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Abstract

The MMU standard descriptors for assessment provide a basis for writing marking criteria at all levels of taught provision. This paper reflects on the development and use of specific assessment criteria in the form of rubrics based on the MMU standard descriptors on two units, Assessment in Higher Education and Enhancing Learning Teaching and Assessment with Technology (ELTAT), on the Post Graduate Certificate and Masters in Academic Practice (PGCMAAP). In addition, the paper briefly reflects upon the use of Turnitin (via the institutional VLE) to build and use rubrics as part of overall online assessment and feedback strategies.

Despite some challenges, both unit teams are confident that the rubrics they developed based on the MMU standard descriptors assisted them in coming to reliable conclusions on the quality of student work and represented a valid assessment tool for the respective assignments. The rubrics have potential to be used both in preparing students to undertake the assessment tasks and as a formative tool while supporting them during and after the completion of the work. A consistent theme in both teams’ reflections was the ability to use the attainment descriptors within selected cells of the rubric as reference points for targeting both feedback on what was attained and feedforward on what could be done to move the work into a higher grade band. Although Turnitin rubrics proved easy to use for marking and feedback, setting them up initially (especially to automatically calculate overall marks) can be challenging.

Based on our experiences we make several recommendations for programme and unit teams who are developing rubrics based on the MMU standard descriptors for use in their assessment and feedback practice.
Introduction

**Background to the MMU standard descriptors**

The 2010 QAA institutional audit report for Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU) recommended that the university should

‘establish a set of comprehensive university-wide assessment criteria to help maintain consistent standards across all provision, both on and off-campus’ (QAA 2010).

A working group was set up to consider this recommendation, with representation from each faculty. It was decided that it would be neither desirable nor necessary to require all programmes, in all subjects, to use a single set of generic assessment criteria. Instead, a set of standard descriptors was developed with three primary purposes in mind:

1. To act as a reference point for academic colleagues to develop their own programme and unit specific marking criteria;

2. To provide a common language to describe student performance in assessed work at each level taught at MMU;

3. To link all assessments clearly to the institutional [Graduate Outcomes](#) set out in the [MMU Undergraduate and Postgraduate Curriculum Frameworks](#).

The standard descriptors sketch out in broad terms (using the MMU graduate outcomes) what is expected of students at a particular level of study, with an indication of how performance at that level can be differentiated. They are too generic to support making grading decisions for individual assignments; rather they form the basis for writing marking criteria that judge the standard to which each learning outcome has been achieved. Criteria need to be specific to the assignment because they need to link the criteria and the intended learning outcomes for the unit.

The MMU standard descriptors for assessment (CASQE, 2012) are provided as a set of exemplar rubrics, one for each level of study (Levels 3-7). The term ‘rubric’ is being used here to describe a document that articulates the expectations for assessment by listing the criteria (what is being looked for in student’s work that we are attempting to assess) and quality definitions for these criteria.
explaining what a student must demonstrate to attain a particular level of achievement e.g. 1st, 2(i), 2(ii), 3rd, Fail (Reddy & Andrade, 2010). An extract from the level 4 standard descriptors is shown in Figure 1

Figure 1 - Extract from level 4 standard descriptors – Link to Full Level 4 Standard Descriptors document

It is likely that the criteria developed specifically for any particular assignment task will draw on a subset of appropriate descriptors at that level (CASQE, 2012).

Purpose of this paper
Teaching teams from two units on the PGC and MA in Academic Practice (PGCMAAP) programme were keen to use the standard descriptors to develop specific assessment criteria in the form of rubrics for the summative assessment tasks for these units. There also seemed to be an opportunity to reflect upon some of the reported benefits and potential challenges in the published literature associated with the use of rubrics.
These include:

- **Reliability**: Rubrics are considered to increase consistency of judgment when assessing performance and authentic tasks. This is in terms of awarding marks across a student cohort as well as between different markers (Jonsson & Svingby, 2007).

