather than absolute.

Faculty PGT Generic Assessment Criteria Format 1 (Approved: July 2024 for use from AY 2024/25 onwards)

Criteria	Distinction (85-100%)	Distinction (70-84%)	Merit (60-69%)	Pass (50-59%)	Marginal Fail (40-49%)	Fail (20-39%)	Low Fail (0-19%)
<p>Practical competence</p> <p>Assessment of a student's applied skills or competence. A practical skills assessment focuses on whether, and/or how well, a student performs a specific practical skill, technique, or competency. These assessments may include written, oral, or practical assessments which may be linked to external stakeholder requirements.</p>	Demonstrates exceptional competence in the application of practical and/or technical skills which reflect the correct application of theory in the context of the assessment. This work is of exemplar quality.	Demonstrates an excellent level of competence in the application of practical and/or technical skills which reflect the correct application of theory in the context of the assessment.	Demonstrates a good level of competence in the application of practical and/or technical skills which reflect a considered application of theory in the context of the assessment.	Demonstrates a sufficient level of competence in the application of practical and/or technical skills with some application of theory in the context of the assessment.	Demonstrates some but an insufficient level of competence in the application of practical and/or technical skills with limited application of theory in the context of the assessment.	Demonstrates a limited level of competence in the application of practical and/or technical skills with limited application of theory in the context of the assessment.	Demonstrates very limited competence in the application of some aspects of the practical and/or technical skills. No application of theory to context.
<p>Problem-solving</p> <p>Ability to effectively identify, analyse and solve problems through the application of appropriate methodologies.</p>	Demonstrates an exceptional and nuanced understanding of the problem; employs an appropriate but highly sophisticated methodology/approach to problem solving; demonstrates exceptional critical thinking and the ability to evaluate complex information critically and creatively; the identified solution(s) demonstrates extremely high potential for positive real-world impact.	Demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the problem; employs a well-structured and appropriate methodology/approach to problem solving; provides a thorough analysis with significant critical evaluation and a strong ability to synthesise information and draw well-supported conclusions; the identified solution(s) demonstrates high potential for positive real-world impact.	Demonstrates a clear understanding of the problem; employs an appropriate methodology/approach to problem solving; provides a sound analysis with critical evaluation and an ability to identify relevant data and draw conclusions; the identified solution(s) demonstrates potential for positive real-world impact.	Demonstrates a basic but sufficient understanding of the problem with some misconceptions; employs a simplistic but appropriate methodology/approach to problem solving; provides some but limited analysis with superficial and limited critical evaluation; the identified solution(s) demonstrates some potential for positive real-world impact.	Demonstrates some but an insufficient understanding of the problem with clear misconceptions; employs an overly simplistic and/or inappropriate methodology/approach to problem solving; provides insufficient analysis and critical evaluation; the identified solution(s) demonstrates minimal potential for positive real-world impact.	Demonstrates limited understanding of the problem with significant misconceptions; employs an inappropriate methodology/approach to problem solving; provides extremely limited analysis and no critical evaluation; the question/problem remains unresolved.	Demonstrates very limited or no understanding of the problem with significant misconceptions. No attempt to resolve the problem which remains unresolved.

*In the majority of cases assessments will be graded holistically, and therefore the assigned weightings should be considered as indicative rather than absolute.

Faculty PGT Generic Assessment Criteria Format 1 (Approved: July 2024 for use from AY 2024/25 onwards)

Criteria	Distinction (85-100%)	Distinction (70-84%)	Merit (60-69%)	Pass (50-59%)	Marginal Fail (40-49%)	Fail (20-39%)	Low Fail (0-19%)
<p>Research Design and Application</p> <p>Competence in application of research methods appropriate for analysing and interpreting data, specific to the assessment. This may include primary or secondary data analysis, or data generated for assessment purposes. For some disciplines, it may be appropriate to consider ethical frameworks and relevant data literacy.</p>	<p>Exceptional application, analysis/interpretation of appropriate research methods (including hypotheses, aims and objectives, where appropriate). The work contains no errors or omissions and is of exemplar or publishable standard.</p>	<p>Demonstrates excellent application, analysis/interpretation of appropriate research methods (including hypotheses, aims and objectives, where appropriate). The work contains no errors or omissions.</p>	<p>Demonstrates good application, analysis/interpretation of appropriate research methods (including hypotheses, aims and objectives, where appropriate). The work contains some minor errors or omissions which marginally impact on the quality of the work.</p>	<p>Demonstrates sufficient application and/or analysis/interpretation of appropriate research methods (including hypotheses, aims and objectives, where appropriate). The work may contain both errors and omissions which impacts on the quality of the work.</p>	<p>Demonstrates insufficient application and analysis/interpretation of appropriate research methods. The work contains both errors and omissions which impacts on the quality of the work.</p>	<p>Demonstrates limited application and analysis/interpretation of appropriate research methods or the selection of research methods and analysis/interpretation is inappropriate. The work contains significant errors and omissions impacting on the quality of the work.</p>	<p>Demonstrates very limited or no articulation of research methods and analysis/interpretation. The work contains significant errors and omissions impacting on the quality of the work.</p>
<p>Reflection</p> <p>Ability to critically reflect on experiences, personal development, and professional practices to inform future actions.</p>	<p>Demonstrates an exceptional level of reflective practice, utilising literature, and/or models to enhance reflection further. The work provides exceptional insight and addresses future professional practice, where appropriate. This work could be used as an exemplar.</p>	<p>Demonstrates an excellent level of reflective practice, utilising literature, and/or models to enhance reflection further. The work provides excellent insight and addresses future professional practice, where appropriate.</p>	<p>Demonstrates a good level of reflective practice, utilising literature, and/or models to enhance reflection. The work provides good insight and addresses future professional practice, where appropriate.</p>	<p>Demonstrates sufficient reflective practice but mostly on a descriptive level. The work provides some insight and addresses future professional practice, where appropriate.</p>	<p>Demonstrates some but largely superficial and insufficient reflective practice. The work is largely descriptive and lacks insight/fails to address future professional practice, where appropriate.</p>	<p>Demonstrates limited reflective practice. The work is extremely descriptive and is void of insight/fails to address future professional practice, where appropriate.</p>	<p>Demonstrates very limited or no reflective practice demonstrated. The work is entirely descriptive and is void of insight/fails to address future professional practice, where appropriate.</p>
<p>Communication</p> <p>Work is communicated to the intended audience which may be in written or oral format. This includes different types of audiences in different formats including talks, conference-style presentations, blogs, webpages, leaflets, academic journals, etc.</p>	<p>The communication of work to the intended audience is exceptional. There are no errors or areas for development, and the work is of exemplar standard.</p>	<p>The communication of work to the intended audience is excellent. There are no errors or significant areas for development.</p>	<p>The communication of work to the intended audience is good. There may be minor areas for development, but this does not detract from the overall quality of the work.</p>	<p>The communication of work to the intended audience is acceptable. Some areas require further development as these detract from the quality of the work.</p>	<p>The work has not been communicated to the intended audience despite overall communication being relatively good.</p>	<p>The work has not been communicated to the intended audience and overall communication is poor.</p>	<p>The work has not been communicated to the intended audience and the communication is very poor.</p>

