**Masters level criteria – Faculty of Health and Social Sciences**

**Academic Criteria for Assignment Classification – Masters**

| **Classification Grade** | **(High) Distinction 80-100%** | **Distinction**  **70 – 79** | **Merit**  **60 - 69%** | **Pass**  **50 - 59%** | **Pass**  **40 - 49%** | **Fail**  **30 - 39%** | **(Low) Fail**  **0-29%** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Knowledge**  **[The theoretical underpinning of a subject, derived from  collective academic enquiry and experts in the field, including knowledge that is contestable]** | Additionally demonstrates originality in knowledge generation by suggesting new theoretical or practical approaches. | Demonstrates a deep understanding and mastery of the knowledge base from a comprehensive range of theoretical and practice approaches | Demonstrates an understanding of a wide and relevant range of theoretical and practical approaches by utilising them effectively | Demonstrates a good but incomplete range of the relevant theoretical and practical approaches | Demonstrates awareness of a limited range of theory and practice knowledge | Demonstrates a very limited or inappropriate range of theory and practice knowledge | Fails to demonstrate awareness or understanding of the knowledge base |
| **Relevance**  **[Content is clearly related / connected/ significant]** | Tightly focused on the title throughout. Consistently addresses all reasonable implications, nuances and assumptions of the title with breadth and depth | Remains tightly focused on the title. Addresses all reasonable implications nuances and assumptions of the title | Communicates effectively by being directly relevant to the title and learning outcomes.  Addresses most implications and assumptions of the title. | Relevant to the title and learning outcomes.  Some of the implications of the title addressed | Mainly relevant to the title and learning outcomes but occasionally wanders from the point. Begins to address some of the implications and assumptions of the title. | Little relevant material.  Brief for assignment not followed.  Only intermittent relevance to the title and learning outcomes,  Topic is only superficially addressed. | Very little relevant material. Brief not followed. Irrelevant or patchy connection to title with little or no consideration of the topic. |
| **Application**  **[Utilisation of outcomes/ learning to a concrete or real life situation]** | Demonstrates excellent application of conceptual frameworks, principles and theories, showing critical appreciation, originality and vision in the generation of new insights to apply to/ inform practice | Demonstrates very good use of conceptual frameworks, principles and theories and appropriately challenges received opinion, enabling development and sustaining of coherent argument in the generation of new insights to apply to/ inform practice | Demonstrates good use of conceptual frameworks, principles and theories, showing good ability in the generation of new insights to apply to/ inform practice | Demonstrates appropriate use of relevant conceptual frameworks, principles and theories. Ability generate new insights to apply to/ inform practice | Demonstrates awareness of conceptual frameworks, principles and theories. Some ability to apply new insights to inform practice | Demonstrates unsatisfactory and inadequate application of conceptual frameworks , principles and theories to practice. Lacks focus. | Lacks application of conceptual frameworks, principles and theories to practice. Displays unsafe practice in written work |
| **Analysis and Evaluation**  **[Demonstration of a systematic examination and reasoned judgement on a range of issues/elements/ materials.]** | Exceptional deep, detailed, and critical analysis and evaluation of the material resulting in illuminating, and elegant conclusions that extend the sum of knowledge in the area. Creatively demonstrates new concepts, ideas or theories. | Thorough and consistent critical analysis and synthesis.  In depth and appropriate analysis of the material resulting in illuminating conclusions which serve to extend the sum of knowledge in the area.  Demonstrates the ability to discover new concepts, ideas or theories through analysis. | Clear evidence of critical analysis and synthesis.  Good and appropriate analysis of the material resulting in clear conclusions which serve to add to the sum of knowledge in the area. | Evidence of critical analysis.  Adequate and appropriate analysis of the material results in generally clear  conclusions, which serve to substantiate , but offers little extension of the sum of knowledge in the area. | Generally adequate and appropriate analysis of the material that results in some  illuminating conclusions but does not expand upon  the sum of knowledge in the area. | Analysis of the material is superficial and/or fails to result in clear and/or illuminating conclusions.  The sum of knowledge in the area is not expanded, challenged or extended. | Analysis of the material is incomplete and superficial. There are little or no conclusions. The sum of knowledge in the area is not expanded, challenged or extended. |
| **Synthesis**  **[A combination of important points from several sources; infers relationships between sources]** | Exceptional work, demonstrating originality, independent thought, synthesis of ideas from credible sources and the generation of innovative views | Demonstrates originality.  Distinctive work, demonstrating independent thought, synthesis of ideas and the generation of alternative views. | Elements of originality.  Good work showing independent thought, synthesis of ideas and critical engagement with alternative views. | Limited evidence of originality.  Demonstration of evidence of independent thought with some synthesis of ideas and critical engagement with alternative views. | Contains some independent thinking. Beginning to synthesise ideas and engage with alternative views. | No synthesis of ideas Expresses a personal position and is uncritical in its conformity to one or more standard views of the topic | Unable to combine evidence or others’ views to create a new perspective of the topic |
| **Structured Argument**  **[Systematic presentation of academic debate/s]** | Highly accomplished, original arguments are presented making creative use of a mode of argument and theoretical model/s to provide an intelligent structure. | Arguments are reliable and presented coherently, making creative use of appropriate mode of argument and/or theoretical model/s to provide an intelligent structure. There is originality in the arguments presented | Arguments generally clear and coherent, and logically constructed.  Uses an appropriate mode of argument and/or theoretical model/s. There are elements of originality in the arguments presented | Arguments lack logic and coherence at times. Uses an appropriate mode of argument and/or theoretical model/s. | Arguments lack logic and coherence at times. Generally uses an appropriate mode of argument and /or theoretical model/s. | Very limited coherence and logic. Fails to make adequate use of an appropriate mode of argument and/or theoretical model/s. | The work is confusing. Arguments lack clarity. There is no evidence of attempts to use appropriate model/ mode of arguments |
| **Presentation and referencing** | Presentation is polished with a creative approach to the topic.  A fluent academic writing style with accurate spelling and syntax.  Thoughts and ideas expressed clearly. Appropriate and complete references from a diverse range of sources. | Presentation polished with an imaginative approach to the topic.  A fluent academic writing style with accurate spelling and syntax.  Thoughts and ideas expressed clearly.  Appropriate and complete references from a range of sources. | Presentation logically structured.  Very well written with correct spelling and syntax.  Style is lucid with appropriate format.  Appropriate , complete and consistent references which may contain minor inaccuracies. | Presentation satisfactory and meaning apparent but language not always fluent. Spelling and syntax satisfactory. Some in-consistencies in referencing but generally acceptable. | Presentation is logical but has minor lapses from standard syntax and spelling.  Generally lucid. Acceptable format.  Some in-consistencies in referencing but generally acceptable. | Presentation disorganised.  Rather poorly written with significant deficiencies in expression, and format.  Significant errors in referencing which is incomplete. | Presentation  very disorganised.  Very poorly written with significant deficiencies in expression and format  References incomplete and  unacceptable |