- **Validity**: Provision of a common assessment language was a central goal of the MMU standard descriptors. The language in the rubric is a matter of validity because an ambiguous rubric cannot be accurately or consistently interpreted by tutors marking assignments or students trying to understand their grades (Payne 2003 cited in Reddy & Andrade, 2010).

- **Clarity/Transparency**: There is growing evidence that use of rubrics improve instruction in relation to assessment by making expectations and criteria explicit (Andrade, 2007)

- **Provision of Feedback**: It is commonly reported that rubrics enable the provision of clear feedback that is easily targeted on ways to improve learning and attainment to the benefit of students (Reddy & Andrade, 2010).

The teams were also aware of what Bloxham and Boyd (2011) described as the ‘disjunction between stated policies and actual practices in higher education marking, particularly in relation to analytical, criterion-referenced grading’, and were keen to explore ways to show how policy and practice could be better aligned.

The PGCMAAP programmes use the Turnitin tool for the submission of assignments and the return of marks and feedback to students. Although both teams built and deployed rubrics in Turnitin (via the institutional VLE) this paper does not specifically reflect upon practical and technical aspects of this experience.

In this paper the teams will:

- Describe the assessment strategies for the two units.

- Reflect on the development and use of marking rubrics based on the MMU standard descriptors in respect of marking and feedback provision.

- Make recommendations to colleagues planning to develop and use their own rubrics based on the standard descriptors.
Overview of the units and their assessment strategies

Assessment in Higher Education

Assessment in HE is a 15 credit unit which can be taken as an option on the PGC or MA in Academic Practice. The assignment requires participants to review an existing assessment strategy for a unit or programme with which they are familiar, and make recommendations for enhancement. This activity is directly aligned to the unit learning outcomes. It is intended to be of wider value to the participant than simply gaining credit for their awards, and so participants are encouraged to submit their work in any format that may be useful to them. For example, participants might prepare the QA paperwork required to make a change to the assignment and submit that together with annotations showing how decisions have been made and are situated in the relevant literature. Alternatively, they might record a presentation that could be used with colleagues to explain the assignment review. Others may produce a traditional review report, comparing an existing approach with a proposal for change.

Whatever the style of the submission, the marking team needs to be able to take a consistent approach to determining grades. A marking rubric is appropriate for this kind of assignment at this level, because the marker is looking for certain key characteristics of the whole submission, irrespective of the format of the assignment.

The marking and feedback strategy for this assignment has the following elements:

1) Provision of annotations on the submission, using Turnitin QuickMarks and comments, if the submission is in an annotatable format

2) Audio feedback in Turnitin GradeMark to provide an overview

3) Use of a rubric in Turnitin GradeMark to determine and demonstrate mark allocation

See here for Full Assessment in Higher Education Assignment Brief.
Enhancing Learning Teaching and Assessment with Technology (ELTAT)

Enhancing Learning Teaching and Assessment with Technology is a 30 credit optional unit which has evolved and expanded in scale from a previous 10 credit unit, Designing Effective Blended and Online Learning (DEBOL), following the PGCMAAP programme review in 2013. The same team of four academics designed and delivered both units, although only 3 were involved in the marking and feedback process for the summative assessment. The reflections below relate to the use of marking rubrics for the assessment of both DEBOL in 2012/13 and ELTAT in 2013/14. The learning design and assessment strategy for both units is almost identical, differing primarily in scale. The assessment strategy embeds weekly formative activities in a developmental portfolio. This provides an evidence base for the summative assessment that requires the production of a plan/scheme of work to embed technology enhanced learning, teaching and assessment in practice and a reflective account of learning from the unit. The ongoing formative tasks take participants through a process of reviewing their current practice, evaluating the opportunities for using technology to enhance their practice, designing appropriate technology enhanced activities and planning to evaluate the effectiveness of proposed developments. Participants are expected to include their developmental portfolio as an appendix (not formally assessed) to their summative assignment and to cross reference to it in evidencing their thinking in relation to their planned development and reflections on their learning. For DEBOL the summative assessment was submitted in written format, however for ELTAT participants were offered the option of submitting their plan and reflections in either written or video format.

