

[From: Norwich Business School UG Student Handbook, 2014-15]

11. Assessment

11.1. Types of Assessment

You will have a range of forms of assessment during your time in Norwich Business School. The school has three classes of assessment

- **Diagnostic** assessment which is designed to help us to understand your strengths and weaknesses at the start of the course and put in place appropriate support for you. These marks do not count towards progression or your final degree but if you do not undertake diagnostic assessment you will miss out on useful support that will improve your grades.
- **Formative** assessment which is designed to enable you to practice using the skills and knowledge that you have acquired or developed on the course and to receive feedback on your progress and “feed-forward” – guidance on what to do to improve your performance. Formative assessment does not count for progression or your degree but if you fail to undertake formative assessment you are missing out on an important opportunity to improve your performance and you may be in breach of the University’s General regulation 13 which covers engagement with your studies.
- **Summative** assessment which is designed to test your learning on the course. The marks from summative assessment do count for progression and, in years 2 and 3, towards your degree classification. Remember that students in years 1 and 2 will need to pass every module before they are allowed to progress.

11.2. Assessment marking schedule

Both examinations and coursework are marked on a standard scale throughout the University. The scale is:

Total Mark (%)	Equivalent Degree Classification
100.00-70.00	I
69.99-60.00	II (i)
59.99-50.00	II (ii)
49.99-40.00	III
39.99-00.00	Fail

Degree classification is determined at a final examiners’ meeting, attended by external examiners from other universities. They act in accordance with the Instructions to Examiners (a copy of which is available in the Central Student Handbook, which is accessible through the Student Portal). The final degree classification is not obtained solely by a mechanical application of these rules to the marks obtained for the modules taken. The examiners may take other relevant information into account in arriving at the classification.

11.3. Guidelines for Assessment

All course work and examination marks are expressed in percentages. These numerical grades are defined against the criteria set down by the university in what are known as the “senate scales”. For example, the senate scale for coursework defines work which is awarded a mark in the range of 60-69% as “Coursework is ‘good’ in most areas and strong in some.” It goes on to provide more detailed criteria for work in this band as follows:

Learning outcomes & scholarship

- 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 1st class piece.

Presentation

- A good standard of presentation: clear, mostly logical, and errors are mostly very minor.

Argument & understanding

- 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.

Criticality & analysis

- 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.

Use of sources and evidence

- The student draws on a good range of material but lacks the breadth of engagement with the secondary literature required to achieve a 1st class mark. Good use of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Partial awareness of the limits of evidence.

Academic referencing

- 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.

Written communication

- A good standard of written English, with only minor errors present.

The full senate scales (and much more information on assessment) can be found at

www.uea.ac.uk/learningandteaching/documents/assessment/

and in the Student Performance Accelerator Workbook.

A close study of the criteria will enable you to understand the standards that you should be aiming at in coursework and help you to interpret the marks that you are awarded.

When coursework is set, details about what is required for that piece of work will be provided. If you are uncertain about something, you should seek advice from the module organiser as soon as possible, and not leave this until just before the deadline for submitting the work.

[Out of scope of request]

[Out of scope of request]

13. Other Assessment Issues

13.1. Submission of Coursework

Summative coursework is required to be submitted for marking which will count towards your module and degree results. You may submit your coursework in paper at your Hub or you may be able to submit online depending on the type of work undertaken. Make sure you are aware of the rules regarding coursework submission (see below) as penalties will be applied for missed deadlines, etc.

Formative coursework is marked but does not contribute to your degree result. The majority of formative work will be submitted in class but you may also be asked to submit through your Hub. You will be advised of the deadlines for formative work by your Module Organiser and/or in your module outlines.

Submission Regulations and Guidelines

Before submitting any type of work you should ensure you know the rules for each assignment and how to submit your work correctly. The [Student guide to coursework submission and return](#) outlines all you need to know regarding submission of your work, including:

- Penalties for late submission
- Electronic submission
- [Extensions](#)
- [Word Count / Limits](#)

It is available to view at

http://www.uea.ac.uk/learningandteaching/documents/assessment/StudentGuide_CourseworkSubmissionandReturn

The University's policy on submission and return of summative coursework is available to view at [https://intranet.uea.ac.uk/calendar/section3/regs\(gen\)/submission-of-work-for-assessment-\(taught-programmes\)](https://intranet.uea.ac.uk/calendar/section3/regs(gen)/submission-of-work-for-assessment-(taught-programmes))

[Out of scope of request]

13.9. Penalties on late submission

The deadline for submission of coursework is 15:00 (3pm) on the submission/due day.

