

KING'S COLLEGE LONDON

MARKING FRAMEWORK



The College Marking Framework is an important reference point for setting and maintaining academic standards across the college. It provides guidance for all assessment practices and promotes consistency across taught programmes with the aim of enhancing the student experience of assessment. It covers the areas of marking policy and marking models, marking schemes (with specific reference to the new Step-Marking Scheme), and marking criteria. Guidance on the marking policy and clear descriptions of the marking models will aid faculties, departments, assessment boards as well as assessment sub-boards in their choice of models. The newly introduced step-marking scheme offers an alternative to the 0-100% marking scale. The generic college marking criteria provide a frame for the setting of learning outcomes, and support faculties and assessment sub-boards in refining their faculty, discipline or assessment-specific marking criteria. They also provide students with a broad sense of learning outcomes expected at different credit levels, and support transparency and consistency. To develop student agency in assessment, faculties and departments are encouraged to engage students in the development of specific marking criteria. Students can also use the criteria for self-assessment or peer assessment.

The College Marking Framework was endorsed by ASSC, approved by CEC, and noted by Academic Board in November/December 2021.

Contents

1. The College Policy.....	3
2. The Governance.....	3
Internal Moderation.....	3
Markers.....	3
Anonymity.....	3
Marking.....	3
3. The Marking Models.....	4
Marks.....	6
Reconciliation of Marks.....	6
Rubric Violations.....	6
Marking Formative Assessment.....	6
External Examiners.....	6
4. The College Marking Schemes.....	7
Governance.....	7
Choice of Marking Schemes.....	7
0-100% Marking Scheme.....	7
The Step-Marking Scheme.....	7
Implementation.....	8
How to mark an assignment with a stepped marking scheme.....	8
Student feedback on step-marking.....	9
UG Step-Marking Scheme.....	9
PG Step-Marking Scheme.....	9
5. The College Marking Criteria.....	10
Guidelines for usage.....	10
Specific Marking Criteria.....	10
Setting Marking Criteria.....	10
Assessment-Specific Marking Criteria.....	10
Using the Criteria to design assessment rubrics.....	10
Student Engagement with Marking Criteria.....	11
The College Generic Marking Criteria.....	12
6. Suggested Implementation of the Marking Frame.....	28
7. Glossary.....	28
8. Members of the Working Group.....	29

1. The College Policy

Assessment Sub-Boards will be entrusted to apply the rules of the College Marking Framework consistently and fairly, and Faculty/School Assessment Boards will be responsible for ensuring that the Assessment Sub-Boards have conducted their marking processes in accordance with the marking framework and the adopted marking models. In keeping with the College commitment to ensure that the assessment process is fair, equal and transparent, Assessment Sub-Boards will select the most appropriate marking model for each assessment type within a module with the overall aim of improving the turnaround time linked to the marking process and enhancing the delivery of relevant and timely feedback. Modules or programmes delivered online are subject to the same assessment scrutiny. All programmes must provide students with details of the College Marking Framework and the model(s) that they intend to apply.

2. The Governance

Faculties should adopt the following Governance procedures for the College Marking Framework: Faculty Assessment Boards will approve the assessment specific/discipline-based marking schemes recommended by their Assessment Sub-Boards and ensure that the appropriate marking model is attributed to each assessment and is fairly and consistently employed. Faculty Assessment Boards should support marking harmonisation across their faculty and may provide guidance and training.

Internal Moderation

Assessment Sub-Boards are responsible for all programmes to have internal moderation systems in place to ensure the consistency of marking and the proper application of the marking criteria. This is particularly relevant where multiple markers mark larger cohorts and where some form of standard-setting between marking groups is needed where markers can discuss and develop a shared understanding of the marking criteria. Faculty Assessment Boards may assist in giving guidance and harmonise across programmes.

Markers

Any individual involved in the marking process will have appropriate experience and expertise. It is the responsibility of the Assessment Sub-Board to ensure that all examiners have suitable training and support to carry out these duties.

Note: Clarification is sought from ASSC for the eligibility of internal markers and the appointment process as well as GTA markers for all marking models to avoid disparity across the faculties.

Anonymity

The identity of students shall be withheld from all examiners until the complete marking process has been conducted unless the nature of the assessment makes this impossible. Exemptions may be necessary for example for supervised dissertations, performances, laboratory work, etc., and must be agreed with the Assessment Sub-Board Chair and the External Examiner. Where anonymity is not possible, programmes must ensure, to the satisfaction of the Assessment Sub-Board and the External Examiner, that there are robust processes in place for second-marking and internal moderation.

Marking

All summative assessment must be subject to a form of second marking. Second marking can take on different forms (see below). Details of the marking process are made available in advance to External Examiners and students and must include the specific form of marking applied as well as the selected marking sample and sample size, where appropriate.