All written parts of the assignment (plan, reflections and appendices) are submitted as a single document to Turnitin. If a video reflection has been chosen this part is submitted via the Moodle video assignment tool with appendices submitted to Turnitin.

The marking and feedback strategy for this assignment has the following elements:

1) Annotation of the written submission using Turnitin Quickmarks
2) Inclusion of 1st Marker and 2nd Marker text comments to the General comments field in GradeMark

3) Provision of a short GradeMark audio comment on the overall assignment

4) Use of a GradeMark rubric to determine and demonstrate mark allocation

See here for Full ELTAT Assignment Brief.

Reflective process and analysis

Those involved in constructing and using the rubrics on both units wrote short (max 800 words) individual pieces reflecting upon their experiences. The individual reflections were shared with, and read by, everyone in the marking teams. Follow-up discussions within and across the teams identified key themes in the reflections. The written reflections and notes from the discussions were used to construct the collective reflections presented below.

Collective reflections

Approaches to constructing rubrics and marking practice

The teams followed different approaches to designing and constructing their rubrics. The first iteration of the rubric for Assessment in HE (See Appendix 1) picked five of the level 7 graduate outcomes (1,2,3,6 and 7) that matched to the requirements of the assignment and incorporated them into the rubric with very few changes to the wording. For example, the threshold pass for ‘Analysis’ was, ‘Novel and complex problems are solved with reference to theory and practice’, exactly the same as the standard descriptor.

In contrast the ELTAT team developed bespoke criteria based on the specific unit learning outcomes assessed by the assignment using the consistent language of the level 7 standard descriptors to articulate the attainment bands (see Appendix 2). This proved to be a complex process as the team recognised that some of the learning
outcomes had several components. For example, in relation to the learning outcome ‘Design constructively aligned learning, teaching and assessment strategies that embed technology effectively in their practice’, participants may have done a really good job in relation to constructive alignment but not been very clear on how they would embed technology or indeed vice versa. To address this, it was decided to separate out these two aspects into two component criteria. Consequently, each initial learning outcome was broken down into component criteria and a specific row articulating the attainment levels was constructed for each. This produced a complex looking and highly detailed rubric that initially intimidated some members of the marking team.

Despite the differences, both teams used consistent forms of language that are explicit in the standard descriptors in the descriptions of the attainment bands. For example, terms such as satisfactory, sufficient, adequate, descriptive are used to describe a threshold pass and terms such as creative, insightful, and authoritative are used to describe the highest attainment band in both rubrics.

The collective reflections suggest that the approaches to the design of the rubrics reflect the teams’ approach to marking, the characteristics of the assignments and different approaches to deploying the rubrics in Turnitin. For Assessment in HE, the team adopted a step-marking procedure (only using marks ending with 2, 5 and 8) i.e. only awarding three different mark points in each band. This marking practice can’t be accommodated within the grade calculation tool in Turnitin, so overall grades were calculated manually for each piece of work. In this respect, the rubric is used to provide an overall visualisation of the distribution of performance across the marking descriptors. This approach to using a rubric is best described as ‘holistic marking’ (Jonsson & Svingby, 2007).

The ELTAT team chose to set up their rubric in Turnitin so that it would calculate a mark. This is not the place to go into technical details about the way Turnitin marking rubrics are set up or how marks are calculated, but it is worth mentioning that marks allocated to each individual criteria were evenly weighted in a calculation to produce an overall mark for the assignment. It is fair to say that it took a few iterations to set up the rubric so that it calculated an
overall mark that the team felt best reflected the level of the portfolio. Even then, they agreed that it would be the decision of the individual markers whether to use the mark generated by the rubric or to use this as a guide in determining the mark themselves. The finished rubric had an extensive set of criteria that both described and gave a weighted mark for each level of attainment. In contrast to the Assessment in HE unit, the approach on ELTAT is best described as ‘analytical marking’ (Jonsson & Svingby, 2007).