*In the majority of cases assessments will be graded holistically, and therefore the assigned weightings should be considered as indicative rather than absolute.

Faculty PGT Generic Assessment Criteria Format 1 (Approved: July 2024 for use from AY 2024/25 onwards)

Criteria	Distinction (85-100%)	Distinction (70-84%)	Merit (60-69%)	Pass (50-59%)	Marginal Fail (40-49%)	Fail (20-39%)	Low Fail (0-19%)
<p>Presentation and structure</p> <p>The extent to which the overall presentation (including the use of visual materials), structure, and formatting follow the correct/appropriate conventions (as per academic standards and third-party stakeholders where appropriate) and add to the quality of the work.</p>	<p>Exceptional presentation (including visuals where relevant) and structure; entirely clear, concise, and compelling with skilful use of the presentation format which actively contributes to the quality of the work; exceptional formatting throughout the assessment, which may include, but is not limited to, headings, text, tables, figures. The work contains no errors or omissions and may be used as an exemplar resource.</p>	<p>Excellent presentation (including visuals where relevant) and structure; very clear, concise, and compelling with skilful use of the presentation format which actively contributes to the quality of the work; excellent formatting throughout the assessment, which may include, but is not limited to, headings, text, tables, figures. The work contains no errors or omissions.</p>	<p>Good presentation (including visuals where relevant) and structure; mostly clear, concise, and compelling with skilful use of the presentation format which actively contributes to the quality of the work; good formatting throughout the assessment, which may include, but is not limited to, headings, text, tables, figures. The work contains some minor errors or omissions which marginally impact on the quality of the work.</p>	<p>Acceptable presentation (including visuals where relevant) and structure; relatively clear although not overly concise; sufficient use of the presentation format which neither adds to nor detracts from the quality of work; sufficient formatting throughout the assessment, which may include, but is not limited to, headings, text, tables, figures. The work may contain both errors and/or omissions which impacts on the quality of the work.</p>	<p>Marginally unacceptable presentation (including visuals where relevant) and structure; lacks clarity and conciseness; the presentation format marginally detracts from the quality of work; marginally insufficient formatting throughout the assessment, which may include, but is not limited to, headings, text, tables, figures. The work contains both errors and omissions which impacts on the quality of the work.</p>	<p>Poor presentation (including visuals where relevant) and structure; significant issues with clarity and conciseness; Limited use of formatting throughout the assessment, which may include, but is not limited to, headings, text, tables, figures. There are significant errors and/or omissions impacting on the quality of the work.</p>	<p>Very poor presentation (including visuals where relevant) and structure which are not appropriate for the assessment; extremely limited use of/inappropriate formatting throughout the assessment, which may include, but is not limited to, headings, text, tables, figures. There are significant errors and omissions impacting on the quality of the work.</p>
<p>Referencing</p> <p>Acknowledges and credits the work of others by following referencing conventions and practices within the discipline. The focus is on the correct referencing conventions, and not plagiarism.</p>	<p>Consistent, error free application of relevant referencing conventions (both within the main body of the assessment and reference list) with exceptional attention to detail.</p>	<p>Consistent application of relevant referencing conventions (both within the main body of the assessment and reference list) with extremely minor errors.</p>	<p>Consistent application of relevant referencing conventions (both within the main body of the assessment and reference list) with minor errors.</p>	<p>Application of relevant referencing conventions (both within the main body of the assessment and reference list) although this is inconsistent and contains minor errors.</p>	<p>Application of relevant referencing conventions within the main body of the assessment and/or reference list although this is inconsistent and contains significant errors.</p>	<p>Incorrect referencing conventions consistently applied within the main body of the assessment and reference list.</p>	<p>The work does not contain citations or a reference list.</p>

*In the majority of cases assessments will be graded holistically, and therefore the assigned weightings should be considered as indicative rather than absolute.