Work submitted	Marks deducted
After 15:00 on the due date and before 15:00 on the day following the due date	10 marks
After 15:00 on the second day after the due date and before 15:00 on the third day after the due date	20 marks
After 15:00 on the third day after the due date and before 15:00 on the 20th day after the due date.	All the marks the work merits if submitted on time (i.e. no marks awarded)
After 20 working days	Work will not be marked and a mark of zero will be entered.

Please note that the deadline represents the last time that a piece of work can be submitted, and not a target. You are advised to plan ahead, and submit work well in advance of the deadline. This will help to ensure that any last minute delays do not result in late submission. Failure to submit on time without an approved extension will result in a penalty for late submission.

13.10. Penalties for Exceeding the Word Limit

A penalty is imposed for exceeding the word limit. The policy also clarifies what should be included and excluded in the word count. Students must include their word count on the coursework coversheet when they submit their work. Specifically, where appropriate:

- The word limit for assignments will be clearly published, normally in the assessment title.
- Assessment outlines / marking criteria will include a requirement to answer the task / question in a specified number of words
- The word count for coursework, written assignments, projects, reports and dissertations shall include: Footnotes and endnotes, references (in the main text), tables and illustrations and if applicable the abstract, title page and contents page. Any appendicised material and the bibliography or reference list shall be excluded from the word count. Where it is agreed that bibliographic referencing will take the form of footnotes and/or endnotes this will not be included in the word count - any additional notes within the body of the text will be counted.

Penalties for exceeding the word limit:

Up to 10% over word limit	No Penalty
10% or more over the word limit	Deduction of 10 marks off original mark
Failure to provide an electronic copy when requested	Mark capped to the pass mark
Intentional misrepresentation of the word count on the coversheet	Mark capped to the pass mark

NOTE:

1. When the original mark is within 10 marks of the pass mark, the penalty will be capped at the pass mark
2. Original marks below the pass mark will not be penalised

13.11. Guidelines on Proof Reading

The University acknowledges that in some circumstances proofreading (technical correction) can form a

Appendix 2 Marking Descriptors for Coursework (“Senate Scales”)

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
90-100% Exemplary 1st <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.
80-89% High 1st <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
70-79% 1st <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
60-69% 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 1st 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 1st 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

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
50-59% Pass 2(ii) Coursework is 'good' in some areas but only satisfactory in others. Good intellectual engagement but execution flawed	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.
40-49% Pass 3rd Coursework is only satisfactory in most areas and weak in some others. Modest evidence of intellectual engagement	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.
<p>****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.</p>							
35-39% Marginal Fail Coursework is barely 'satisfactory' in a few areas and weak in most others.	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

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
20-34% Fail Coursework is weak in most areas.	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
10-19% Fail Coursework is very weak in most areas.	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
0-9% Fail Coursework is very weak in all areas.	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.	No evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation.	No understanding is demonstrated. Arguments notable for their complete absence.	The treatment is wholly descriptive	Evidence absent Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citation entirely absent. Bibliography omitted. Application of the mechanics of scholarship entirely absent.	Incomprehensible. No attempt to compose proper sentences or paragraphs

[Out of scope of request]

11. Assessment

11.1. Types of Assessment

You will have a range of forms of assessment during your time in Norwich Business School. The school has three classes of assessment:

- **Diagnostic** assessment which is designed to help us to understand your strengths and weaknesses at the start of the course and put in place appropriate support for you. These marks do not count towards progression or your final degree but if you do not undertake diagnostic assessment you will miss out on useful support that will improve your grades.
- **Formative** assessment which is designed to enable you to practice using the skills and knowledge that you have acquired or developed on the course and to receive feedback on your progress and “feed-forward” – guidance on what to do to improve your performance. Formative assessment does not count for progression or your degree but if you fail to undertake formative assessment you are missing out on an important opportunity to improve your performance and you may be in breach of the University’s General regulation 13 which covers engagement with your studies.
- **Summative** assessment which is designed to test your learning on the course. The marks from summative assessment do count for progression and, in years 2 and 3, towards your degree classification. Remember that students in years 1 and 2 will need to pass every module before they are allowed to progress. **If a student does fail a module, the Board of Examiners may offer a reassessment opportunity which would be in any components of the module for which the student did not achieve a pass mark.**

11.2. Assessment marking schedule

Both examinations and coursework are marked on a standard scale throughout the University. The scale is:

Total Mark (%)	Equivalent Degree Classification
100.00-70.00	I
69.99-60.00	II (i)
59.99-50.00	II (ii)
49.99-40.00	III
39.99-00.00	Fail

Degree classification is determined at a final examiners' meeting, attended by external examiners from other universities. They act in accordance with the Instructions to Examiners (a copy of which is available in the Central Student Handbook, which is accessible through the Student Portal). The final degree classification is not obtained solely by a mechanical application of these rules to the marks obtained for the modules taken. The examiners may take other relevant information into account in arriving at the classification.