3. The Marking Models

UG / PG MARKING MODELS
Model 1: Independent Double Marking
Each assignment is marked independently by two markers and both examiners record their marks and comments separately. The two marks are subsequently reconciled to agree the mark for the assessment. Any research project/dissertation which is marked by the supervisor must be independently second-marked.
Model 2: Open Second Marking
Each assignment is marked by two markers and both examiners record their marks and comments separately, but the second marker has access to the first marker's marks and comments.
Model 3: Independent Double Marking by Sample Marking
Each assignment is marked by the first marker. A second marker marks a sample but is not informed of the first marker's marks and comments and both examiners record their marks and comments separately.
Model 4: Open Second Marking by Sample Marking
Each assignment is marked by the first marker. The second marker marks a sample of the full set of scripts but has access to the first marker's marks and comments.
Model 5: Second Marking by Check Marking
Check Marking may be used for small components of summative assessments as long as the assessment does not contribute more than 15% to the overall assessment of the module. The assessment is marked by the first marker. The second marker confirms the assessment is appropriately marked and brings it to the attention of the first marker if not.
Model 6: Second Marking by Clerical Check
Clerical Checking is appropriate for quantitative, technical, or multiple-choice assessments where there is a precise model solution and marking scheme, and answers are quantitative/non-subjective and precise model solutions are available. The assessment is marked either by the first marker or automatically by the assessment programme. A clerical check is carried out to ensure that all marks have been accurately collated and assigned to the correct candidate.
Model 7: Second Marking of Live Assessment
Where an assessment is conducted as a live activity and recording it is not appropriate, the assessment should include provisions for second-marking and External Examiner scrutiny. This may take the form of having two or more markers present, inviting the External Examiner to observe the event, or asking students to submit notes, slides and/or visual material for these purposes.

Faculties or departments will determine and publish the most appropriate marking model for every assessment depending on credit level, credits, and percentage of the module mark.

Note: The working group will seek support from the Assessment Working Group to provide further guidance on examples for each marking model.

Double Marking for the full cohort (Model 1 and Model 2):

- Independent double-marking (**Model 1**): Two markers mark all assessments without seeing each other's marks and comments. See below for the reconciliation of marks.
- Open second-marking (**Model 2**): The first marker marks all assessments. A second marker marks all assessments as well but has access to the first marker's marks and comments. Open second-marking is less time-intensive than independent double marking by two markers (Model 1) while retaining the potential for students to benefit from different perspectives. See below for the reconciliation of marks.

Second Marking by Sample Marking (Model 3 and Model 4):

- Sampling can be conducted as independent double marking, i.e. a second marker marks a sample of scripts without seeing the first marker's marks and comments (**Model 3**).
- Sampling may also be employed as open second marking (moderation), i.e. a second marker has access to the first marker's marks and comments (**Model 4**).

For both models, it is anticipated that if the second marker agrees with the sampled marks, the marking is accurate for the cohort. **See below for the reconciliation of marks.** The sample size should be randomly selected from across the range of marks and must be a minimum of 10% of the entire cohort or 5 scripts (whichever is greater). It should include:

- All Fails
- For modules with less than 20 students enrolled – at least 1 script per classification.
- For modules with 20-29 students enrolled – at least 2 scripts per classification.
- For modules with 30 or more students enrolled – at least 3 scripts per classification.

Second Marking by Check Marking (Model 5):

Check Marking may be used for small parts of summative assessments. The assessment is marked by the first marker. A second marker checks that the assessment is appropriately marked and systematic errors and/or patterns of inconsistency are avoided. If any are identified, they must be referred to the Chair of the Assessment Sub-Board who will determine the most appropriate course of action to be taken.

- The checked sample size should be randomly selected from across the range of marks and must be a minimum of 10% of the entire cohort or 5 scripts, whichever is greater.
- The assessment must not contribute to more than 15% of the overall assessment for the module.
- Check marking must not be the only marking model employed for the module.

Second Marking by Clerical Check (Model 6)

A clerical check will usually only be appropriate for quantitative or multiple-choice assessments where answers can be scored objectively rather than requiring qualitative judgement on the part of the marker. The assessment is marked either by the first marker or automatically by the assessment software. A clerical check is then carried out to ensure that all marks have been accurately collated and assigned to the correct candidate. The precise nature of clerical checks will vary depending on the nature of recording and computing marks but would normally include consideration of the following aspects: all components of the assessment have been assigned a mark, marks assigned are within the permitted range, correct weightings have been applied to the components in a quantitative rubric, any correction for guessing has been applied appropriately for MCQ assessments. The overall aim is to check that marks are recorded correctly for individual students.

Please note that step-marking does not apply to Model 6.

Second Marking of Live Assessment (Model 7)

An assessment that is conducted as a live activity (for example oral assessments, presentations, etc.) should be recorded and second-marked according to the appropriate model (Models 1-5), where possible. Where recording is not appropriate (e.g., for performance, laboratory work, marking clinical work with patients, group work, etc.), the assessment should include provisions for second-marking and External Examiner scrutiny. This may take the form of having two or more assessors present, inviting the External Examiner to observe the event, or asking students to submit notes, slides and/or visual material for these purposes.

Marks

The original marks made by the first and second marker must be recorded separately and made available to the External Examiner and at the Assessment Sub-Board for scrutiny. Summative marks shall not be awarded for attendance at teaching events. Marks for participation should be restricted to small teaching groups or online discussion boards.

Reconciliation of Marks

All marks must be agreed by the markers. Procedures for dealing with discrepancies between markers are compliant with the College Marking Framework and are made available to all examiners. **Marks are reconciled with reference to the marking criteria.** Individual marks should not be changed until all marks of the assessment have been checked. The agreed mark must be recorded separately and the first and second marker should comment on how the agreed mark has been reached so that this is transparent for students, Faculty Assessment Boards, and External Examiners. Where a first and second marker are unable to agree on a final mark or other patterns of inconsistency emerge, the matter must be referred to the Chair of the Assessment Sub-Board, who will determine the most appropriate course of action. Typically, this means a third, experienced marker is asked to support resolving the discrepancy with reference to the marking criteria. External Examiners should not be asked to moderate between internal markers but should be able to follow the reconciliation process.