'I would say that my initial perception of the marking rubric was of an exceptionally complex and unwieldy tool and I initially struggled to see how I would be able to use it effectively. After some discussions across the marking team I better understood the structure and rationale behind the rubric, and when I started using it for real, my concerns quickly disappeared.' - NR

**Reliability**
Both unit teams considered that the use of rubrics had helped them to mark consistently across the respective cohorts and within teams. For the majority of submissions, markers on both units came to very similar decisions about the quality of the work. In the small number of cases where there were disparities, the rubrics provided a very helpful framework to discuss and resolve issues. Overall, decisions about designing and using the rubrics to mark holistically (Assessment in Higher Education) or analytically (ELTAT) were largely a matter of preference of the marking teams. Our collective view is that the standard descriptors facilitated both approaches equally effectively.

'The rubrics streamlined the process of second marking and moderation and allowed me to easily align comments and feedback which other markers had provided with the attainment of the learning outcomes.' - NR

'It was apparent that we had all aligned our feedback to the criteria within the rubric and there were very few (only minor) modifications made to the original marks allocated' - SG
Validity

The unit level learning outcomes were an important aspect of both the holistic and analytical rubric approaches. For Assessment in HE, the unit learning outcomes became increasingly reflected in the marking criteria, following reflections/discussions over a couple of iterations. For ELTAT, the unit learning outcomes were used as specific criteria but the team found it necessary to unpick them into component parts that could be judged individually. The language of the rubric evolved in both approaches through an ongoing process of trialling, discussion and reflection on the experiences within the marking teams.

Previous studies of assessors and the marking process, particularly those that look at the use of criteria (e.g. Ecclestone 2001; Hanlon, Jefferson et al. 2004; Beattie, et al. 2008) emphasise that the existence of criteria is insufficient to achieve absolute objectivity and independent validity of marking decisions for most assessment tasks in higher education. Our experience reinforces this and shows that upfront and ongoing discussion around the development and use of the rubrics are an important factor in the construction of a valid rubric. Through these discussions, the teams gained a consistent view of what they were looking for in the assignment and a collective understanding of the language used to describe levels of attainment. As a result, both teams considered that the rubrics represented valid tools for measuring attainment in respect of the assessed tasks. This was also an important factor in determining the reliability of the rubric.

'It has taken three iterations to achieve a rubric that I think is sensitive enough to the individual assignment for making decisions with reasonable speed.' – RF

'Overall, I think the main benefit in the use of the rubric was having the detailed discussions about the assignment before undertaking the marking, rather than the usual practice of having difficult discussion about disparities between markers after marking the work. In other words we were all clear on what we were looking for from the start.' - RC
**Clarity/Transparency**

The rubrics were made available to participants on both units as part of the unit handbooks and within assignment briefs provided when the assignments were set. We haven’t looked in detail at how effective this has been in making expectations and criteria on the assessment task explicit to participants as suggested by Andrade (2007), however we are confident that we were able to have informed discussions with participants at the point that the assignment was being set. Furthermore, we are able to refer to the rubrics in ongoing dialogues while supporting the participants in completion of both regular formative tasks and their summative assignments. This is an area that needs to be looked at in greater detail in the future. Both teams are confident that using the rubrics enables them to produce feedback that enables students to understand how marks have been arrived at by the markers.

> 'Comments from students in relation to the feedback clearly demonstrate that they value the close alignment to the learning outcomes, and have been able to readily see the profile of attainment of learning outcomes across the unit and then link comments and feedback to these in a straightforward way.' - NR

**Provision of Feedback**

In relation to feedback provision, it is difficult to separate out the use of the rubric and the use of Turnitin. A key strength of Turnitin is that it enables the provision of rich, multi-layered feedback (QuickMarks, General Comments and Audio Recordings). Building and using the rubrics within Turnitin provides an additional layer to that richness. Within Turnitin the rubric provides an accessible and straightforward way of visualising the overall quality of the work across criteria. The quality descriptors within each cell of the rubric (see appendices 1 & 2) provided useful reference points for targeting both feedback on what was attained and feedforward on what could be done to move the work into a higher grade band. The ability to target developmental feedback in this way was a consistent theme in both teams’ reflections. Gratifyingly, the ELTAT unit was described as an “exemplary unit – excellent, feedforward feedback consistently applied across all submissions and markers. Feedback was
transparent and linked explicitly to the rubric.” by the external examiner for the PGCMAAP.

