**ASSESSMENT CRITERIA – QUALITATIVE-BASED WORK**

**Level 3**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Classification** | **% Range** | **Content (Analysis and Enquiry)** | **Application of Theory** | **Knowledge and Understanding** | **Evidence of Reading** | **Referencing & Bibliography** | **Communication / Presentation Skills** |
| I  *[Outstanding Work]* | 80 – 100 | Excellent description and discussion of views, issues and information with evidence of critical evaluation and some original thinking | Evidence of detailed, relevant application of theory, where applicable | Detailed knowledge and depth of understanding of principles and concepts | Evidence of reading appropriate supplementary sources | Accurate referencing and bibliography | Excellent presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using an accurate, coherent style |
| I  *[Excellent Work]* | 70 – 79 | Detailed description of main issues and information with evidence of evaluation | Evidence of relevant application of theory, where applicable | Knowledge and understanding of principles and concepts | Evidence of reading some supplementary sources | Appropriate referencing and bibliography | Good quality presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using an accurate and logical approach |
| II (i)  *[Good Quality Work]* | 60 – 69 | Description of main issues and information with occasional evidence of discussion | Occasional relevant application of theory | Adequate knowledge of key principles and concepts | Evidence of directed reading only | Adequate referencing and bibliography | Acceptable presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using a competent style with appropriate vocabulary |
| II (ii)  *[Acceptable Work]* | 50 - 59 | Description of main issues and material only | Limited evidence of relevant application of theory | Elementary knowledge of key principles and concepts | Limited evidence of directed reading | Limited referencing | Adequate presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using a largely clear if basic style with adequate vocabulary |
| III  *[Adequate Work]* | 40 – 49 | Limited description of main issues and material only | Very limited evidence of relevant application of theory | Limited and/or inconsistent knowledge of key principles and concepts | Evidence of minimal reading only | Limited referencing | Weak presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using a basic and inconsistent approach |
| Fail  (marginal)  *[Limited Work]* | 35 – 39 | Omission of some relevant material | Little or no evidence of relevant application of theory | Little evidence of knowledge of key principles and concepts | Little or no evidence of reading | Little or no referencing | Poor presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, adopting a basic style with inconsistent/ inaccurate vocabulary |
| Fail  *[Unacceptable Work]* | 0 – 34 | Insufficient and largely irrelevant material | No evidence of relevant application of theory | No evidence of knowledge of key principles and concepts | No evidence of reading | No referencing | Inadequate presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, adopting a very basic approach with many inaccuracies and errors in spelling, vocabulary and syntax |