Second marking by Sampling (Models 3 and 4): It is anticipated that if the second marker agrees with the sampled marks, the marking is accurate for the cohort. Where there is a discrepancy of more than 10 percentage points in a mark, the sample is extended to all scripts marked by the marker for whom there is a discrepancy. Where the assessment in question counts for 80% or more of the module mark and the difference in marks crosses a classification boundary for more than 25% of the sample, the sample is doubled in size to establish whether a discrepancy exists that requires action.

Rubric Violations

When students fail to answer the correct number of questions in different sections of an examination, they have violated the rubric requirements of the assessment. In such cases the examination script (all answers) is marked as usual by both examiners, and the following should apply:

- If insufficient questions have been attempted, the mark is determined from the questions answered. A mark of zero is awarded for unanswered questions.
- If more than the required number of questions have been answered, the question(s) with the lowest mark(s) will be discounted. If the first and second marker award the lowest mark to different questions, the Chair of the Assessment Sub-Board will determine the most appropriate course of action, typically bringing in a third marker to support resolving the discrepancy with reference to the marking criteria.
- If a question in the assessment is found to be faulty, for example the same question appears twice, or a question is incomplete, the Chair of the Assessment Sub-Board will determine the course of action.

Marking Formative Assessment

Formative marking is not covered by these marking models (although they may be applied) and can be more flexible. Unmoderated single marking is possible. Formative work could also involve peer marking (where students mark one another's work) and self-evaluation (where students are guided through evaluating their own work).

External Examiners

The assessment process for a programme must be scrutinised by an External Examiner. External Examiners are given an opportunity to consider and comment on local procedures and their enactment in their final report. Additional moderation for the cohort is carried out by the External Examiner(s) through viewing a sample of the assessments. External Examiners have the right to request a cohort to be remarked if they feel the marking is not appropriate or consistent.

4. The College Marking Schemes

Governance

Faculties are strongly encouraged to support the newly developed step-marking scheme for all assessments where markers use their academic judgment, for example essay-based assessments, oral exams, etc. Assessment Sub-Boards decide whether the less granular stepped scheme or the full range of 0-100% is more appropriate for an assessment. Similar formative and summative assessment should use the same scheme. Step-marked formative assessment not needing this level of granularity may further reduce the steps. Pass marks (and therefore capped marks) stay at 40% (UG) and 50% (PG). Qualifying marks (PSRB) remain at the agreed level. If a module mark is made up of several assessment components, a combination of both schemes (reduced steps and 100% numerical) is possible. The final module mark will be made up of all assessment components according to their weighting. The module mark will be the mean average and does not need to be one of the fixed percentage points on the step-marking scale.

Choice of Marking Schemes

Assessment sub-boards can choose between the 0-100% marking scale or the newly introduced step-marking scheme for each assessment but are encouraged to use the step-marking scheme for all assessments where markers use their academic judgment.

0-100% Marking Scheme

Numerical marking is necessary for certain types of quantitative assessment (MCQs, yes/no questions, etc.) and remains on the full 0-100% scale, as in the past. It may also be used where a reduced scale of stepped marks is not appropriate, such as assessments with a small number of marks for each question.

UNDERGRADUATE	
First - High First	90-100%
First - Mid-range First	80-89%
First - First	70-79%
Upper Second - 2.1	60-69%
Lower Second - 2.2	50-59%
Third	40-49%
Fail - Marginal Fail	33-39%
Fail	20-32%
Fail	0-19%

POSTGRADUATE	
Distinction	≥ 70
Merit	60-69
Pass	50-59
Fail	40-49
Fail	0-39

The Step-Marking Scheme

The step-marking scheme is recommended for work based on a wholistic application of the marking criteria where assessment uses criteria or rubrics to make judgements that result in a single overall mark for the piece, for example essay-based assessments, presentations, projects, oral exams, etc. There is no requirement to use step-marking when marks are assigned automatically (e.g., by computer software), or via a structured mark scheme with clear specification of how individual marks are awarded (e.g., SAQs, technical work) for multiple components and are aggregated mathematically.

Advantages:

- As it can be difficult to mark to one percent accuracy in qualitative methods of assessment, a move to a banded grading can improve the alignment between assessment rubrics and assessment grades, resulting in a more consistent marking approach and clearer feedback for students. Student feedback suggests that students question the difference between narrow percentage marks for assessment containing an element of subjective marking, and they frequently comment on their perception of inconsistencies between markers. The second marking process, too, should benefit from a less granular scale.
- Step-marking avoids borderline marks (e.g. 49; 59; 69) as marks are clearly at the top end of one band (e.g. 68) or at the lower end of another (e.g. 72).
- Components of module assessment that carry a low weight or sub-components of an assignment, may use a sub-set of the steps, such as using only the mid-points of each band, for example, using only one numeric mark within each set of marks assigned to an identified letter grade (e.g., FF = 0, F = 21, F+ = 35, D = 45, C = 55 etc). The specific subset of numeric marks would be common to all markers for that assignment. This practice avoids applying an unnecessary degree of precision to low-stakes assessment components.
- The step-marking scheme does not necessitate regulatory changes nor changes to the module approval process via OPAMA but will need a careful introduction combined with training for markers. King's Academy offers workshops and guidance on marking training that can be tailored to program or module teams on a bespoke basis. Local marking criteria may need to be aligned to the new scheme.