Please note that the University may also award a 'Starred First'. For this award, the Board of Examiners will consider the performance of all Honours Degree students recommended for a first class Honours Degree. At its discretion, the Board may indicate with a star those students whose performance displays exceptional merit, in line with the Board's published criteria.

11.3. Guidelines for Assessment

All course work and examination marks are expressed in percentages. These numerical grades are defined against the criteria set down by the University in what are known as the "senate scales". For example, the senate scale for coursework defines work which is awarded a mark in the range of 60-69% as "Coursework is 'good' in most areas and strong in some." It goes on to provide more detailed criteria for work in this band as follows:

Learning outcomes & scholarship

- 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 1st class piece.

Presentation

- A good standard of presentation: clear, mostly logical, and errors are mostly very minor.

Argument & understanding

- 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.

Criticality & analysis

- 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.

Use of sources and evidence

- The student draws on a good range of material but lacks the breadth of engagement with the secondary literature required to achieve a 1st class mark. Good use of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Partial awareness of the limits of evidence.

Academic referencing

- 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.

Written communication

- A good standard of written English, with only minor errors present.

The full senate scales (and much more information on assessment) can be found at:

www.uea.ac.uk/learningandteaching/documents/assessment/

And in the Student Performance Accelerator Workbook.

A close study of the criteria will enable you to understand the standards that you should be aiming at in coursework and help you to interpret the marks that you are awarded.

When coursework is set, details about what is required for that piece of work will be provided. If you are uncertain about something, you should seek advice from the module organiser as soon as possible, and not leave this until just before the deadline for submitting the work.

[Out of scope of request]

13. Other Assessment Issues

13.1. Submission of Coursework

Summative coursework is required to be submitted for marking which will count towards your module and degree results. Electronic submission of assignments will be set up for all assignments except those that need to be handed in in paper at the Hub, such as portfolios or worksheets. Make sure you are aware of the rules regarding coursework submission (see below) as penalties will be applied for missed deadlines, etc.

Formative coursework is marked but does not contribute to your degree result. The majority of formative work will be submitted in class but you may also be asked to submit through your Hub. You will be advised of the deadlines for formative work by your Module Organiser and/or in your module outlines.

Submission Regulations and Guidelines

Before submitting any type of work you should ensure you know the rules for each assignment and how to submit your work correctly. The [Student guide to coursework submission and return](#) outlines all you need to know regarding submission of your work, including:

- Penalties for late submission
- Electronic submission
- [Extensions](#)
- [Word Count / Limits](#)

It is available to view at

http://www.uea.ac.uk/learningandteaching/documents/assessment/StudentGuide_CourseworkSubmissionandReturn

The University's policy on submission and return of summative coursework is available to view at

<https://portal.uea.ac.uk/documents/6207125/7465906/Section+3+Submission+of+Work+for+Assessment+-+Taught+Programmes.pdf>

[Out of scope of request]

13.9. Penalties on late submission

The deadline for submission of coursework is 15:00 (3pm) on the submission/due day.

Work submitted	Marks deducted
After 15:00 on the due date and before 15:00 on the day following the due date	10 marks
After 15:00 on the second day after the due date and before 15:00 on the third day after the due date	20 marks
After 15:00 on the third day after the due date and before 15:00 on the 20th day after the due date.	All the marks the work merits if submitted on time (i.e. no marks awarded)
After 20 working days	Work will not be marked and a mark of zero will be entered.

Please note that the deadline represents the last time that a piece of work can be submitted, and not a target. You are advised to plan ahead, and submit work well in advance of the deadline. This will help to ensure that any last minute delays do not result in late submission. Failure to submit on time without an approved extension will result in a penalty for late submission.

13.10. Penalties for Exceeding the Word Limit

A penalty is imposed for exceeding the word limit. The policy also clarifies what should be included and excluded in the word count. Students must include their word count on the coursework coversheet when they submit their work. Specifically, where appropriate:

- The word limit for assignments will be clearly published, normally in the assessment title.
- Assessment outlines / marking criteria will include a requirement to answer the task / question in a specified number of words
- The word count for coursework, written assignments, projects, reports and dissertations shall include: Footnotes and endnotes, references (in the main text), tables and illustrations and if applicable the abstract, title page and contents page. Any appendicised material and the bibliography or reference list shall be excluded from the word count. Where it is agreed that bibliographic referencing will take the form of footnotes and/or endnotes this will not be included in the word count - any additional notes within the body of the text will be counted.