**ASSESSMENT CRITERIA – QUALITATIVE-BASED WORK**

**Level 4**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Classification** | **% Range** | **Content (Analysis and Enquiry)** | **Application of Theory** | **Knowledge and Understanding** | **Evidence of Reading** | **Referencing & Bibliography** | **Communication / Presentation Skills** |
| I  [Outstanding Work] | 80 – 100 | Excellent description and discussion of views, issues and information with evidence of critical evaluation and some original thinking | Evidence of detailed, relevant application of theory, where applicable | Excellent knowledge and depth of understanding of principles and concepts | Evidence of reading a wide range of appropriate supplementary sources | Excellent referencing and bibliography | Excellent presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using an accurate, logically structured, expressive style |
| I  [Excellent Work] | 70 – 79 | Detailed description of main issues and information with evidence of evaluation | Evidence of relevant application of theory, where applicable | Knowledge and depth of understanding of principles and concepts | Evidence of reading appropriate supplementary sources | Accurate referencing and bibliography | Good quality presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using a clear, coherent style with appropriate vocabulary |
| II (i)  [Good Quality Work] | 60 – 69 | Description of main issues and information with occasional evidence of discussion | Occasional relevant application of theory | Knowledge and sound understanding of the key principles and concepts | Evidence of directed reading and some supplementary sources | Appropriate referencing and bibliography | Acceptable presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using a largely clear and coherent style with appropriate vocabulary |
| II (ii)  [Acceptable Work] | 50 - 59 | Description of main issues and material only | Limited evidence of relevant application of theory | Basic knowledge of the key principles and concepts only | Evidence of directed reading | Adequate referencing and bibliography | Adequate presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using a largely clear if basic style with adequate vocabulary |
| III  [Adequate Work] | 40 – 49 | Limited description of main issues and material only | Very limited evidence of relevant application of theory | Adequate knowledge of key principles and concepts only | Limited evidence of reading | Limited referencing and bibliography | Weak presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using a basic and inconsistent approach |
| Fail  (marginal)  [Limited Work] | 35 – 39 | Omission of some relevant material | Little or no evidence of relevant application of theory | Limited and or inconsistent knowledge and understanding of key principles and concepts | Evidence of minimal reading only | Inadequate referencing and bibliography | Poor presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, adopting a basic style with inconsistent/ inaccurate vocabulary |
| Fail  [Unacceptable Work] | 0 – 34 | Insufficient and largely irrelevant material | No evidence of relevant application of theory | Little or no evidence of knowledge and understanding of the key principles and concepts | Little or no evidence of reading | Little or no referencing and bibliography | Inadequate presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, adopting a very basic approach with many inaccuracies and errors in spelling, vocabulary and syntax |

**ASSESSMENT CRITERIA – QUALITATIVE-BASED WORK**

**Level 5**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Classification** | **% Range** | **Content (Analysis and Enquiry)** | **Application of Theory** | **Knowledge and Understanding** | **Evidence of Reading** | **Referencing & Bibliography** | **Communication / Presentation Skills** |
| I  [Outstanding Work] | 80 – 100 | Extensive critical insightful evaluation and synthesis of a range of views, issues and complex information which demonstrates original and reflective thinking | Evidence of detailed, relevant application of theory, and/or empirical results, where applicable | Excellent knowledge and depth of understanding of principles and concepts | Evidence of reading a wide range of supplementary sources | Excellent referencing and bibliography | Exceptional presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using an accurate, coherent, original style |
| I  [Excellent Work] | 70 – 79 | Critical evaluation and synthesis of views, issues and information which demonstrates some originality | Clear evidence of relevant application of theory, and/or empirical results, where applicable | Comprehensive knowledge and depth of understanding of principles and concepts | Evidence of reading a range of supplementary sources | Comprehensive referencing and bibliography | Excellent presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using an accurate, coherent, expressive style |
| II (i)  [Good Quality Work] | 60 – 69 | Evaluation and synthesis of main issues and information | Appropriate application of theory and/or empirical results, where applicable | Knowledge and sound understanding of principles and concepts | Adequate evidence of reading supplementary sources | Appropriate referencing and bibliography | Good quality presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using a clear, coherent style with appropriate vocabulary |
| II (ii)  [Acceptable Work] | 50 - 59 | Accurate description of main issues and information, with some evaluation | Occasional relevant application of theory and/or empirical results | Knowledge and understanding of key principles and concepts only | Evidence of directed reading and some supplementary sources | Adequate referencing and bibliography | Acceptable presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using a largely clear and coherent style with appropriate vocabulary |
| III  [Adequate Work] | 40 – 49 | Description of main issues and information only | Limited evidence of relevant application of theory and/or empirical results | Basic knowledge and understanding of key principles and concepts only | Evidence of directed reading only | Limited referencing and bibliography | Adequate presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using a largely clear if basic style with adequate vocabulary |
| Fail  (marginal)  [Limited Work] | 35 – 39 | Omission of some relevant information with weak and/or incomplete explanation | Very limited evidence of application of theory and/or empirical results | Limited and/or superficial knowledge and understanding of key principles and concepts | Evidence of minimal reading only | Inadequate referencing and bibliography | Poor presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, adopting a basic style with inconsistent/ inaccurate vocabulary |
| Fail  [Unacceptable Work] | 0 – 34 | Insufficient and largely irrelevant information with inadequate explanation | No evidence of application of theory and/or empirical results | Little or no knowledge and understanding of key principles and concepts | Little or no evidence of reading | Little or no referencing and bibliography | Inadequate presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, adopting a very basic approach with many inaccuracies and errors in spelling, vocabulary and syntax |