Implementation

- The Assessment Sub-Board decides which assessments will be marked on the stepped marking scheme. If a module mark is made up of several assessment components, a combination of both schemes (reduced steps and 100% numerical) is possible.
- If an assessment is marked using the stepped scheme, the corresponding numerical mark will be used in calculating the final percentage mark for the module.
- The final module mark will be made up of all assessment components according to their weighting. The module mark will be the mathematical average and does not need to be one of the fixed percentage points on the step-marking scale.
- Course units which are subject to Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB) requirements should be marked in line with those requirements.

How to mark an assignment with a stepped marking scheme

- The student's work is marked against published assessment criteria by using the grade descriptors. The descriptors describe key features and general characteristics of assessed work associated with each grade.
- Markers decide first on the grade (class), for example 2.1.
- By considering the grade descriptors the assessment is then assigned to a band inside the grade, i.e. lower, middle, or higher range.
- The step maps onto a numerical mark, for example a 'high 2.1' = 68%. This mark is recorded on the system.
- If the module is assessed by one component, the fixed percentage point becomes the overall course unit mark. If the module is assessed by more than one component, the fixed percentage points for each component is averaged to produce the overall module mark.

Student feedback on step-marking

The new step-marking scheme was submitted for feedback to King's 100, a diverse group of just over 100 students, who provided their input, and shared their thoughts, ideas, and opinions with members of the working group. There was overwhelming support for the new scheme. (For details, see the previous draft version of the marking frame.)

UG STEP-MARKING SCHEME		
Credit Level 4,5,6		Mark Allocated
First	High First	100
		95
		92
	Mid-range First	88
		85
		82
	First	78
		75
		72
Second	High 2.1	68
	Mid-range 2.1	65
	Low range 2.1	62
	High 2.2	58
	Mid-range 2.2	55
	Low range 2.2	52
Third	High Third	48
	Mid-range Third	45
	Low range Third	42
Fail	Marginal Fail	35
	Mid Fail	28
	Low Fail	21
	Fail	14
	Fail	7
	Non-submission or of no discernible merit.	0

PG STEP-MARKING SCHEME	
Credit Level 7	Mark Allocated
Distinction	100
	95
	92
	88
	85
	82
	78
	75
	72
Merit	68
	65
	62
Pass	58
	55
	52
Fail	48
	45
	42
	35
	28
	21
14	
7	
0	

5. The College Marking Criteria

Guidelines for usage

This guidance is for academic staff using the generic criteria to design rubrics for their assessments and not intended to go to students.

Marking criteria are designed to help students know what is expected of them. The generic college marking criteria set out below represent the overarching principles of attainment covering levels 4-7 of study and provide guidance on the overall standards expected at different grade bands. They reflect the QAA [FHEQ \(Framework for Higher Education Qualifications\)](#) and [SEEC descriptors](#) but need to be benchmarked against subject specific criteria at programme level. Where the generic criteria are deemed to be sufficient, they can be used directly for assessing students' learning. However, assessment-specific criteria is recommended in order to ensure that marking decisions are consistent, fair, and transparent to both staff and students. **The College Marking Criteria must be approved by ASSC on an annual basis as per current practice.**

Specific Marking Criteria

Faculties are encouraged to establish appropriately specific and detailed marking criteria which are congruent with the generic criteria and the level of study. **Specific marking criteria must be approved by the faculty on an annual basis.**

Setting Marking Criteria

Well-written marking criteria ensure that marking is reliable and transparent. They communicate expectations to students, provide detailed feedback and encourage critical thinking and self-evaluation. When setting specific marking criteria, it helps to start from the students' perspective: **Marking criteria should allow students to see clearly how their work will be judged against a set of agreed learning outcomes.** This will support students to plan their assessment and take control of their learning. Meaningful marking criteria also act as a frame for the feedback given to students and help students to understand how they achieved their mark. Markers should be encouraged to use the text in the rubric to justify a mark, which may also make marking more efficient while supporting consistent grades between all markers. Marking criteria may need to take into account the frame of the assessment, for example whether it is an open book assessment, online assessment, group work, etc., and the time allowed for submission.

Assessment-Specific Marking Criteria

It is recommended that the College criteria be **adapted to individual assessments.** Because all assessments need to be aligned with module learning outcomes, it is best to design both the assessment and the rubric based on what is being specifically assessed in the module. The sub-criteria within each of the main four are not exhaustive but are intended to cover a wider range of disciplinary skills, knowledge, and attributes than the previous College criteria; therefore, they are applicable to a wider range of non-traditional emerging assessments such as reflection and multi-media. It is not expected that all assessments will use the full range. Similarly, for some forms of assessment, such as short answer questions or MCQ, where there is a detailed mark-scheme, the criteria have to be applied to the setting of the assessment, not the student responses. **Assessment-specific marking criteria should be adapted from the generic College criteria and must be approved by the faculty on an annual basis.**

Using the Criteria to design assessment rubrics

There is inevitable difference between disciplines, and although the College criteria is designed to take this into account, the specific standards may be better understood by students, and more consistency amongst marking teams ensured, if criteria are devised based on the assessment. Examples will be designed by King's Academy for different assessment modes in the upcoming Curriculum Design Toolkit (launched 2022).