Penalties for exceeding the word limit:

Up to 10% over word limit	No Penalty
10% or more over the word limit	Deduction of 10 marks off original mark
Failure to provide an electronic copy when requested	Mark capped to the pass mark
Intentional misrepresentation of the word count on the coversheet	Mark capped to the pass mark

NOTE:

1. When the original mark is within 10 marks of the pass mark, the penalty will be capped at the pass mark
2. Original marks below the pass mark will not be penalised

Appendix 2 Marking Descriptors for Coursework (“Senate Scales”)

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
90-100% Exemplary 1st Coursework is ‘exemplary’ in most areas	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.
80-89% High 1st Coursework is strong in most areas and may be exemplary in some	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
70-79% 1st Coursework is strong in most areas	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
60-69% Pass 2(i) Coursework is ‘good’ in most areas and strong in some.	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 1st 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 and 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 1st 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

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
50-59% Pass 2(ii) Coursework is 'good' in some areas but only satisfactory in others. Good intellectual engagement but execution flawed.	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.
40-49% Pass 3rd Coursework is only satisfactory in most areas and weak in some others. Modest evidence of intellectual engagement	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.
**** 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.							
35-39% Marginal Fail Coursework is barely 'satisfactory' in a few areas and weak in most others.	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

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
20-34% Fail Coursework is weak in most areas.	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
10-19% Fail Coursework is very weak in most areas.	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
0-9% Fail Coursework is very weak in all areas.	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.	No evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation.	No understanding is demonstrated. Arguments notable for their complete absence.	The treatment is wholly descriptive	Evidence absent Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citation entirely absent. Bibliography omitted. Application of the mechanics of scholarship entirely absent.	Incomprehensible. No attempt to compose proper sentences or paragraphs

[Out of scope of request]

11. Assessment

11.1. Types of Assessment

You will have a range of forms of assessment during your time in Norwich Business School. The school has three types of assessment:

- **Diagnostic** assessment which is designed to help us to understand your strengths and weaknesses at the start of the course and put in place appropriate support for you. These marks do not count towards progression or your final degree but if you do not undertake diagnostic assessment you will miss out on useful support that will improve your grades.
- **Formative** assessment which is designed to enable you to practice using the skills and knowledge that you have acquired or developed on the course and to receive feedback on your progress and “feed-forward” – guidance on what to do to improve your performance. Formative assessment does not count for progression or your degree but if you fail to undertake formative assessment you are missing out on an important opportunity to improve your performance and you may be in breach of the University’s General regulation 13 which covers engagement with your studies.
- **Summative** assessment which is designed to test your learning on the course. The marks from summative assessment do count for progression and, in years 2 and 3, towards your degree classification. Remember that students in years 1 and 2 will need to pass every module before they are allowed to progress. If a student does fail a module, the Board of Examiners may offer a reassessment opportunity which would be in any components of the module for which the student did not achieve a pass mark.

11.2. Assessment marking schedule

Both examinations and coursework are marked on a standard scale throughout the University. The scale is:

Total Mark (%)	Equivalent Degree Classification
100.00-70.00	I
69.99-60.00	II (i)
59.99-50.00	II (ii)
49.99-40.00	III
39.99-00.00	Fail

Degree classification is determined at a final examiners’ meeting, attended by external examiners from other universities. They act in accordance with the Instructions to Examiners (a copy of which is available in the Central Student Handbook, which is accessible through the Student Portal). The final

degree classification is not obtained solely by a mechanical application of these rules to the marks obtained for the modules taken. The examiners may take other relevant information into account in arriving at the classification.

Please note that the University may also award a 'Starred First'. For this award, the Board of Examiners will consider the performance of all Honours Degree students recommended for a first class Honours Degree. At its discretion, the Board may indicate with a star those students whose performance displays exceptional merit, in line with the Board's published criteria.

11.3. Guidelines for Assessment

All course work and examination marks are expressed in percentages. These numerical grades are defined against the criteria set down by the University in what are known as the "senate scales". For example, the senate scale for coursework defines work which is awarded a mark in the range of 60-69% as "Coursework is 'good' in most areas and strong in some." It goes on to provide more detailed criteria for work in this band as follows:

Learning outcomes & scholarship

- 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 1st class piece.

Presentation

- A good standard of presentation: clear, mostly logical, and errors are mostly very minor.

Argument & understanding

- 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.

Criticality & analysis

- 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.

Use of sources and evidence

- The student draws on a good range of material but lacks the breadth of engagement with the secondary literature required to achieve a 1st class mark. Good use of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Partial awareness of the limits of evidence.

Academic referencing

- 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.

Written communication

- A good standard of written English, with only minor errors present.

The full senate scales (and much more information on assessment) can be found at:

<https://portal.uea.ac.uk/learning-and-teaching/docs/assessment> and in the Student Performance Accelerator Workbook.

A close study of the criteria will enable you to understand the standards that you should be aiming at in coursework and help you to interpret the marks that you are awarded.

When coursework is set, details about what is required for that piece of work will be provided. If you are uncertain about something, you should seek advice from the module organiser as soon as possible, and not leave this until just before the deadline for submitting the work.

