

# UEA SENATE SCALE: COURSEWORK

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
<b>90-100%</b> Exemplary 1 <sup>st</sup>  <i>Coursework is 'exemplary' in most areas</i>	Learning outcomes have been met to an exemplary standard showing creativity and innovation. Demonstrates an exemplary understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains the highest standards of scholarship that can be expected of a degree-level submission.	Exemplary presentation: clear, logical, imaginative, creative and original. Almost flawless.	Highly effective and sustained arguments, demonstrating exemplary level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Addresses all aspects of the assignment to exemplary standard.	Work demonstrates exemplary standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Exemplary in its use of ideas, concepts and theory. Exemplary analysis of data. Exemplary self-reflection.	Exemplary use of sources/case studies and/or evidence. Demonstrates impressive command of data or literature, drawing on a very broad range of material and/or examining the topic in considerable detail. Demonstrates an exemplary sensitivity to the limits/limitations of evidence.	Exemplary in all respects. Outstanding bibliography with academic referencing conventions employed accurately, consistently and according to established practice within the discipline.	Exemplary standard of written English. Written communication, including use of subject-specific language, is of highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a degree-level submission.
<b>80-89%</b> High 1 <sup>st</sup>  <i>Coursework is strong in most areas and may be exemplary in some</i>	Learning outcomes have been met to a very high standard. Demonstrates a strong understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a very high level of scholarship, though small potential improvements can be readily identified.	A very high standard of presentation: clear, logical and few errors.	Coherent and articulate arguments, demonstrating a very high level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment to a high standard.	Work demonstrates a very high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts, and theory to good effect. High level of self-reflection.	Work demonstrates a very strong command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail. Also demonstrates a high level of awareness of, and sensitivity to, the limits of evidence.	A very high standard of referencing throughout. Bibliography conforms to a very high standard.	A very high standard of written English
<b>70-79%</b> 1 <sup>st</sup>  <i>Coursework is strong in most areas</i>	Learning outcomes have been fully met to a high standard. Demonstrates a strong understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains an impressive level of scholarship, though there may be scope for improvement in a few areas.	A high standard of presentation: clear, logical and few errors.	Coherent and articulate arguments, demonstrating a high level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment to a high standard.	Work demonstrates a high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts, theory to good effect. High level of self-reflection.	Work demonstrates a strong command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail. The submission shows awareness of the limits/limitations of evidence.	A high standard of referencing throughout. Bibliography conforms to a high standard, though there may be a number of small errors	A high standard of written English

# UEA SENATE SCALE: COURSEWORK

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
<b>60-69%</b> Pass 2(i)  <i>Coursework is 'good' in most areas and strong in some.</i>	Learning outcomes have been met to a good standard. Demonstrates a good understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a good level of scholarship, but lacks sophistication of a 1 <sup>st</sup> class piece.	A good standard of presentation: clear, mostly logical, and errors are mostly very minor.	The work contains evidence of insight. Though it may lack finesse, it is thorough, clear and shows an understanding of the subject context. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment.	The work contains some good examples of critical analysis but limited originality and creativity in use of ideas, concepts, case studies etc. Good level of self-reflection.	The student draws on a good range of material but lacks the breadth of engagement with the secondary literature required to achieve a 1 <sup>st</sup> class mark. Good use of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Partial awareness of the limits of evidence.	A good standard of referencing, though a few errors or inconsistencies may be present. Good bibliography but possibly containing technical errors, some minor, some more serious.	A good standard of written English, with only minor errors present
<b>50-59%</b> Pass 2(ii)  <i>Coursework is 'good' in some areas but only satisfactory in others. Good intellectual engagement but execution flawed.</i>	Learning outcomes have been met satisfactorily. Some have been met to a good standard. Demonstrates some understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Standard of scholarship likely to be undermined by poor linkage of issues/themes, poor use of evidence, unsubstantiated claims etc.	A satisfactory standard achieved: mostly clear, some evidence of logical progression. Some minor inaccuracies.	Competent work, with evidence of engagement in the relevant issues, but little originality and only occasional insight. Gaps in understanding and knowledge; may not have addressed all aspects of the assignment.	Conscientious work and attentive to subject matter and/or task set, but balanced more towards a descriptive rather than a critical, analytical treatment.	Draws on a satisfactory but relatively limited range of sources. Some assessment of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Some use of examples. Treatment of data or literature is basically sound but too narrow in scope and underdeveloped. Understanding of the limits of evidence not fully articulated or understood.	Referencing satisfactory on the whole, though some inconsistencies or instances of poor/limited citation may be present. Satisfactory bibliography but likely to reveal some weaknesses in composition and use of referencing conventions.	A reasonable standard of written English, though a number of errors may be present.
<b>40-49%</b> Pass 3 <sup>rd</sup>  <i>Coursework is only satisfactory in most areas and weak in some others. Modest evidence of intellectual engagement.</i>	Learning outcomes have been met to the minimum required level. Understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is only adequate. Standard of scholarship undermined by poorly constructed ideas, arguments, use of evidence, partial response to the question etc.	Barely satisfactory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies /errors may be of a more serious nature.	Work shows some understanding of the topic and some relevant knowledge, but its treatment is basic, unimaginative, and superficial and the student's grasp of key concepts is weak. Arguments employed are poorly evidenced and/or contain flaws.	Narrow range of data and/or literature employed is very limited. May be mostly limited to material provided in lectures/seminars.	Draws on a limited range of sources. Little attempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided but are poorly chosen or employed. Lacking in sophistication or finesse. The submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence/ability in the use of evidence. Limits of evidence very poorly articulated or understood.	Citations present, but referencing is poor, suggesting that little effort has been made to follow guidance. Bibliography barely adequate. Many errors, some serious, revealing limited awareness of mechanics of scholarship.	A barely satisfactory standard of written English; a number of serious errors may be present; Poorly structured and written, with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar.

