**Marking & Descriptors**

|  **Descriptors****Criterion** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **1-2** | **Fail**  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Coherence, flow**Is the work logically structured with a coherent argument? (30%) | Exemplary, rigorous and concise argumentation, performed in an original and highly persuasive manner  | There is a clear and consistent line of argument with a coherent and effective underlying structure. Demonstrates an ability to deal with complex issues coherently, systematically and creatively. | Work is well-structured showing competent response.Work demonstrates continuity and coherence of argument that is logical and straightforward to follow. | Provides adequate response but lacks consistent argument.Work somewhat deficient in integration and coherence and/or showing some lack of intellectual engagement with the material. | Work is poorly organised and lacks logical structure.Lack of integration and coherence of issues with unclear argument. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Depth, Critical Discussion (theory)**Does the work critically address a range of views? Is it self-reflective and analytical?(30%) | Brings together and critically discusses internationally leading, current academic insights, and reflect on these appropriately. | Shows critical awareness and insightful understanding of the issue to be addressed, problem to be analysed or task to be executed. Demonstrates informed reflection with references to examples from practice. | Shows strong grasp of the issue, problem or task, supported by clear understanding of relevant fields of academic knowledge. Evidence of reflection in most areas. | Adequate awareness of issue, problem or task. Analysis not entirely thorough or complete. Some evidence of reflection but lacks insight into impact on practice.  | Shows inadequate grasp of issue, problem or task; analysis thin with insufficient knowledge of critical and analytical questions; links to own practice are descriptive with little evidence of reflection.  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Use of Sources and Referencing**Is a range of reading and other resources used appropriately and critically assessed? Are sources fully and accurately cited using an appropriate style, (e.g. Harvard)?(20%) | Clear definition of the scope of the research project, and within these boundaries, extensive discussion of the Internationally current debate, in the relevant domains. | Demonstrates wide range of reading and resources consulted with imaginative use of evidence and concepts. Evidence of a thorough grasp of relevant materials possibly beyond the scope of the course, extending to appropriate sources (e.g. academic), and of wide, self-directed reading properly integrated in the assignment. Work is fully supported by appropriately cited references applied in a consistently accurate format. | Evidence of some useful self-directed reading with awareness and use of relevant course materials, both generic and subject-specific. Reference made to other resources. Use of references and citations relatively consistently applied. | Confined to course materials and lacks critical engagement. Some use of other resources. Some inconsistencies in citations and references which detracts from the reading. | Limited or inappropriate use of relevant course literature. Little or no use of other resources. Lacks citations and demonstrates poor referencing style. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Presentation / Communication / Language**Is the work legible, grammatical and fluent? Are data presented accurately and appropriately? (20%) | Outstanding problem solving, convincingly and creatively presented in a manner that professionals/scholars would appreciate. | Exemplary presentation with clarity of message and information. Fluent prose style with accurate spelling and grammar. | Well presented, with good prose style; clear, logical and generally error-free. | Satisfactory presentation with limited errors; straightforward to read. | Unsatisfactory presentation with textual errors; poor clarity of expression and inappropriate writing style. |