[Out of scope of request]

[Out of scope of request]

13. Other Assessment Issues

13.1. Submission of Coursework

Summative coursework is required to be submitted for marking which will count towards your module and degree results. Electronic submission of assignments will be set up for all assignments except those that need to be handed in in paper at the UG Hub, such as portfolios or worksheets. Make sure you are

aware of the rules regarding coursework submission (see below) as penalties will be applied for missed deadlines, etc.

Formative coursework is marked but does not contribute to your degree result. The majority of formative work will be submitted in class but you may also be asked to submit through your Hub. You will be advised of the deadlines for formative work by your Module Organiser and/or in your module outlines.

Submission Regulations and Guidelines

Before submitting any type of work you should ensure you know the rules for each assignment and how to submit your work correctly. The [Student guide to coursework submission and return](#) outlines all you need to know regarding submission of your work, including:

- Penalties for late submission
- Electronic submission
- [Extensions](#)
- [Word Count / Limits](#)

It is available to view at

http://www.uea.ac.uk/learningandteaching/documents/assessment/StudentGuide_CourseworkSubmissionandReturn

The University's policy on submission and return of summative coursework is available to view at

<https://portal.uea.ac.uk/documents/6207125/7465906/Section+3+Submission+of+Work+for+Assessment+-+Taught+Programmes.pdf>

[Out of scope of request]

13.9. Penalties on late submission

The deadline for submission of coursework is 15:00 (3pm) on the submission/due day.

Work submitted	Marks deducted
After 15:00 on the due date and before 15:00 on the day following the due date	10 marks
After 15:00 on the second day after the due date and before 15:00 on the third day after the due date	20 marks
After 15:00 on the third day after the due date and before 15:00 on the 20th day after the due date.	All the marks the work merits if submitted on time (i.e. no marks awarded)
After 20 working days	Work will not be marked and a mark of zero will be entered.

Please note that the deadline represents the last time that a piece of work can be submitted, and not a target. You are advised to plan ahead, and submit work well in advance of the deadline. This will help to ensure that any last minute delays do not result in late submission. Failure to submit on time without an approved extension will result in a penalty for late submission.

13.10. Penalties for Exceeding the Word Limit

A penalty is imposed for exceeding the word limit. The policy also clarifies what should be included and excluded in the word count. Students must include their word count on the coursework coversheet when they submit their work. Specifically, where appropriate:

- The word limit for assignments will be clearly published, normally in the assessment title.
- Assessment outlines / marking criteria will include a requirement to answer the task / question in a specified number of words
- The word count for coursework, written assignments, projects, reports and dissertations shall include: Footnotes and endnotes, references (in the main text), tables and illustrations and if applicable the abstract, title page and contents page. Any appendicised material and the bibliography or reference list shall be excluded from the word count. Where it is agreed that bibliographic referencing will take the form of footnotes and/or endnotes this will not be included in the word count - any additional notes within the body of the text will be counted.

Penalties for exceeding the word limit:

Up to 10% over word limit	No Penalty
10% or more over the word limit	Deduction of 10 marks off original mark
Failure to provide an electronic copy when requested	Mark capped to the pass mark
Intentional misrepresentation of the word count on the coversheet	Mark capped to the pass mark

NOTE:

1. When the original mark is within 10 marks of the pass mark, the penalty will be capped at the pass mark
2. Original marks below the pass mark will not be penalised

[Out of scope of request]

Appendix 2: Marking Descriptors for Coursework (“Senate Scales”)

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
90-100% Exemplary 1st <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.
80-89% High 1st <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
70-79% 1st <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
60-69% 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 1st 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 1st 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

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
50-59% Pass 2(ii) Coursework is 'good' in some areas but only satisfactory in others. Good intellectual engagement but execution flawed.	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.
40-49% Pass 3rd Coursework is only satisfactory in most areas and weak in some others. Modest evidence of intellectual engagement.	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.

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
****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.							
35-39% 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
20-34% 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
10-19% 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

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
0-9% Fail Coursework is very weak in all areas.	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.	No evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation.	No understanding is demonstrated. Arguments notable for their complete absence.	The treatment is wholly descriptive	Evidence absent Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citation entirely absent. Bibliography omitted. Application of the mechanics of scholarship entirely absent.	Incomprehensible. No attempt to compose proper sentences or paragraphs

[Out of scope of request]

11. Assessment

11.1. Types of Assessment

You will have a range of forms of assessment during your time in Norwich Business School. The school has three types of assessment:

- **Diagnostic** assessment that is designed to help teaching staff to understand your strengths and weaknesses at the start of the course and put in place appropriate support for you. These marks do not count towards progression or your final degree but if you do not undertake diagnostic assessment, you will miss out on useful support that will improve your grades.
- **Formative** assessment which is designed to enable you to practice using the skills and knowledge that you have acquired or developed on the course and to receive feedback on your progress and “feed-forward” – guidance on what to do to improve your performance. Formative assessment does not count for progression or your degree but if you fail to undertake formative assessment, you are missing out on an important opportunity to improve your performance and you may be in breach of the University’s General regulation 13 that

covers engagement with your studies.