The new College criteria can, therefore, be primarily used as a guide for staff to design their own assessment rubrics in terms of knowledge, skills, and attributes, as well as the type of language that is used in criteria descriptors at different levels and bands.

Marking with Rubrics

Although the new College criteria are designed to be more specific over a wider range of specified disciplinary skills and knowledge, there is inevitable subjectivity in marking of this nature, and a rubric cannot claim to ensure 'objective' marking. Therefore, it is recommended that marking teams use **calibration/standardisation** sessions prior to marking at any point during the course in order to achieve more consistency in marking. The community discussion of standards can help to eliminate bias or subjectivity in judgment, and research has also shown that such discussions can aid harmonisation and shared understanding of standards between markers in disciplines over time. [King's Academy's guidance on running calibration sessions](#) can be referred to here.

Markers should be encouraged to use the text in the rubric to justify a mark. However, it is not always the case that a student's performance neatly fits into one grade for all criteria. Work attracting a merit can be considered "very good" but typically will not meet the full expectations of the examiners in all key attributes associated with the assessment or will have a significant deficit in only one area. When designing assessment, some modules may choose to use weighted criteria based on learning outcomes or importance of the achieved skill; for example, communication may be judged at 20% of the grade, with knowledge and understanding at 50%. This should be made clear to students and marking teams where used. Markers will work out the overall grade that should be assigned given the levels selected for each element of the student work.

It will be necessary for some more objectively marked assessments to use a grade scale of 0-100 or marking proof rather than a criterion-referenced assessment, and it is not recommended or expected that this should change. However, benchmarking to the College criteria generic skills and/or to [subject benchmark statements](#) may help when designing assessments/exam questions and translating these to students in feedback.

The difference between levels 4-7

The criteria are based on [FHEQ \(Framework for Higher Education Qualifications\)](#) and [SEEC descriptors](#). But it is also recommended to look at [subject benchmark statements](#) for your discipline at levels 4-7 when designing your own rubrics. At levels 4-6, the operational context at which students will be working will be the basis for grades above a pass. A student should still be able to achieve a 1st even if they are working within that context. For example, a student at level 4 should not be expected to go beyond "*specified range of techniques and information sources*" to achieve a 1st. This is taken into account in the sub-criteria. Grades above 80 should be reserved for students who show exceptional work above the operational context expected for that level. This is to ensure that the full range of grades can be used and that a grade above 70 should not only be reserved for 'publishable standard' work.

Student Engagement with Marking Criteria

Students should be actively encouraged to engage with the marking criteria for an assessment as early as possible in the academic year, for example by applying it to formative assessment and engaging the student in the process. If possible and as part of the principles of the education strategy, students should play a role in setting marking criteria. Research has shown that students better understand marking criteria when they are active participants in the creative process to achieve a sense of ownership.

Note: *King's Academy has kindly agreed to look into a frame for student participation and to support faculties and departments to explore this route of using discussion and negotiation to come to a final 'product'.*

The College Generic Marking Criteria Level 4

UG Credit Level 4			Subject Knowledge and Understanding Demonstrates broad understanding of key aspects of the topic relevant to this level of study, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> knowledge of key theories, concepts, terminology, and facts relevant to the task informed by broad reading around a topic showing a rigorous approach to study emerging critical understanding of theories within the discipline. 	Intellectual Skills Demonstrates conceptualization, critical thinking and scholarly practice, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> critical evaluation of ideas and construction of an argument identification of research foci and application of strategies/methods to solve defined problems evaluation and synthesis of digital and non-digital literature to inform responses within familiar contexts analysis of data/theories using pre-defined techniques/ criteria. 	Practical Skills including Digital Capabilities Employs a range of specialized skills, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> discipline-specific specialist skills processing and interpretation of data contribution to teamwork, group organisation and emerging leadership use of discipline-specific computational tools and technologies other digital literacies including usage of media tools, creation, collaboration and wellbeing. 	Generic/Transferable Skills including Professional Competencies Employs a range of enabling skills and competencies, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> effective communication in a range of multi-media formats (including structure, accuracy of grammar and awareness of audience/genre within discipline-specific outputs) awareness of strengths and weaknesses and ability to use guidance/feedback to develop strategies for learning, with emerging autonomy ethical awareness in relation to self, others, and academic/work community
First	A+ High First 80-100	100 95 92 88 85 82	Highly detailed knowledge and comprehensive understanding of the key concepts, terminology and theories which form the knowledge base of the subject. Informed by wider reading and showing an emerging critical appreciation of theories and knowledge that are open to interpretation.	Takes an insightful critical approach with convincing, well-synthesised arguments throughout. A well-defined focus of research enquiry and excellent application of strategies to address a defined problem, which may show some originality. Extensive range of sources evaluated, referenced, and applied within defined parameters, appropriate to the task and of excellent quality. Excellent application and interpretation of analysis of data/theories, showing emerging critical judgment and some originality/creativity.	Highly proficient application of discipline-specific specialist skills. Processing and interpretation of data efficiently and effectively. Exceptional team working, including enabling of others. Proficient use of relevant computational tools and technologies. Exceptional digital literacy skills	Excellent communication of information and ideas in a given medium/genre. Excellent awareness of audience and an appropriate style maintained throughout. Excellent demonstration of insight and autonomy in evaluating own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional, digital and practical skills. Excellent appreciation of and ability to act on feedback to develop highly effective strategies for learning. Highly developed ethical awareness.