‘From a personal point of view, I find the use of the rubric makes marking judgements more straightforward and gives me more time to think about feedback.’ - RF

‘The response from participants on the unit has been overwhelmingly positive. They seem to value the depth and quality of the feedback they have received on their work and a number have taken the time and effort to contact the teaching team to thank them for this.’ - SG

Specific thoughts on use of Turnitin

Once set up the Turnitin rubrics are easy to use for marking and feedback, however the rubric editing and management tools in Turnitin are a bit clunky, making it more of a challenge to build and set up the rubrics in the first place. The rubrics used by ELTAT to calculate an overall mark are particularly tricky to set up and the overall mark produced is best seen as a guideline to help inform academic decision making, rather than a definitive mark.

Recommendations

Based on our experiences we make the following recommendations to programme and unit teams who are developing rubrics based on the MMU standard descriptors for use in their assessment and feedback practice.

- Construct the rubrics based on the standard descriptors at the same time as designing the assessment tasks.
- Be prepared to adapt the standard descriptor exemplar rubrics to meet the needs of individual assignments. This may involve:
  - Determining the marking teams’ preference for holistic or analytical marking and constructing the rubrics accordingly.
  - Changing the wording of the quality descriptors to reflect better the requirements of the specific assignment task and to align with unit level learning outcomes. It is
helpful to make use of the consistent language in the standard descriptors in making these changes.

- Involve all members of the marking and moderation team in the design and development of the rubric i.e. have difficult conversations about expectations of the assignment before undertaking the marking.
- Ensure that all markers and moderators fully understand their role in the assessment process.
- Ensure that the unit learning outcomes, MMU standards descriptors and the specific assignment rubric are shared with students as part of a detailed assignment brief at the start of the unit.
- Explain in detail to students how the marking team will make use of the rubric in assessing their assignments and refer to it frequently while supporting students in completion of their assignment.
- Be prepared to fine-tune the rubric over several iterations based on staff and student experience and ongoing reflection.