- **Summative** assessment that is designed to test your learning on the course. The marks from summative assessment do count for progression and, in years 2 and 3, towards your degree classification.

Further details can be found on the Learning and Teaching webpage at:

<https://portal.uea.ac.uk/learning-and-teaching/students/coursework>

<https://portal.uea.ac.uk/learning-and-teaching/students/exams>

11.2. Assessment marking schedule

Both examinations and coursework are marked on a standard scale throughout the University. The scale is:

Total Mark (%)	Equivalent Degree Classification
100.00-70.00	I
69.99-60.00	II (i)
59.99-50.00	II (ii)
49.99-40.00	III
39.99-00.00	Fail

The university also provides GPA scores alongside the degree classifications. The GPA scale is:

Total Mark (%)	Equivalent GPA Score
100.00-74.50	4.25
74.49-70.50	4.00
70.49-66.50	3.75
66.49-63.50	3.50
63.49-60.50	3.25
60.49-56.50	3.00
56.49-53.50	2.75
53.49-49.50	2.50
49.49-47.50	2.25
47.49-42.50	2.00
42.49-39.50	1.50
39.49-37.50	1.00
37.49-34.50	0.75
34.49-29.50	0.50
29.49-00.00	0.00

Degree classification is determined at a final examiners' meeting, attended by external examiners from other universities. They act in accordance with the Instructions to Examiners (a copy of which is available in the Central Student Handbook, which is accessible through the Student Portal). The final degree classification is not obtained solely by a mechanical application of these rules to the marks obtained for the modules taken. The examiners may take other relevant information into account in arriving at the classification.

11.3. Guidelines for Assessment

All course work and examination marks are expressed in percentages. These numerical grades are defined against the criteria set down by the University in what are known as the “senate scales”.

The full senate scales (and much more information on assessment) can be found at:

<https://portal.uea.ac.uk/learning-and-teaching/docs/assessment> and in the Student Performance Accelerator Workbook.

A close study of the criteria will enable you to understand the standards that you should be aiming at in coursework and help you to interpret the marks that you are awarded. In undertaking course work, it would be advisable for you to be mindful of the senate scales and think carefully about how your work will be assessed in relation to those scales.

When coursework is set, details about what is required for that piece of work will be provided. If you are uncertain about something, you should seek advice from the module organiser as soon as possible, and not leave this until just before the deadline for submitting the work.

[Out of scope of request]

13. Other Assessment Issues

Assessment is the process by which academic progress is monitored during the degree course. Academic work is assessed during the course of a module and an overall mark is awarded for each module completed.

The basis on which each module is assessed is shown in the module description. Detailed information about the assessment arrangements for each module (titles, tasks and the deadline for submission of assignments; course tests; seminar presentations, examinations, etc.) are presented in module outlines. If, when taking a module, the student is in any doubt about the assessment arrangements it is their responsibility to consult the relevant module organiser as soon as possible.

Assessment is seen to have several meaningful functions:

- It is an essential part of the learning process and is intrinsic to the design of every module;
- It provides a vehicle for focused independent study in chosen areas;
- It is formative, in the sense of enabling students to monitor and improve their own performance;
- It allows judgements to be made about academic and professional qualities which will determine progression and final qualification;
- It provides reflection of a knowledge base and of professional competence, where relevant.

The main types of Assessment are:

- CT – Course Test
- CW – Coursework
- EXSTD – Standard Exam

- PR – Project
- PS – Presentation
- WA – Written Assignment

[Out of scope of request]

Appendix 2: Marking Descriptors for Coursework (“Senate Scales”)

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
90-100% Exemplary 1st <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.
80-89% High 1st <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
70-79% 1st <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
60-69% 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 1st 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 1st 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

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
50-59% Pass 2(ii) Coursework is 'good' in some areas but only satisfactory in others. Good intellectual engagement but execution flawed.	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.
40-49% Pass 3rd Coursework is only satisfactory in most areas and weak in some others. Modest evidence of intellectual engagement.	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.

