

P_SS Portfolio Assessment Criteria

| Mark Band | Knowledge and Understanding | Analysis and Argument | Structure and Presentation | Support/Academic Conventions | Academic Writing and Expression |
|-----------|--|---|--|---|--|
| 80 - 100 | Highly detailed, accurate and appropriate knowledge of relevant concepts, theories and topics .Impressive depth of conceptual understanding. A critical awareness of the ambiguities and limitations of knowledge, concepts and theories in the field. Informed discussion and application of the relationship between theory and practice. Critically evaluates alternative approaches. | Exceptional work with judiciously selected and evaluated evidence. Very high quality analysis, developed independently or through effective synthesis of sources. Ability to investigate contradictory information and identify reasons for contradictions. Highly persuasive conclusions, comprehensively supported with sources and data. | Presents exceptionally well-structured answers, with a highly clear and logical organisation of content; demonstrates appropriate flexibility in the structure of the answer according to the needs of the question. Paragraphs have an exceptionally clear focus and logical structure; a wide range of cohesive linking words/phrases is used accurately and appropriately to provide links between ideas, sentences and paragraphs. | Selects support from highly appropriate and academic sources. A comprehensive range of sources is used without reliance on a core text or single source throughout. Supports all points extremely well throughout using wholly relevant source material in a thoughtful way. Wholly accurate citation and referencing conventions used throughout with perhaps only very minor inaccuracies in punctuation. Extremely accurate, skilful paraphrasing / summarising in own words, demonstrating sensitivity towards nuances of vocabulary. | An exceptional level of fluency and clarity in academic writing. Using highly appropriate tone and style. Originality in expression. |
| 70 - 79 | A consistent depth and breadth knowledge and understanding of relevant concepts, theories and topics. Incorporation of strong, relevant examples where appropriate. Quality of critical evaluation demonstrates a clear awareness of the limitations of knowledge, concepts and theories in the field. | Thoroughly logical work, supported by judiciously selected and evaluated evidence. High quality analysis, developed independently or through effective synthesis of sources. Some ability to investigate contradictory information and identify reasons for contradictions. Strong conclusions, clearly supported with sources and data. | Presents very well-structured answers, with a clear and logical organisation of content; demonstrates flexibility in the structure of the answer according to the needs of the question. Paragraphs have a very clear focus and logical structure; a range of cohesive linking words/phrases is used accurately and appropriately to provide links between ideas, sentences and paragraphs. | Selects support from appropriate and academic sources. A wide range of sources are used with little reliance on a core text or single source. Supports all points consistently well using wholly relevant source material in a thoughtful way. Wholly accurate citation and referencing conventions throughout with possibly a few punctuation errors or omissions of page numbers. Accurate, skilful paraphrasing/ summarising in own words. | An outstanding level of fluency and clarity in academic writing. Highly appropriate and consistent use of style and tone. |
| 60 - 69 | Good coherent knowledge and a clear, systematic understanding of relevant concepts, theories and topics. Incorporation of good, relevant examples where appropriate. Competent critical evaluation of the subject matter | Sound, logical, analytical thinking. Synthesis and evaluation of evidence. Ability to devise and sustain persuasive arguments, and to review the reliability, validity and significance of evidence. Sound, convincing conclusions. | Presents well-structured answers, with a clear and logical organisation of content. Paragraphs have a clear focus and logical structure; a range of linking words/phrases is used quite appropriately to provide links between ideas, sentences and paragraphs. | Selects support from appropriate and academic sources. A good range of sources are used in balance, perhaps with some reliance on a core text or small number of sources throughout. Accurate citation and referencing conventions used in majority of places with a few punctuation errors or omissions of page numbers. Generally accurate, skilful paraphrasing/ summarising in own words. | Ability to communicate ideas and evidence accurately and convincingly. Uses appropriate academic tone and style to good effect. Demonstrates some originality in style and expression. |

