

Appendix A: Conceptual Equivalents Scales/Descriptors Guidance Notes

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>(i) Conceptual equivalent scales/descriptors are most appropriate for less quantitative modules and their use is mandatory unless answers are clearly either right or wrong, for example multiple choice and numerical assessments. The scale can be considered either as a set of discrete marks or as defined bands of marks. Discrete marks are most appropriate for less quantitative assessments and their use is mandatory.</p> <p>(ii) Exemptions from the above, for example, due to the requirements of professional or statutory bodies, require approval by the Courses and Regulations Group.</p> <p>(iii) The scale should be applied once, at the level of the assessed component of the module, and not at any subsequent stage.</p> <p>(iv) Separate descriptors for dissertations and projects have not been developed at either undergraduate or postgraduate Level. The descriptors for Level 3 and postgraduate level (with appropriate deletion of phrases such as “module content/material”) are likely to provide sufficient general guidance for this purpose.</p> <p>(v) The postgraduate scale applies to all postgraduate programmes and modules.</p> <p>(vi) Successive sets of descriptors subsume lower sets within each level and across each band. A piece of work identified as falling within a given class or mark range should include some or most, but not necessarily all,</p> | <p>of the relevant descriptors. It is expected that the full marking scale be utilised, for example where students’ work is considered to be excellent, outstanding or exemplary, a first class mark should be awarded as indicated on the table.</p> <p>(vii) It is expected that at all levels there will be an effective use of language and an acceptable level of written expression.</p> <p>(viii) An indicative but not exhaustive list of module material includes: module resource material, textbooks, journal articles, internet sources, videos, CBL, lab work, reflection on work placements.</p> <p>(ix) At Level 1 exploration of learning resources outside module materials is not necessarily expected.</p> <p>(x) At Level 1 completeness/ comprehensiveness /quality of argument is the guide to a mark.</p> <p>When the discrete marks are used for sections of a paper or for individual questions, combining them will probably produce an overall mark which does not correspond to one of the discrete marks on the scale. The overall mark should not be altered where this is the case.</p> <p>The Secretary to the Board of Examiners should record in the minutes that due consideration has been given to the conceptual equivalents scale.</p> |
|--|---|

Conceptual Equivalents Scale Postgraduate

Module Descriptor	Mark Band	Criteria	Determinator within grade band
A (Outstanding)	80–100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorough and systematic knowledge and understanding of <i>module content</i>; • Clear grasp of issues involved, with evidence of innovative and original use of learning resources • Knowledge beyond <i>module content</i> • Clear evidence of independence of thought and originality • Methodological rigour • High critical judgement and confident grasp of complex issues 	Originality of argument
A (Clear)	70–79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methodological rigour • Originality • Critical judgement • Use of additional learning resources. 	Methodological rigour
B	60–69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good knowledge and understanding of <i>module content</i> • Well argued answer • Some evidence of originality and critical judgement • Sound methodology • Critical judgement and some grasp of complex issues 	Extent of use of additional or non-core learning resources
C	50–59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good knowledge and understanding of the <i>module content</i> • Reasonably well argued • Largely descriptive or narrative in focus • Methodological application is not consistent or thorough 	Understanding of the main issues
Marginal Fail	40–49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacking methodological application • Adequately argued • Basic understanding and knowledge • Gaps or inaccuracies but not damaging 	Relevance of knowledge displayed
Weak Fail	0–39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little relevant material and/or inaccurate answer or incomplete • Disorganised • Largely irrelevant material and misunderstanding • No evidence of methodology • Minimal or no relevant material 	Weakness of argument

**module content* should be interpreted as the topic or area of research being undertaken in the study in keeping with the learning outcomes for the module. The above criteria can be applied to both taught modules at M-level and the M-level dissertation (ignoring reference to *module content*).