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
****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.							
35-39% 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
20-34% 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
10-19% 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

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
0-9% Fail Coursework is very weak in all areas.	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.	No evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation.	No understanding is demonstrated. Arguments notable for their complete absence.	The treatment is wholly descriptive	Evidence absent Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citation entirely absent. Bibliography omitted. Application of the mechanics of scholarship entirely absent.	Incomprehensible. No attempt to compose proper sentences or paragraphs

[Out of scope of request]

11. Assessment

11.1. Types of Assessment

You will have a range of forms of assessment during your time in Norwich Business School. The school has three types of assessment:

- **Diagnostic** assessment that is designed to help teaching staff to understand your strengths and weaknesses at the start of the course and put in place appropriate support for you. These marks do not count towards progression or your final degree but if you do not undertake diagnostic assessment, you will miss out on useful support that will improve your grades.
- **Formative** assessment which is designed to enable you to practice using the skills and knowledge that you have acquired or developed on the course and to receive feedback on your progress and “feed-forward” – guidance on what to do to improve your performance. Formative assessment does not count for progression or your degree but if you fail to undertake formative assessment, you are missing out on an important opportunity to improve your performance and you may be in breach of the University’s General regulation 13 that covers engagement with your studies.
- **Summative** assessment that is designed to test your learning on the course. The marks from summative assessment do count for progression and, in years 2 and 3, towards your degree classification.

Further details can be found on the Learning and Teaching webpage at:

<https://portal.uea.ac.uk/learning-and-teaching/students/coursework>

<https://portal.uea.ac.uk/learning-and-teaching/students/exams>

11.2. Assessment marking schedule

Both examinations and coursework are marked on a standard scale throughout the University. The scale is:

Total Mark (%)	Equivalent Degree Classification
100.00-70.00	I
69.99-60.00	II (i)
59.99-50.00	II (ii)
49.99-40.00	III
39.99-00.00	Fail

The university also provides GPA scores alongside the degree classifications. Further details can be found at:

<https://portal.uea.ac.uk/learning-and-teaching/students/results-regulations/gpa>

Degree classification is determined at a final examiners’ meeting, attended by external examiners from other universities. They act in accordance with the Instructions to Examiners (a copy of which is available in the Central Student Handbook, which is accessible through the Student Portal). The final degree classification is not obtained solely by a mechanical application of these rules to the marks obtained for the modules taken. The examiners may take other relevant information into

account in arriving at the classification.

11.3. Guidelines for Assessment

All course work and examination marks are expressed in percentages. These numerical grades are defined against the criteria set down by the University in what are known as the “senate scales”.

The full senate scales (and much more information on assessment) can be found at: <https://portal.uea.ac.uk/learning-and-teaching/docs/assessment> and in the Student Performance Accelerator section of this Handbook.

A close study of the criteria will enable you to understand the standards that you should be aiming at in coursework and help you to interpret the marks that you are awarded. In undertaking course work, it would be advisable for you to be mindful of the senate scales and think carefully about how your work will be assessed in relation to those scales.

When coursework is set, details about what is required for that piece of work will be provided. If you are uncertain about something, you should seek advice from the module organiser as soon as possible, and not leave this until just before the deadline for submitting the work.

[Out of scope of request]

[Out of scope of request]

13. Other Assessment Issues

Assessment is the process by which academic progress is monitored during the degree course. Academic work is assessed during the course of a module and an overall mark is awarded for each module completed.

The basis on which each module is assessed is shown in the module description. Detailed information about the assessment arrangements for each module (titles, tasks and the deadline for submission of assignments; course tests; seminar presentations, examinations, etc.) are presented in module outlines. If, when taking a module, the student is in any doubt about the assessment arrangements it is their responsibility to consult the relevant module organiser as soon as possible.

Assessment is seen to have several meaningful functions:

- It is an essential part of the learning process and is intrinsic to the design of every module;
- It provides a vehicle for focused independent study in chosen areas;
- It is formative, in the sense of enabling students to monitor and improve their own performance;
- It allows judgements to be made about academic and professional qualities which will determine progression and final qualification;
- It provides reflection of a knowledge base and of professional competence, where relevant.

The main types of Assessment are:

- CT – Course Test
- CW – Coursework
- EXSTD – Standard Exam
- PR – Project
- PS – Presentation
- WA – Written Assignment

13.1. Submission of Coursework

Information relating to submission and return of coursework, extensions requests, remark requests and other coursework related issues can be found in the UEA Handbook – section 15

- <https://portal.uea.ac.uk/documents/6207125/8540534/University+Student+Handbook+for+Taught+Programmes/bbd468b8-e895-4cd2-b496-6dcc0ac1f08c>

[Out of scope of request]

Appendix 2: Marking Descriptors for Coursework (“Senate Scales”)

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
90-100% Exemplary 1st Coursework is ‘exemplary’ in most areas	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.
80-89% High 1st Coursework is strong in most areas and may be exemplary in some	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
70-79% 1st Coursework is strong in most areas	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
60-69% Pass 2(i) Coursework is ‘good’ in most areas and strong in some.	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 1st 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 1st 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

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
50-59% Pass 2(ii) Coursework is 'good' in some areas but only satisfactory in others. Good intellectual engagement but execution flawed.	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.
40-49% Pass 3rd Coursework is only satisfactory in most areas and weak in some others. Modest evidence of intellectual engagement.	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.