**ASSESSMENT CRITERIA – QUALITATIVE-BASED WORK**

**Level 6**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Classification** | **% Range** | **Content (Analysis and Enquiry)** | **Application of Theory** | **Knowledge and Understanding** | **Evidence of Reading** | **Referencing & Bibliography** | **Communication / Presentation Skills** |
| I  [Outstanding Work] | 80 – 100 | Critical insightful evaluation and synthesis of a wide range of views, issues and complex information which demonstrates an original and reflective approach | Extensive evidence of relevant and perceptive application of theory, and/or empirical results, where applicable | Exceptional knowledge and in-depth understanding of principles and concepts | Extensive evidence of researching and integrating appropriate supplementary sources | Outstanding referencing and bibliography | Outstanding presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using an accurate, coherent, sophisticated style |
| I  [Excellent Work] | 70 – 79 | Critical evaluation and synthesis of a wide range of views, issues and information which demonstrates original and reflective thinking | Evidence of extensive relevant application of theory, and/or empirical results, where applicable | Excellent knowledge and depth of understanding of principles and concepts | Evidence of extensive research and reading of supplementary sources | Excellent referencing and bibliography | Excellent presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using an accurate, coherent, expressive style |
| II (i)  [Good Quality Work] | 60 – 69 | Critical evaluation and synthesis of a range of views, issues and information | Evidence of relevant application of theory and/or empirical results, where applicable | Comprehensive knowledge and depth of understanding of principles and concepts | Evidence of research and reading a range of supplementary sources | Comprehensive referencing and bibliography | Good quality presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using a clear, coherent and expressive style with appropriate vocabulary |
| II (ii)  [Acceptable Work] | 50 - 59 | Accurate description of main issues and key information, with some critical evaluation | Occasional relevant application of theory, and/or empirical results where applicable | Appropriate knowledge and understanding of principles and concepts | Evidence of making use of directed reading and some supplementary sources | Adequate referencing and bibliography | Acceptable presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using a largely clear and coherent style with appropriate vocabulary |
| III  [Adequate Work] | 40 – 49 | Limited evaluation and description of main issues and information | Limited evidence of relevant application of theory and/or empirical results | Basic knowledge of key principles and concepts only | Evidence of basic reading only | Limited referencing and bibliography | Adequate presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using a largely clear if basic style with adequate vocabulary |
| Fail  (marginal)  [Limited Work] | 35 – 39 | Omission of some relevant information with weak and/or incomplete explanation | No evidence of relevant application of theory and/or empirical results | Limited and/or superficial knowledge of key principles and concepts | Minimal evidence of reading | Inadequate referencing and bibliography | Poor presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, adopting a basic style with inconsistent/ inaccurate vocabulary |
| Fail  [Unacceptable Work] | 0 – 34 | Insufficient and largely irrelevant information with inadequate explanation | No evidence of application of theory and/or empirical results | Insufficient evidence of key principles and concepts | Little or no evidence of reading | Little or no referencing and bibliography | Inadequate presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, adopting a very basic approach with many inaccuracies and errors in spelling, vocabulary and syntax |