	A First 70-79	78 75 72	Detailed knowledge and understanding of the relevant concepts and theories. Thorough understanding of key facts and use of terminology. Informed by reading and showing emerging critical awareness of the limits of knowledge and contested theories.	Takes a critical approach with convincing, well-synthesised arguments. A well-defined focus of research enquiry and very good application of relevant strategies to address a defined problem. Comprehensive range of relevant literature evaluated, referenced, and applied within defined parameters, appropriately to the assignment and of very good quality. Very good application and interpretation of analysis of data/theories, and an emerging critical judgment.	Very good application of discipline-specific specialist skills. Processing and interpretation of a range of data efficiently and effectively. Effective team working, showing leadership skills where appropriate. Very good use of relevant computational tools and technologies. Very good digital literacy skills.	Very good communication of information and ideas in a given medium/genre. Very good awareness of audience and an appropriate style maintained throughout. Very good demonstration of insight and autonomy in evaluating own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional, digital and practical skills. Very good ability to apply feedback and develop highly effective strategies for learning Well developed ethical awareness.
Second	B 2.1 60-69	68 65 62	Good knowledge and understanding of key theories and main relevant concepts. Generally accurate, but possibly incomplete description or application of facts/some misuse of terminology. Answers informed by reading showing clarity of thought.	Takes a critical approach, with coherent and well-structured arguments with only minor errors in synthesis. A defined focus of research enquiry and good application of relevant strategies to address a defined problem. Good range of relevant literature evaluated and applied within defined parameters. There may be a few relatively minor errors in referencing. Proficient analysis of data/ theories with only minor flaws in application/interpretation.	Good application of discipline-specific specialist skills. Processing and interpretation of data effectively with only minor flaws. Good contribution to team working. Good use of relevant computational tools and technologies. Good digital literacy skills.	Good communication of information and ideas in a given medium/genre. Appropriate style for the intended audience. Good demonstration of insight and able to evaluate own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional, digital and practical skills. Good ability to apply feedback to develop effective strategies for learning or improve tasks. Developing ethical awareness.
	C 2.2 50-59	58 55 52	Knowledge and understanding of key theories, relevant concepts and terminology demonstrated, but may be incomplete/show some misunderstandings. Generally accurate, but incomplete description or application of relevant facts/some misuse of terminology. Answers informed by reading, showing a generalised understanding.	Some critical analysis and a clear structure but often descriptive with limited analysis or evaluation. Arguments may lack coherence in places due to poor synthesis. Research enquiry has a basic focus and application of relevant strategies to address a defined problem. Mostly appropriate range of relevant literature within defined parameters. There may be some errors in referencing. Analysis of data/theories but they may be flaws in application/ interpretation.	Sufficient application of discipline-specific specialist skills. Mostly effective processing and interpretation of data. Can work effectively with others. Effective use of relevant computational tools and technologies. Generally good digital literacy skills.	Mostly appropriate communication of information and ideas in a given medium/genre. Mostly appropriate style and awareness of audience. Demonstration of insight and/or ability to evaluate own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional, digital and practical skills. Some ability to apply feedback to develop strategies for learning or improve tasks but may be generic. Some ethical awareness.

Third	D Third 40-49	48 45 42	General knowledge of theories and/or concepts demonstrated but may lack detail or be irrelevant to the task. Basic understanding of main facts and use of terminology evident but there may be frequent inaccuracies/omissions. Answers generally informed by reading.	Some analysis given but may demonstrate flaws or points missing or be mainly descriptive. Research enquiry has a basic focus and some application of strategies but may be inaccuracies or irrelevancies. Mainly descriptive. Basic use of literature and/or limited material even within defined parameters. There may be frequent errors in referencing although an overall system is used. Some analysis of data/theories with some significant flaws in application/interpretation.	Basic application of discipline-specific specialist skills. Basic processing and interpretation of data with some flaws. Mostly working effectively with others. Mostly effective use of relevant computational tools and technologies. Basic digital literacy skills.	Communicates of information and ideas in a given medium/genre but with evident weaknesses. Style may be inappropriate in places. Some evidence of ability to evaluate own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional, digital and practical skills identified by others. Some evidence of ability to apply feedback to develop generic strategies for learning or improve tasks. Some ethical awareness although there may be flaws.	
	Fail	F+ Marginal Fail 30-39	35	Some knowledge but limited understanding. Work contains inaccuracies/misunderstandings/omissions of key theories, concepts and facts. Limited use of reading to inform answers.	Mainly descriptive. Research enquiry lacks focus and application of strategies have inaccuracies or irrelevancies. Limited and/or inappropriate literature/material and/or poorly referenced. Largely unsystematic, incomplete and/or inaccurate analysis of data/theories.	Limited evidence of discipline-specific specialist skills. Processing and/or interpretation of data flawed. Not always working effectively with others. Issues with use of relevant computational tools and software packages. Limited demonstration of digital literacy skills.	Limited communication of information and ideas in a given medium/genre with evident weaknesses. Style not always appropriate. Limited evidence of ability to evaluate own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional, digital and practical skills identified by others. Limited evidence of ability to apply feedback to develop effective strategies for learning. Flawed or minimal ethical awareness.
		F Fail 1-29	28 21 14 7	Major gaps in knowledge and understanding. Work is mainly inaccurate, and demonstrates misunderstandings of key theories, concepts, and facts. Limited use of reading to inform answers.	Purely descriptive and shows a lack of understanding of the task. Research enquiry lacks focus and application of strategies are mainly inaccurate or irrelevant. Limited and/or inappropriate literature, poorly referenced. Unsystematic, incomplete and/or inaccurate analysis of data/theories.	Little evidence of discipline-specific specialist skills. Processing and interpretation of data seriously flawed. Not working effectively with others. Inability to use of relevant computational tools and software packages. Little or no demonstration of digital literacy skills.	Significant weaknesses in communication of information and ideas in a given medium/genre. Style inappropriate. Very limited evidence of insight into own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional, digital and practical skills. Little or no ability to apply feedback to develop effective strategies for learning. No ethical awareness.
FF		0	Non-submission or of no discernible merit.	Non-submission or of no discernible merit.	Non-submission or of no discernible merit.	Non-submission or of no discernible merit.	