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
****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.							
35-39% Marginal Fail Coursework is barely 'satisfactory' in a few areas and weak in most others.	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
20-34% Fail Coursework is weak in most areas.	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
10-19% Fail Coursework is very weak in most areas.	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
0-9% Fail Coursework is very weak in all areas.	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.	No evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation.	No understanding is demonstrated. Arguments notable for their complete absence.	The treatment is wholly descriptive	Evidence absent Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citation entirely absent. Bibliography omitted. Application of the mechanics of scholarship entirely absent.	Incomprehensible. No attempt to compose proper sentences or paragraphs

Appendix 2: PG Marking Criteria

PG Marking Guidelines from Student Handbook

All course work and examination marks are expressed in numerical percentages. The table below shows how numerical grades relate to class of performance and gives some of the criteria used in the determination of grades.

80-100% = outstanding work at distinction level

A mark in this range will be given for work which shows the qualities described below (70-79% range). In addition it will show evidence of intellectual rigour, independence of judgement and inventiveness, and will convey a firm impression of originality of mind. It should demonstrate insight which forces reconsideration of existing knowledge and understanding in the reader.

70-79% = excellent work at distinction level

Work in this range will display a full understanding of its subject, a firm grasp of factual details and of the relevant theory and literature and techniques. It will be clearly argued and presented, with evidence of insight and some originality of thought and expression. It will demonstrate wider reading, and draw upon relevant source material which goes beyond the core material required for the module. Application of appropriate theory and techniques to management situations is anticipated, with evidence of the ability to critically evaluate their relevance.

65-69% = work of a very high standard

Work in this range will show a thorough grasp of the topic (though a lesser ability to apply theory and techniques) and will be clearly argued and presented. It should demonstrate wider reading, and draw upon relevant source material which goes beyond the core material required for the module. It will show an appropriate awareness of the relevant theory, literature, and techniques without quite achieving that intellectual independence and originality that distinguishes distinction level work. It should demonstrate the ability to use theory to transfer learnings from one context or situation to another.

60-64% = very good work

Work in this range will be intelligently argued, although there may be flaws in the structure or in the use of information. There may also be some unevenness in the quality of the work, and theory and techniques may be less well applied than in work of a very high standard.

55-59% = good work

Work in this range will show a broad knowledge and understanding of its subject. It may lack sophistication in its argument or be somewhat too descriptive in its treatment, and consequently ignores relevant theoretical foundations and technical applications. It should demonstrate accurate and a more complete recycling of the material covered.

50-54% = acceptable work to an adequate level Work in this range will show a satisfactory knowledge but may be vague or very descriptive in its interpretation of the subject. It may also be structurally weak, and lack a sense of argumentative purpose, and be less extensively argued. There will be little evidence of managerial applicability. It should demonstrate accurate recycling of the material covered.

Pass Mark = 50%

40-49% = Marginal fail; work which does not reach an acceptable level

Only partly addressed to the question; lacking in synthesis of ideas; tendency to description rather than analysis. Restricted range of sources consulted; only basic understanding of evidence; limited range of examples, sometimes inappropriate ones, limited understanding of key concepts. Poor typography and layout; considerable number of grammatical errors; limited vocabulary; inaccurate citation and bibliography with significant omissions. *Given a mark in this category, the Exam Board may require the student to re-sit / resubmit the assessment.*

30-39% = Clear Fail

Weak structure; largely irrelevant to set question; considerable misunderstanding of key concepts. Minimal range of sources consulted; very limited understanding of evidence; minimal range use of examples; little use of sources beyond direct paraphrase of lectures, easily available texts or web pages. Poor presentation; numerous and significant grammatical errors; highly restricted vocabulary; inadequate citation and bibliography.

20-29% = Well below passable standard

Only marginally addresses the question; fundamental misunderstanding of key concepts; mostly irrelevant; no line of argument. Little attempt to support any assertions; no use of sources beyond direct paraphrase of lectures or easily available texts or web pages. Poor grammar and vocabulary makes it difficult to decipher any intended meaning; no citation; no relevant bibliography.

10-19% = Very few learning outcomes met

Few relevant elements; only fragmentary arguments; only slight evidence of understanding of key concepts. No attempt to support assertions. Poor grammar and vocabulary makes it very difficult to understand the intended meaning.

1-9% = Far from meeting any learning outcome

No evidence of learning anything from the module, although there may be elements derived from general knowledge. Short answer; note form; mostly incomprehensible.

0% = No work submitted

(from: Exams Papers Setting Marking and Moderation, UEA, [date])