**ASSESSMENT CRITERIA – QUALITATIVE-BASED WORK**

**Level 7**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Classification** | **% Range** | **Content (Analysis and Enquiry)** | **Application of Theory** | **Knowledge and Understanding** | **Evidence of Reading** | **Referencing & Bibliography** | **Communication / Presentation Skills** |
| Distinction | 70 – 100 | Critical insightful evaluation and synthesis of a wide range of views, issues and complex information which demonstrates a highly original and reflective approach. Demonstrates the ability to pursue research at Doctoral level | Extensive evidence of advanced, relevant and perceptive application of theory, and/or empirical results, where applicable, informed extensively by current research and practice in the area | Exceptional knowledge and conceptual understanding of complex and/or specialised principles and concepts and the development and advancement of ideas and practice | Extensive evidence of integrating supplementary sources | Outstanding referencing and bibliography | Outstanding presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using an accurate, coherent, sophisticated style |
| Commendation | 60 – 69 | Critical evaluation and synthesis of a wide range of views, issues and information which demonstrates original and reflective thinking | Clear evidence of relevant applications and/or empirical results, where applicable, informed by current research and practice in the area | Wide knowledge and depth of understanding of complex and/or specialised principles and concepts and the development of ideas and practice | Evidence of extensive reading of supplementary sources | Comprehensive referencing and bibliography | Excellent presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using an accurate, coherent, expressive style |
| Pass | 50 – 59 | Some critical evaluation and synthesis of a range of views, issues and information | Evidence of relevant applications and/or empirical results, where applicable with some links to current research in the area | Appropriate knowledge and depth of understanding of key principles and concepts with some understanding of their development in practice | Evidence of reading supplementary sources | Adequate referencing and bibliography | Acceptable presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using a largely clear and coherent style with appropriate vocabulary |
| Fail  (marginal) | 45 – 49 | Some evaluation and synthesis of issues and information | Occasional relevant applications and/or empirical results, where applicable | Basic knowledge and depth of understanding of key principles and concepts only | Limited evidence of reading | Limited referencing and bibliography | Adequate presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, using a largely clear if basic style with adequate vocabulary |
| Fail | 31 – 44 | Limited evaluation and description of main issues and information | Limited applications and/or empirical results, where applicable | Limited and/or superficial knowledge of key principles and concepts | Minimal evidence of reading | Inadequate referencing and bibliography | Poor presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, adopting a basic style with inconsistent/ inaccurate vocabulary |
| Fail | 0 – 30 | Insufficient and largely irrelevant information with inadequate explanation | Little or no evidence of relevant application and/or empirical results | Virtually devoid of any evidence of knowledge and understanding | Little or no evidence of reading | Inadequate referencing and bibliography | Inadequate presentation, verbally, electronically and/or in writing, adopting a very basic approach with many inaccuracies and errors in spelling, vocabulary and syntax |