The College Generic Marking Criteria Level 5

UG Credit Level 5			Subject Knowledge and Understanding Demonstrates detailed understanding of key aspects of the topic relevant to this level of study, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> detailed knowledge of key theories, concepts, terminology, and facts relevant to the task informed by wide reading around a topic showing a rigorous approach to study a growing critical understanding of theories within the discipline including where knowledge bases are more or less secure. 	Intellectual Skills Demonstrates abstract conceptualization, critical thinking and scholarly practice, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> critical evaluation of ideas and construction of an argument recognising competing perspectives identification of research foci and application of strategies/methods to solve problems with varying complexity and predictability evaluation and synthesis of digital and non-digital literature to inform responses within a range of more and less familiar contexts analysis of data/theories and selecting appropriate techniques/ criteria. 	Practical Skills including Digital Capabilities Demonstrates command of a range of specialized skills, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> confident use of discipline-specific specialist skills processing and interpretation of data to provide new information contribution to teamwork, group organization, give and receive feedback and ability to modify behaviour confident use of discipline-specific computational tools and technologies other digital literacies including usage of media tools, creation, collaboration, and wellbeing. 	Generic/Transferable Skills including Professional Competencies Demonstrates command of a range of enabling skills and competencies, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> effective communication in a range of multi-media formats (including structure, accuracy of grammar and awareness of audience/genre within discipline-specific outputs) uses and sets criteria to evaluate strengths and weaknesses of self and others, and ability to use guidance/feedback to develop strategies for learning ethical responsibility in relation to self, others, and academic/work community
First	A+	100	Highly detailed knowledge and comprehensive understanding of the key concepts, terminology and theories which form the knowledge base of the subject. Fully informed by wide reading and showing appreciation of competing theories, principles and concepts.	Takes an insightful critical approach with convincing, well-synthesised arguments throughout. A well-defined focus of research enquiry and discerning selection and application of strategies to address predictable and more complex problems showing originality. Extensive range of sources evaluated, referenced and applied within a range of familiar and less familiar	Highly proficient application of discipline-specific specialist skills. Processing and interpretation of data efficiently and effectively. Exceptional team working, including enabling of others and responsibility taken for outcomes. Proficient use of relevant computational tools and technologies. Exceptional digital literacy skills	Excellent communication of information and ideas in a given medium/genre. Excellent awareness of audience and an appropriate style maintained throughout. Excellent demonstration of insight and autonomy in evaluating own strengths, weaknesses, and impact in relation to professional, digital and practical skills. Excellent demonstration of ability to act on and give feedback based on external standards and
	High First	95				
	80-100	92				
		88				
		85				
		82				

				contexts, appropriate to the task and of excellent quality. Excellent application and discrimination between relevance of data/theories, showing critical judgment and originality/creativity.		achieve desired outcomes using own success criteria. Highly developed sense of ethical responsibility in relation to professional and personal codes of conduct.
	A First 70-79	78 75 72	Detailed knowledge and understanding of the relevant concepts and theories. Thorough understanding of key facts and use of terminology. Fully informed by wide reading and showing awareness of contested theories principles and concepts.	Takes a critical approach with convincing, well-synthesised arguments. A well-defined focus of research enquiry and discerning selection and application of strategies to address predictable and more complex problems, showing some originality. Comprehensive range of relevant literature evaluated, referenced and applied within a range of familiar and less familiar contexts appropriately to the task and of very good quality. Very good application and discrimination between relevance of data/theories, showing critical judgment and some originality/creativity.	Very good application of discipline-specific specialist skills. Processing and interpretation of a range of data efficiently and effectively. Effective team working, showing leadership skills and responsibility where appropriate. Very good use of relevant computational tools and technologies. Very good digital literacy skills.	Very good communication of information and ideas in a given medium/genre. Very good awareness of audience and an appropriate style maintained throughout. Very good demonstration of insight and autonomy in evaluating own strengths, weaknesses, and impact in relation to professional, digital and practical skills. Very good demonstration of ability to act on and give feedback based on external standards and achieve desired outcomes using own success criteria. Well- developed sense of ethical responsibility in relation to professional and personal codes of conduct.
Second	B 2.1 60-69	68 65 62	Good knowledge and understanding of key theories and main relevant concepts. Generally accurate, but possibly incomplete description or application of facts/some misuse of terminology. Answers informed by wide reading showing clarity of thought and recognizing competing perspectives.	Takes a critical approach, with coherent and well-structured arguments with only minor errors in synthesis. A defined focus of research enquiry, appropriate selection and application of relevant strategies to address predictable and more complex problems. Good range of relevant literature evaluated and applied within familiar contexts and some less familiar. There may be a few relatively minor errors in referencing. Proficient analysis of data/ theories with only minor flaws in application/interpretation. Some ability to distinguish between the relevance of data/theories.	Good application of discipline-specific specialist skills. Processing and interpretation of data effectively with only minor flaws. Good contribution to team working. Good use of relevant computational tools and technologies. Good digital literacy skills.	Good communication of information and ideas in a given medium/genre. Appropriate style for the intended audience. Good demonstration of insight and able to evaluate own strengths, weaknesses, and impact in relation to professional, digital and practical skills. Good evidence of ability to act on and give feedback to achieve desired outcomes in reference to external standards. Good sense of ethical responsibility in relation to professional and personal codes of conduct.