References


http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602930902862859 [Last accessed March, 2015]
## Appendix 1: Assessment in HE Rubric 2013-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate outcome:</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86%-100%</td>
<td>Your assessment strategy is novel, creative and feasible.</td>
<td>Your assessment strategy is presented creatively and persuasively in a way which is accessible to colleagues</td>
<td>A complex and innovative assessment strategy is produced, which synthesises useful information from a wide range of appropriate sources to produce original outcomes of publishable standards</td>
<td>You have critically evaluated the social and community contexts of the discipline in developing a creative assessment strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%-85%</td>
<td>Your assessment strategy is imaginative and feasible.</td>
<td>Your assessment strategy is presented convincingly and fluently to a defined audience in a way which is accessible to colleagues</td>
<td>A complex assessment strategy is produced which gathers useful information from a wide range of appropriate sources and synthesises the results to produce imaginative outcomes</td>
<td>You have critically evaluated the social and community contexts of the discipline in developing an imaginative assessment strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%-69%</td>
<td>Your assessment strategy is interesting and feasible, but may not be novel.</td>
<td>Your assessment strategy is presented confidently and coherently in a way which is accessible to colleagues</td>
<td>A complex assessment strategy is produced which gathers useful information from appropriate sources and synthesises the results</td>
<td>You have carefully analysed the social and community contexts of the discipline in developing a feasible assessment strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%-59%</td>
<td>Your assessment strategy is appropriate and feasible.</td>
<td>Your assessment strategy is presented clearly and appropriately in a way which is accessible to colleagues</td>
<td>An assessment strategy is produced which gathers information from appropriate sources and synthesises the results</td>
<td>You have considered the social and community contexts of the discipline in developing a basic assessment strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%-49%</td>
<td>Your assessment strategy is not appropriate to context or level, or is not feasible.</td>
<td>Your assessment strategy is unclear and confused</td>
<td>There is a partial attempt to produce an assessment strategy which gathers information from appropriate sources</td>
<td>There is partial or limited identification of the social and community contexts of the discipline in developing an assessment strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%-44%</td>
<td>Your assessment strategy is not appropriate or feasible.</td>
<td>Your assessment strategy is unclear and inappropriate</td>
<td>Limited attempt to produce an assessment strategy which gathers information from appropriate sources</td>
<td>There is limited or incorrect identification of the social and community contexts of the discipline in developing an assessment strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-19%</td>
<td>There is little or no evidence of any attempt to develop an appropriate, feasible assessment strategy.</td>
<td>Your assessment strategy is unclear and inappropriate and does not use appropriate strategies or media</td>
<td>Little or no attempt to plan an assessment strategy which gathers information from appropriate sources</td>
<td>There is little or no identification of the social and community contexts of the discipline in developing an assessment strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2: ELTAT Rubric 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome: On completion of the unit participants should be able to:</th>
<th>Fail 0%-19%</th>
<th>Fail + 20%-44%</th>
<th>CF 45%-49%</th>
<th>Pass 50%-59%</th>
<th>Merit 60%-69%</th>
<th>Distinction 70%-85%</th>
<th>Distinction + 86%-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assess the potential of technology to enhance their current learning, teaching and assessment practice</strong></td>
<td>Overall: Assessment of potential technology</td>
<td>No assessment of potential technology</td>
<td>A superficial assessment of potential technology</td>
<td>A partial assessment of potential technology</td>
<td>Adequate assessment of potential technology</td>
<td>A clear and detailed assessment of potential technology</td>
<td>A rigorous and authoritative assessment of potential technology to enhance their current practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis/reflect on current provision</td>
<td>No analysis/reflect on current provision</td>
<td>A superficial analysis/reflect on current provision</td>
<td>A partial analysis/reflect on current provision</td>
<td>Adequate evaluation analysis/reflect on current provision</td>
<td>A clear and detailed analysis/reflect on current provision</td>
<td>A rigorous analysis on current/reflect provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment of potential technology linked to practice</td>
<td>No assessment of potential technology</td>
<td>Assessment of potential technology not linked to current/proposed practice</td>
<td>Assessment of potential technology linked to some but not all aspects of current/proposed practice</td>
<td>Assessment of potential technology clearly linked to all main aspects of current/proposed practice</td>
<td>Assessment of potential technology rigorously linked to all aspects of current/proposed practice</td>
<td>Assessment of potential technology meticulously and authoritatively linked to all aspects of current/proposed practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of detail in assessment of potential technology</td>
<td>No assessment provided</td>
<td>Assessment lacking detail in most aspects</td>
<td>Assessment lacking detail in some aspects</td>
<td>Clear assessment but limited in scope</td>
<td>Thoroughly detailed assessment</td>
<td>Rigorously detailed assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design constructively aligned learning, teaching and assessment strategies that embed technology effectively in their practice.</strong></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>No design provided</td>
<td>Proposed design is superficial</td>
<td>Proposed design lacks detail in a few key areas</td>
<td>The design adequately describes the proposal</td>
<td>The design thoroughly describes the proposal</td>
<td>The design meticulously articulates an original proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constructively alignment</td>
<td>No attempt to constructively align the proposed learning, teaching and assessment strategy</td>
<td>A superficial attempt to constructively align the proposed learning, teaching and assessment strategy</td>
<td>A partial attempt to constructively align the proposed learning, teaching and assessment strategy</td>
<td>Adequate attempt to constructively align the proposed learning, teaching and assessment strategy</td>
<td>A clear and detailed attempt to constructively align the proposed learning, teaching and assessment strategy</td>
<td>A rigorous attempt to constructively align the proposed learning, teaching and assessment strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRADE CATEGORIES:
- **0% - 19%**: Fail
- **20% - 44%**: Fail +
- **45% - 49%**: CF
- **50% - 59%**: Pass
- **60% - 69%**: Merit
- **70% - 85%**: Distinction
- **86% - 100%**: Distinction +