**ASSESSMENT CRITERIA – QUANTITATIVE-BASED WORK**

**Level 3**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Classification** | **% Range** | **Knowledge and Understanding** | **Problem Solving** | **Calculations** | **Analysis and Interpretation** | **Presentation of Work** |
| I  *[Outstanding Work]* | 80 – 100 | Evidence of knowledge and understanding of key theories, principles and concepts | Competent in the use of appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems. Can work beyond routine context or complexity | Able to demonstrate the steps taken, very few errors in calculations, using recognised methods to formulate solutions | Evidence of analytical and interpretation in familiar contexts, evaluating outcomes and deriving conclusions | Well directed presentation, logically structured |
| I  *[Excellent Work]* | 70 – 79 | Knowledge and understanding of most key theories, principles and concepts evident | Able to use appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems and those of some complexity | Demonstrates the steps taken, few errors in calculations, using recognised methods | Reasonable evidence of use of analytical and interpretative skills in familiar contexts, evaluating outcomes and making judgements | Clearly presented, logically structured |
| II(i)  *[Good Quality Work]* | 60 – 69 | Adequate knowledge and understanding of most key theories, principles and concepts evident | Able to use appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems | Errors in the steps taken or in the calculations, recognised methods not always used correctly | Some evidence of use of analytical and interpretative skills in familiar contexts, evaluating outcomes and making judgements | Competent presentation and structure |
| II(ii)  *[Acceptable Work]* | 50 - 59 | Knowledge and understanding of key theories, principles and concepts is limited | Ability to use appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems is limited | Steps taken in calculations lack clarity, recognised methods not used or used incorrectly | Limited evidence of the use of analytical and interpretative skills | Limited presentation and/or structure |
| III  *[Adequate Work]* | 40 – 49 | Knowledge and understanding of key theories, principles and concepts is very limited | Very limited ability to use appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems | Steps taken in calculations are incomplete, calculations largely incorrect, recognised methods not used or used incorrectly | Little evidence of analysis and/or incorrect interpretation | Poor presentation, and/or structure |
| Fail  (marginal)  *[Limited Work]* | 35 – 39 | Lack of knowledge and understanding of key theories, principles and concepts | Not able to or does not use appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems | Steps taken in calculations are incomplete or/and incorrect, recognised methods not used or used incorrectly | No analysis and/or interpretation | Very poor presentation and inadequate structure |
| Fail  *[Unacceptable Work]* | 0 – 34 | No evidence of knowledge or understanding of key theories, principles and concepts | Does not use appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems | Steps taken in calculations are incorrect, recognised methods not used or used incorrectly | No analysis and/or interpretation | Unacceptable presentation and structure |

**ASSESSMENT CRITERIA – QUANTITATIVE-BASED WORK**

**Level 4**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Classification** | **% Range** | **Knowledge and Understanding** | **Problem Solving** | **Calculations** | **Analysis and Interpretation** | **Presentation of Work** |
| I  *[Outstanding Work]* | 80 – 100 | Substantial knowledge and clear understanding of major theories, principles and concepts | Able to identify more complex problems and competent in the modelling of standard problems | Clear demonstration of the steps taken, few errors in calculations, using recognised methods to formulate solution | Evidence of analysis and interpretation of new and seen data in conclusions derived | Very well directed presentation, logically structured |
| I  *[Excellent Work]* | 70 – 79 | Evidence of knowledge and clear understanding of a range of theories, principles and concepts | Competent in the use of appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems | Able to demonstrate the steps taken, errors in calculations, using recognised methods to formulate solutions | Reasonable evidence of analytical and interpretation in evaluating outcomes and deriving conclusions | Well directed presentation, logically structured |
| II(i)  *[Good Quality Work]* | 60 – 69 | Knowledge and understanding of key theories, principles and concepts evident | Able to use appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems | Errors in the steps taken in calculations, recognised methods used incorrectly | Some evidence of use of analytical and interpretative skills in evaluating outcomes and making judgements | Clearly presented, logically structured |
| II(ii)  *[Acceptable Work]* | 50 - 59 | Knowledge and understanding of key theories, principles and concepts limited or inconsistent | Limited ability to use appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems | Steps taken in calculations lack clarity recognised methods not used or used incorrectly | Limited evidence of the use of analytical and interpretative skills | Competent presentation and structure |
| III  *[Adequate Work]* | 40 – 49 | Knowledge and understanding of key theories, principles and concepts very limited | Very limited ability to use appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems | Steps taken in calculations are incomplete, calculations largely incorrect, recognised methods not used or used incorrectly | Little evidence of analysis and/or incorrect interpretation | Poor presentation, and structure |
| Fail  (marginal)  *[Limited Work]* | 35 – 39 | Lack of knowledge and understanding of key theories, principles and concepts | Not able to use appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems | Steps taken in calculations are incomplete or/and incorrect, recognised methods not used or used incorrectly | No analysis and/or interpretation | Very poor presentation and inadequate structure |
| Fail  *[Unacceptable Work]* | 0 – 34 | No evidence of knowledge or understanding of key theories, principles and concepts | Does not use appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems | Steps taken in calculations are incorrect, recognised methods not used or used incorrectly | No analysis and/or interpretation | Unacceptable presentation and structure |

