School of Nursing

SCHOOL OF NURSING POSTGRADUATE ASSIGNMENT MARKING & FEEDBACK

THIS SECTION IS TO BE COMPLETED BY THE STUDENT BEFORE SUBMISSION

NAME: Click here to enter text.	**ID Number:** Click here to enter text.	**Date:** Click here to enter a date.
Module Number & Name: Click here to enter text.		
I confirm that the work submitted has been produced through my own efforts and I am aware of the University's definition of plagiarism and associated policy. Tick to confirm ☐		

Proposed weighting demonstrates focus of attention	
Level 7	
Knowledge	30%
Comprehension/Application	
Analysis	60%
Synthesis	
Evaluation	
Language	5%
Referencing	5%

N.B. The following feedback should be read in combination with the notes throughout the text of your submission

The strengths of this submission were…
1T

This submission could be improved by…
1T

Moderator comments:
1T

Provisional Mark	**1T**

Signature (Internal Examiner) : 1T **Signature (Moderator) : 1T**

In line with University procedures marks will be available on the student portal following the Board of Examiners. Students should review the feedback provided and self-assess their work using the taxonomy that follows and the assignment guidelines

Reviewed by External Examiner ☐ External examiner signature: 1T

POSTGRADUATE TAXONOMY

Mark/Class	Understanding and applying	Analysing	Creating	Evaluating	Narrative	Referencing
>80 Excellent:	Evidence of highly relevant knowledge from wide range of disciplines that was creative and imaginatively woven into practice	Evidence of reflection, interpretation, critique and application to practice. Major and minor issues were robustly covered	Evidence that submission consistently critiqued relationships between concepts. Showed ability to provide an integrated view	Evidence of independent and creative thinking. Often generated new ways viewing issues. Illuminated flaws in current thinking	Narrative flow. No clichés. No grammatical or spelling errors. The work was easy to read and engaging.	Overwhelming primary sources used. Blended use of seminal work and current literature Insightful criticality present No referencing errors
70-79 Very good:	Evidence of relevant knowledge from a range of disciplines that were relevant to the area	Interpretation, critique and application to practice. Very good argument presented. Question answered fully	Critical thinking demonstrated that always critiqued relationships between concepts and illuminated connections	Evidence of independent and creative thinking. Sometimes generates new ways of viewing issues	Very good narrative flow. No grammatical or spelling errors	Mostly primary sources used Very good use of seminal work and current literature No referencing errors
60-69 Good:	Evidence of knowledge and principles that were supported by up-to-date research	Interpretation, critique and application to practice Focussed on major aspects of the question. Good argument presented May refer to minor issues	Critical thinking demonstrated that frequently critiqued relationships between concepts	Level of independent and creative thinking. May generate new ways of viewing issues	Narrative flow. Few clichés No grammatical or spelling errors	Use of seminal work and current literature Majority primary sources used No referencing errors
50-59 Average:	Evidence of relevant knowledge & principles that drew upon research that was not always up to date	Interpretation, critique and application to practice. Average argument presented that answered major parts of the question but omitted minor issues	Critical thinking demonstrated that identified and sometimes critiqued relationships between concepts	Level of independent thinking. May generate new ways of viewing issues	Narrative flow, some non-sequiturs and clichés. No or few grammatical or spelling errors	Minority primary sources used Average critique of seminal work and current literature No referencing errors
45-49 Unsatisfactory:	Evidence of knowledge or sufficient reading. Little current research was present	Critical thinking that demonstrated inadequate interpretation, critique and application to practice Major parts of the question addressed but unsatisfactory argument presented	Submission that did not critique where relationships between concepts may lie	Level of independent thinking. Rarely generated new ways of viewing issues	Meaning generally clear but many grammatical and/or spelling errors made it difficult to read	Mostly secondary sources used Referencing errors Absence of criticality: No critique of published work
<45 Unacceptable:	Evidence of knowledge that questioned the extent of your understanding of the subject area	Unacceptable evidence of critical thinking displayed. . Little interpretation, critique and application to practice. Answer omitted some essential issues. Unacceptable argument developed	Unacceptable submission that didn't identify relationships between concepts	Unacceptable evidence of independent thinking. Does not generate new ways of viewing things	Unacceptable use of English that clouded the meaning. No narrative flow and many grammatical and spelling errors made it very hard to read	Minimal research used Absence of criticality: No critique of published work Wrong system used No reference list

Post Feedback Action Plan

Having received feedback about your submission it would be good to focus upon what you did well and what you need to focus your attention on to develop. In order to do that the following template has been designed to enable you to write down what you need to do to achieve your goals. This will be a useful way to record what you need to do and bring it to your next studies advice session or use it for reflection before your next submission or if you have to resubmit your work.

Reflection on session:				
What did the feedback say I did well? 1T				
Looking at what the feedback said could be improved upon, use the boxes below to plan how you will address the points made:				
Specific focus: What was the point made?	**Outcome measure:** How will I know I've addressed it?	**Achievable:** Resources? What do I need to make it happen?	**Realistic:** Is this within reason?	**Time bound:** When does it need to be done by? When will review it?
1T	1T	1T	1T	1T