**Improvement Areas**:
- **0% - 19%**: No attempt to constructively align the proposed learning, teaching and assessment strategy
- **20% - 44%**: Superficial attempt to constructively align the proposed learning, teaching and assessment strategy
- **45% - 49%**: Partial attempt to constructively align the proposed learning, teaching and assessment strategy
- **50% - 59%**: Adequate attempt to constructively align the proposed learning, teaching and assessment strategy
- **60% - 69%**: Clear attempt to constructively align the proposed learning, teaching and assessment strategy
- **70% - 85%**: Rigorous attempt to constructively align the proposed learning, teaching and assessment strategy
- **86% - 100%**: Thoroughly detailed attempt to constructively align the proposed learning, teaching and assessment strategy

**Analysis/Reflection**:
- **0% - 19%**: No analysis/reflect on current provision
- **20% - 44%**: Superficial analysis/reflect on current provision
- **45% - 49%**: Partial analysis/reflect on current provision
- **50% - 59%**: Adequate evaluation analysis/reflect on current provision
- **60% - 69%**: Clear evaluation analysis/reflect on current provision
- **70% - 85%**: Rigorous evaluation analysis/reflect on current provision
- **86% - 100%**: Thoroughly detailed analysis/reflect on current provision

**Detail in Most/Limited in Scope**:
- **0% - 19%**: No assessment of potential technology
- **20% - 44%**: Superficial assessment of potential technology
- **45% - 49%**: Partial assessment of potential technology
- **50% - 59%**: Adequate assessment of potential technology
- **60% - 69%**: Clear assessment of potential technology
- **70% - 85%**: Rigorous assessment of potential technology
- **86% - 100%**: Thoroughly detailed assessment of potential technology
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome: On completion of the unit participants should be able to:</th>
<th>Fail 0%-19%</th>
<th>Fail + 20%-44%</th>
<th>CF 45%-49%</th>
<th>Pass 50%-59%</th>
<th>Merit 60%-69%</th>
<th>Distinction 70%-85%</th>
<th>Distinction + 86%-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embedding of technology</td>
<td>No design provided</td>
<td>Design does not clearly describe how technology will be embedded in practice</td>
<td>Design lacks details in a few key areas about how technology will be embedded in practice</td>
<td>The design describes the main aspects of how technology will be embedded in practice</td>
<td>The design thoroughly describes all aspects of how technology will be embedded in practice</td>
<td>The design rigorously describes all aspects of how technology will be embedded in practice</td>
<td>The design is original and meticulously describes all aspects of how technology will be embedded in practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>No action plan provided</td>
<td>A superficial action plan provided</td>
<td>A partial action plan provided</td>
<td>An adequate action plan provided</td>
<td>A clear and detailed action plan provided</td>
<td>A highly detailed and rigorous action plan provided</td>
<td>A meticulously detailed and authoritative action plan provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan detail</td>
<td>No plan provided</td>
<td>The plan is lacking detail in most aspects</td>
<td>Plan is lacking detail in some aspects</td>
<td>The plan is clear but limited in scope</td>
<td>The plan is thoroughly detailed in most aspects.</td>
<td>The plan is rigorously detailed in most aspects.</td>
<td>The plan is meticulously detailed in all aspects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections on achievability</td>
<td>No reflections provided on the achievability of the action plan</td>
<td>Reflections on achievability unrealistic in most aspects</td>
<td>Reflections on achievability unrealistic in some aspects</td>
<td>Reflections on achievability generally realistic</td>
<td>Reflections on achievability consistently realistic</td>
<td>Reflections on achievability realistic and alternatives explored</td>
<td>Reflections on achievability realistic and alternatives explored in detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>No evaluation strategy is provided</td>
<td>A superficial evaluation strategy is provided</td>
<td>A partial evaluation strategy is provided</td>
<td>Adequate evaluation strategy is provided</td>
<td>A clear and detailed evaluation strategy is provided</td>
<td>A rigorous evaluation strategy is provided</td>
<td>A rigorous and authoritative evaluation strategy is provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of evaluation not provided</td>
<td>Purpose of evaluation is vague and lacking in detail</td>
<td>Purpose of evaluation unclear in some aspects and lacks detail</td>