**ASSESSMENT CRITERIA – QUANTITATIVE-BASED WORK**

**Level 5**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Classification** | **% Range** | **Knowledge and Understanding** | **Problem Solving** | **Calculations** | **Analysis and Interpretation** | **Presentation of Work** |
| I  *[Outstanding Work]* | 80 – 100 | Comprehensive knowledge and clear understanding of major and complex theories, principles and concepts | Competent in both the identification and modelling of more complex problems | Applies appropriate techniques, and demonstrates innovation and creativity in formulating substantially correct solutions | Clear evidence of analysis and interpretation of new or abstract data and in conclusions derived | Excellent, well directed presentation, logically structured |
| I  *[Excellent Work]* | 70 – 79 | Substantial knowledge and clear understanding of major theories, principles and concepts | Able to identify more complex problems and competent in the modelling of standard problems | Clear demonstration of the steps taken, few errors in calculations, using recognised methods to formulate solutions | Evidence of analysis and interpretation of new and seen data in conclusions derived | Well directed presentation, logically structured |
| II(i)  *[Good Quality Work]* | 60 – 69 | Evidence of knowledge and clear understanding of a range of theories, principles and concepts | Competent in the use of appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems | Able to demonstrate the steps taken, errors in calculations, not always using recognised methods to formulate solution | Reasonable evidence of analysis and interpretation in evaluating outcomes and deriving conclusions | Clearly presented, logically structured |
| II(ii)  *[Acceptable Work]* | 50 - 59 | Knowledge and understanding of key theories, principles and concepts evident | Able to use appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems | Errors in steps taken in calculations, recognised methods not used or used incorrectly | Some evidence of analytical and interpretative skills in evaluating outcomes and deriving conclusions | Neat presentation and structure |
| III  *[Adequate Work]* | 40 – 49 | Knowledge and understanding of key theories, principles and concepts limited or inconsistent | Limited ability to use appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems | Steps taken in calculations are incomplete or largely incorrect, recognised methods not used or used incorrectly | Very limited use or incorrect use of analytical and interpretative skills | Weak presentation and structure |
| Fail  (marginal)  *[Limited Work]* | 35 – 39 | Knowledge and understanding of key theories, principles and concepts very limited | Very limited ability to use appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems | Steps taken in calculations are incomplete and incorrect recognised methods not used or used incorrectly | Little or no analysis and interpretation | Poor presentation and inadequate structure |
| Fail  *[Unacceptable Work]* | 0 – 34 | Lack of knowledge and understanding of key theories principles and concepts | Not able to use appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems | Steps taken in calculations are incomplete and incorrect recognised methods not used or used incorrectly | No analysis or interpretation | Unacceptable presentation and structure |

