

M11 Assessment Criteria for Group Report in Reflection – Sept 2021

Assessment	≤ 5	6	7	8	9	10
<p>1. Structure and quality of argumentation (30%) <i>e.g. writing, clarity, structure, conclusion that follows</i></p>	<p>Overall lack of precision, substantial flaws in the reasoning and argument, with poor or very poor structure. Conclusions do not follow.</p>	<p>Writing is ok, but tends to lack clarity and precision. Some promising ideas but arguments contain assumptions or are undeveloped. Structure is rather poor; conclusions rarely follow.</p>	<p>Sometimes well written, sometimes lacks clarity or detail. Arguments sometimes follow, but sometimes need development. Structure is ok, but sometimes opaque. Weak conclusions.</p>	<p>Generally well written, minor gaps in the argument. Mostly good structure, with few gaps in precision. Conclusion mostly follows from arguments and/or evidence, with some minor gaps.</p>	<p>Work is carefully developed and mostly very well written, though there may be minor errors or omissions. Central claims are clearly outlined, and the conclusion is supported.</p>	<p>Writing is polished, accurate, fluent, showing rigorous, systematic, logical, coherent argumentation. Conclusion clearly and unambiguously follows from the arguments and evidence.</p>
<p>2. Ethical discussion (30%) <i>e.g. identify and discuss relevant ethical dimensions, incorporate relevant themes and materials</i></p>	<p>Offers only general or vague account of theories or issues. Understanding is limited. Neglects relevant theories or fails to show how selected theories are pertinent to the selected topic.</p>	<p>Promising but undeveloped ideas, uncritical, or lacking sufficient depth, rigour, or care. Shows some understanding of key theories but may struggle to apply them.</p>	<p>Understanding of key theories is adequate, but with some confusion or misunderstanding. Shows promise but tends to lack nuance or sufficient reflection.</p>	<p>Generally good, comprehensive account of relevant theories mostly well applied. Discussion is clear and thorough but lacks sufficient breadth or nuance.</p>	<p>Very good knowledge and understanding of relevant ethical issues and theories. Discussion is thorough. Gaps are few and minor.</p>	<p>Impressive understanding of key ethical issues and theories. Substantial knowledge, plus skill in application. Confident handling of all content.</p>
<p>3. Research and evidence (20%) <i>e.g. use of relevant evidence, with reference to reliable sources</i></p>	<p>Evidence is either not used or not used appropriately. Sources are not appropriate, are unreliable, or are of poor quality. Few or no academic sources used.</p>	<p>Limited evidence provided or uses material with dubitable quality or relevance. If good sources are cited, they may not be well used, applied, or understood.</p>	<p>Uses some relevant and good quality evidence, with some success, but also with gaps, such as in understanding or application.</p>	<p>Some good evidence for some central claims. Not all sources are relevant, fully understood or well applied, but main argument remains unaffected.</p>	<p>Very good use of high quality, relevant sources. Good, critical understanding of cited material, with awareness of more obvious limitations in the evidence.</p>	<p>Excellent, nuanced use of high quality, relevant sources. Very good, critical treatment of cited material, including understanding a wide range of limitations.</p>

<p>4. Reflection and analysis (20%) <i>e.g. original insights or discussion, thought and application of themes to project</i></p>	<p>Content is cited without sufficient thought or understanding. At its weakest, the work is inaccurate and poorly considered.</p>	<p>Achieves a minimal quality of detail but demonstrates limited application. Too many gaps in the discussion or in the range of issues identified.</p>	<p>Covers the main issues and demonstrates some insight or offers relevant discussion, but with errors or omissions.</p>	<p>Some good insight and/or discussion, which suggests careful thought and application. More could be said, even if main issues are mostly well tackled.</p>	<p>Very good discussion, some promising or good insight. Clear evidence of thought, very good application. Errors few, mostly minor.</p>	<p>Substantial discussion, plus excellent insight and understanding. Confident handling of key themes plus highly successful application.</p>
---	--	---	--	--	--	---