# UEA SENATE SCALE: COURSEWORK

Marks awarded in the range below indicate that the candidate has failed to achieve the standards required for a pass mark on this occasion. It is recommended that students receiving marks in this range meet with their adviser or the marker to review the factors that may have influenced the mark and ways in which their performance might be enhanced in subsequent assessments.  
Work representing unsafe practice in professional schools will be marked as a fail.

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
<b>35-39%</b> Marginal Fail  <i>Coursework is barely 'satisfactory' in a few areas and weak in most others.</i>	Insufficient demonstration of learning outcomes to justify a pass grade. Understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is not sufficient for a pass. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in several areas.	Unsatisfactory standard, lacking sufficient clarity, and a logical progression, with serious errors/inaccuracies.	The submission contains some material of merit, but it is only a partial attempt to address the question and fails to answer the question fully or in a robust manner with few (and mostly unsuccessful) attempts to construct argument(s). Poor understanding of key issues or concepts	The treatment is mostly descriptive. Whilst the work contains some evidence of criticality or analysis, it is too limited or partial or lacking in depth to justify a pass.	Draws on a very limited range of sources. No real attempt to assess evidence. Examples are occasionally provided but are poorly chosen and employed. Entirely lacking in sophistication or finesse. The submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence/ability in the choice and use of evidence.	Citations present but very limited. Referencing is very poor. Bibliography is either omitted, partial or poorly structured. Guidance not followed. Many serious errors, revealing very limited awareness of mechanics of scholarship.	Unsatisfactory standard of written English; too many serious errors present. Weaknesses undermine clarity of meaning. Text occasionally incomprehensible. Includes significant flaws in spelling, grammar, and basic sentence/paragraph composition
<b>20-34%</b> Fail  <i>Coursework is weak in most areas.</i>	Learning outcomes have been met in a limited way. Understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is considerably below that required for a pass. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in many areas.	Very poor standard of presentation, lacking sufficient clarity, and a sufficiently logical progression, with many serious inaccuracies.	Little material of merit or relevance, revealing a lack of understanding of key issues or concepts. Fails to address most aspects of the task or question set. Work lacks any sustained argument(s).	The treatment is almost wholly descriptive. Contains little evidence of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic.	Draws on minimal range of sources. Rarely goes beyond paraphrasing bits of lecture notes or easily accessible web sources. No attempt to assess evidence. Examples are very rarely provided, those that are, being very poorly employed. Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citation almost or entirely absent. Guidance largely ignored. Bibliography omitted or very poorly assembled. Awareness of mechanics of scholarship very weak.	A poor standard of written English. . Includes serious flaws in spelling, grammar, and basic sentence/paragraph composition
<b>10-19%</b> Fail  <i>Coursework is very weak in most areas.</i>	The work submitted will have very limited relevance to any of the stated learning outcomes. Understanding of link between theory and practice is very weak. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in all areas.	Little evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation. Many serious errors/inaccuracies.	No material of merit or relevance, revealing a complete lack of understanding of key issues or concepts. Fails to address all aspects of the task or question set. No attempt to construct argument(s).	The treatment is wholly descriptive. No evidence of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic.	Almost complete absence of evidence. Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citations absent. Guidance entirely ignored. No bibliography that could merit description as such. Work shows no real attempt to apply the mechanics of scholarship.	A very poor standard of written English throughout with little care taken in the composition of proper sentences or paragraphs.

## UEA SENATE SCALE: COURSEWORK

<p><b>0-9%</b> Fail</p> <p><i>Coursework is very weak in all areas.</i></p>	<p>Lacks any understanding of learning outcomes. No understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Standard of scholarship very poor throughout.</p>	<p>No evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation.</p>	<p>No understanding is demonstrated. Arguments notable for their complete absence.</p>	<p>The treatment is wholly descriptive</p>	<p>Evidence absent Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.</p>	<p>Citation entirely absent. Bibliography omitted. Application of the mechanics of scholarship entirely absent.</p>	<p>Incomprehensible. No attempt to compose proper sentences or paragraphs.</p>
---	---	---	--	--	---	---	--