<td>Purpose of the evaluation is clear but lacks detail in some aspects</td>
<td>Purpose of the evaluation is clear and detailed in all aspects</td>
<td>Purpose of the evaluation is clear and meticulously detailed and authoritative.</td>
<td>Purpose of the evaluation is clear, meticulously detailed and authoritative.</td>
<td>Purpose of the evaluation is clear, meticulously detailed and authoritative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>No evaluation data sources identified from relevant stakeholders</td>
<td>Only one or two data sources identified for a limited set of stakeholders</td>
<td>Some data sources omitted from one or two key stakeholders</td>
<td>Main data sources from key stakeholders identified</td>
<td>A range of data sources for key stakeholders identified</td>
<td>A wide range of data sources for all stakeholders identified</td>
<td>An extensive range of stakeholders for all stakeholders identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome: On completion of the unit participants should be able to:</td>
<td>Fail 0%-19%</td>
<td>Fail + 20%-44%</td>
<td>CF 45%-49%</td>
<td>Pass 50%-59%</td>
<td>Merit 60%-69%</td>
<td>Distinction 70%-85%</td>
<td>Distinction + 86%-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Communication of work is unclear and inappropriate to a defined audience and does not use appropriate strategies or media</td>
<td>Communication of work is unclear and inappropriate to a defined audience and does not consistently use appropriate strategies or media</td>
<td>Communication of the outcomes of their work is unclear and confused and does not consistently use appropriate strategies or media</td>
<td>The outcomes of their work are presented clearly and appropriately to a defined audience using a range of strategies and media</td>
<td>The outcomes of their work are presented confidently and coherently to a defined audience using an interesting range of appropriately selected strategies and media</td>
<td>The outcomes of their work are presented convincingly and persuasively to multiple audiences using a wide range of appropriately selected strategies and media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Most required elements of the Portfolio are missing</td>
<td>Some required elements of the Portfolio are missing</td>
<td>One or two required elements of the Portfolio are missing</td>
<td>All of the required elements of the Portfolio are included with some lacking in detail</td>
<td>All of the required elements of the Portfolio are included in detail</td>
<td>All of the required elements of the Portfolio are included in meticulous detail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>The Portfolio is devoid of meaningful structure</td>
<td>The Portfolio is poorly structured and difficult to follow</td>
<td>The Portfolio is lacking in structure and difficult to follow in places</td>
<td>The Portfolio has a good basic structure and flow</td>
<td>The Portfolio is well structured and flows effectively</td>
<td>The Portfolio has a strong structure and flows very well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to Appendices</td>
<td>Reflections devoid of links to appendices</td>
<td>Links to appendices evident in few aspects of reflections</td>
<td>Links to appendices evident in some but not all aspects of reflections</td>
<td>Reflections clearly linked to appendices for most aspects of reflections.</td>
<td>Reflections thoroughly linked to appendices for all aspects of reflections.</td>
<td>Reflections rigorously linked to appendices for all aspects of reflections.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of supporting literature</td>
<td>Little or no use of supporting literature</td>
<td>Limited use of supporting literature</td>
<td>Insufficient use of supporting literature</td>
<td>Appropriate use of supporting literature</td>
<td>Effective use of supporting literature</td>
<td>Extensive use of supporting literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard referencing technique</td>
<td>Work does not implement the required referencing technique</td>
<td>Limited implementation of the required referencing technique</td>
<td>Work partially implements the required referencing technique</td>
<td>Work adequate implements the required referencing technique</td>
<td>Work thoroughly implements the required referencing technique</td>
<td>Work rigorously implements the required referencing technique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presentation should be appropriate for masters level work (Spelling, grammar, logical, coherent, clarity, fluency, structure, citations correct and appropriate and bibliography correctly constructed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>