| | | | | | |
|--------|--|--|--|--|---|
| 50 -59 | A sound knowledge and understanding of the material, main concepts and key theories. Makes an attempt at the application of relevant examples where appropriate. Critical awareness of issues and problems, demonstrating ability to research and analyse these. Several points require more detail or specificity, and some knowledge presented is of limited relevance. | Evidence of logical, analytical thinking and synthesis. Can analyse new and abstract concepts and theories. Awareness of different stances and ability to use evidence to support a coherent argument. May be descriptive in places. Broadly valid conclusions. | Presents relatively well-structured answers, though lacks complexity and/or logic in places. Paragraphs mostly have a clear focus and logical structure; generally appropriate links are made between ideas, sentences and paragraphs, but these may be quite basic, unclear or inaccurate in places. | Selects support from academic sources but tends to over-rely on a limited number of sources. Some points require more academic support and/or support selected is not entirely relevant to the point made. Generally follows citation and referencing conventions, but there are some inaccuracies or omissions. Clear attempt to consistently paraphrase /summarise in own words, but this may not always be successful. | Ability to communicate reliably with good level of fluency and clarity in academic writing. A good level of fluency and clarity in writing. Uses appropriate academic style and tone with a few exceptions. |
| 40 -49 | Demonstrate some understanding of key aspects of the subject matter. Coherent knowledge, at least in part informed by research in the subject discipline. Makes an attempt at the application of examples, but these may lack relevance and/or appropriacy. Several points require more accuracy, detail or specificity, and some knowledge presented is of limited relevance. | Able to critically evaluate arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data to make judgements. Able to sustain a reasonably coherent argument, but may be overly descriptive and limited in sophistication. | An attempt is made at a structured answer, but is limited by a lack of clarity and/or complexity. Paragraphs are present, but many lack focus and logical structure; paragraphs are difficult to follow in one or two places because of inappropriate or inaccurate use of links between ideas and topics sentences. | A limited range of sources is used, with heavy reliance on a small number of core texts/sources. There may be the inclusion of some sources that may not be academic. Support is sometimes irrelevant to the point made and/or points are supported only in some places. Points are largely supported by single sources. Generally follows conventions, but there are frequent inaccuracies or omissions. Some attempt to paraphrase/ summarise in own words, but some words/phrases may be too close to the original in a few places. | Generally accurate and reliable communication appropriate to academic level, task and audience, with some weaknesses. |
| 30 -39 | Gaps in knowledge, with only superficial and insufficient understanding of the subject area. Some significant inaccuracies. Shows some potential to evaluate material, theories and data, but limited in application. Examples may be missing or highly inappropriate /irrelevant. | Some evidence of analytical intellectual skills, but for the most part descriptive. Ideas/findings sometimes illogical and contradictory. Generalized statements made with scant evidence. Conclusions lack relevance. Major deficiencies in structure and content of argument | Structure is unclear and lacking logic, and is overly simplistic. Paragraphs are poorly organised, with many diverse points included in some paragraphs. Links between ideas, sentences and paragraphs are inappropriate, inaccurate and/or non-existent. | Limited evidence of reading or research, with a poor quality and range of sources. Support is often missing or irrelevant to the point made. Limited evidence of accurate acknowledgment of sources. Basic attempts to paraphrase/ summarise in own words but a number of words/phrases are largely copied from source (with reference) in places and/or may overuse quotation. | Communication skills are very limited, writing skills rely on replication of material provided. Writing coherently is challenging. Lack of skills impedes communication. |
| 0 - 29 | Major gaps in knowledge and understanding of material at this level. Substantial and significant inaccuracies. | Unsubstantiated generalisations, made without use of any credible evidence. Lack of logic, leading to unsupportable or missing conclusions. | Structure is very unclear throughout with little or no sense of logical development. Paragraphs are not formed or contain too many diverse points; ideas are very difficult to follow. | Demonstrates little evidence of reading or research. Little, if any, support is given for points and/or support used may be irrelevant in most places. Consistent, basic errors in citation and referencing conventions. Very little or no attempt to paraphrase/summarise with many phrases copied from source (with reference) or long quoted extracts. | Very little grasp of communication skills appropriate to the level of study. Meaning is unclear and presentation is ineffective. |