**ASSESSMENT CRITERIA – QUANTITATIVE-BASED WORK**

**Level 6**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Classification** | **% Range** | **Knowledge and Understanding** | **Problem Solving** | **Calculations** | **Analysis and Interpretation** | **Presentation of Work** |
| I  *[Outstanding Work]* | 80 – 100 | Comprehensive depth of knowledge and clear understanding of major and complex theories, principles and concepts | Very competent in both the identification and modelling of more complex problems | Techniques are appropriately and effectively used demonstrating innovation and creativity in formulating substantially correct solutions | Evidence of excellent analysis and interpretation of new or abstract data and in conclusions derived | Excellent, well directed presentation, logically structured |
| I  *[Excellent Work]* | 70 – 79 | Comprehensive knowledge and clear understanding of major and complex theories, principles and concepts | Competent in both the identification and modelling of more complex problems | Applies appropriate techniques, and demonstrates innovation and creativity in formulating mainly correct solutions | Clear evidence of analysis and interpretation of new or abstract data and in conclusions derived | Well directed presentation, logically structured |
| II(i)  *[Good Quality Work]* | 60 – 69 | Substantial knowledge and clear understanding of major theories, principles and concepts | Able to identify more complex problems and competent in the modelling of standard problems | Clear demonstration of the steps taken few errors in calculations using recognised methods to formulate solution | Evidence of analysis and interpretation of new and seen data in conclusions derived | Clearly presented, logically structured |
| II(ii)  *[Acceptable Work]* | 50 - 59 | Evidence of knowledge and clear understanding of a range of theories, principles and concepts | Competent in the use of appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems | Able to demonstrate the steps taken, errors in calculations, may not always using recognised methods to formulate solution | Reasonable evidence of analysis and interpretation in evaluating outcomes and making judgements | Neat presentation and structure |
| III  *[Adequate Work]* | 40 – 49 | Knowledge and understanding of key theories, principles and concepts limited or inconsistent | Able to use appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems | Steps taken in calculations lack clarity, calculations have numerous errors, recognised methods not used or used incorrectly | Limited use of analytical and interpretative skills | Weak presentation and structure |
| Fail  (marginal)  *[Limited Work]* | 35 – 39 | Very limited knowledge and understanding of key theories, principles and concepts | Limited ability to use appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems | Steps taken in calculations are incomplete or largely incorrect, recognised methods not used or used incorrectly | Little or no analysis and interpretation | Poor presentation and structure |
| Fail  *[Unacceptable Work]* | 0 – 34 | Little or no evidence of knowledge and/or understanding of key theories, principles and concepts | Very limited ability to use appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems | Steps taken in calculations are incomplete and incorrect, recognised methods not used or used incorrectly | No analysis or interpretation | Unacceptable presentation, and structure |

**ASSESSMENT CRITERIA – QUANTITATIVE-BASED WORK**

**Level 7**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Classification** | **% Range** | **Knowledge and Understanding** | **Problem Solving** | **Calculations** | **Analysis and Interpretation** | **Presentation of Work** |
| Distinction | 70 – 100 | Systematic understanding of specialised and/or applied areas of theoretical or research based knowledge | Independent and professional in the approach taken to complex problem solving | Can use a large range of techniques appropriately and demonstrates innovation and creativity in complex and unpredictable situations | Very high level of competence in analysing and interpreting complex or incomplete data and in communicating the outcome | Excellent well directed presentation, logically structured |
| Commendation | 60 – 69 | Clear understanding of specialised or applied areas of theoretical or research based knowledge | Largely independent and professional in the approach taken to complex problem solving | Uses techniques effectively and demonstrates innovation and creativity in complex situations | Competent in analysing and interpreting complex or incomplete data and in communicating the outcome | Clearly presented, logically structured |
| Pass | 50 - 59 | Demonstrates understanding of specialised or applied areas of theoretical or research based knowledge | Reasonably competent in solving of complex problems | Uses techniques effectively and demonstrates some innovation or creativity in complex situations | Reasonably competent in analysing and interpreting complex or incomplete data and in communicating the outcome | Neat presentation and structure |
| Fail  (marginal) | 45 – 49 | Limited understanding of specialised or applied areas of theoretical or research based knowledge | Solve complex problems only with some guidance or direction | Some errors in techniques used, work lacks innovation or creativity, reliance on routine procedures | Limited ability to analyse and/or interpret complex or incomplete data and in communicating the outcome | Weak presentation and structure |
| Fail | 31 - 44 | Very limited understanding of specialised or applied areas of theoretical or research based knowledge | Limited ability to solve complex problems | Many errors in techniques used, no innovation or creativity shown, reliance on routine procedures | Little or no analysis and interpretation of complex data, poor presentation of results | Poor presentation and structure |
| Fail | 0 – 30 | Has not grasped the theoretical or research base of the subject | Very limited ability to solve complex problems | Inability to use techniques, routine procedures have errors | No analysis or interpretation of complex data, poor or very poor presentation of results | Unacceptable presentation, and structure |