	C 2.2 50-59	58 55 52	<p>Knowledge and understanding of key theories, relevant concepts and terminology demonstrated, but may be incomplete/show some misunderstandings. Generally accurate, but incomplete description or application of relevant facts/some misuse of terminology. Answers informed by reading, showing a generalised understanding of key theories but a lack of awareness of different perspectives.</p>	<p>Some critical analysis and a clear structure but often descriptive with limited analysis or evaluation. Arguments may lack coherence in places due to poor synthesis. Research enquiry has a basic focus and mostly appropriate strategies are selected and applied but these may be better in predictable than more complex problems. Mostly appropriate range of relevant literature applied in familiar contexts. There may be some errors in referencing. Strategies selected might not always be appropriate. Analysis of data/theories but they may be flaws in application/interpretation.</p>	<p>Sufficient application of discipline-specific specialist skills. Mostly effective processing and interpretation of data. Can work effectively with others but may not be able to resolve conflict or modify behaviour in response to group. Effective use of relevant computational tools and technologies. Generally good digital literacy skills with weakness in some areas.</p>	<p>Mostly appropriate communication of information and ideas in a given medium/genre. Mostly appropriate style and awareness of audience. Demonstration of insight and/or ability to evaluate own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional, digital and practical skills. Evidence of ability to give and apply feedback to improve tasks/develop learning strategies, but reliant on expectations set by others. Adheres to professional and personal codes of conduct.</p>
Third	D Third 40-49	48 45 42	<p>General knowledge of theories and/or concepts demonstrated but may lack detail or be irrelevant to the task. Basic understanding of main facts and use of terminology evident but there may be frequent inaccuracies/omissions. Answers generally informed by reading. Does not go beyond core knowledge/ideas.</p>	<p>Some analysis given but may demonstrate flaws or points missing or be mainly descriptive. Research enquiry has a basic focus and some evidence of selection and application of strategies but there may be more inaccuracies or irrelevancies with complex problems. Mainly descriptive. Basic use of specified literature and/or limited material in unfamiliar contexts. There may be frequent errors in referencing although an overall system is used. Strategies selected not always appropriate. Some analysis of data/theories with some significant flaws in application/interpretation.</p>	<p>Basic application of discipline-specific specialist skills. Basic processing and interpretation of data with some flaws. Mostly working effectively with others but generally not able to resolve conflict or modify behaviour in response to group. Mostly effective use of relevant computational tools and technologies. Sufficient digital literacy skills.</p>	<p>Communicates of information and ideas in a given medium/genre but with evident weaknesses. Style may be inappropriate in places. Some evidence of ability to evaluate own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional, digital and practical skills identified by others. Some evidence of ability to give and apply feedback to improve tasks/learning strategies but only when set by others. Adheres to professional and personal codes of conduct although there may be flaws/mistakes made.</p>

Fail	F+ Marginal Fail 30-39	35	Some knowledge but limited understanding. Work contains inaccuracies/misunderstandings/omissions of key theories, concepts and facts. Limited use of reading to inform answers.	Mainly descriptive. Research enquiry lacks focus, and selection and application of strategies have inaccuracies or irrelevancies in both complex and predictable problems. Limited and/or inappropriate literature/material and/or poorly referenced. Strategies selected are mainly inappropriate. Largely unsystematic, incomplete and/or inaccurate analysis of data/theories.	Limited evidence of discipline-specific specialist skills. Processing and/or interpretation of data flawed. Not always working effectively with others. Issues with use of relevant computational tools and software packages. Limited demonstration of digital literacy skills.	Limited communication of information and ideas in a given medium/genre with evident weaknesses. Style not always appropriate. Limited evidence of ability to evaluate own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional, digital and practical skills identified by others. Limited evidence of ability to give or apply feedback to improve tasks or develop learning strategies. Does not adhere to personal or professional codes of conduct.
	F Fail 1-29	28 21 14 7	Major gaps in knowledge and understanding. Work is mainly inaccurate, and demonstrates misunderstandings of key theories, concepts and facts. Limited use of reading to inform answers.	Purely descriptive and shows a lack of understanding of the task. Research enquiry lacks focus and selection, and application of strategies are inaccurate or irrelevant in both predictable and complex problems. Limited and/or inappropriate literature, poorly referenced. Unsystematic, incomplete and/or inaccurate analysis of data/theories.	Little evidence of discipline-specific specialist skills. Processing and interpretation of data seriously flawed. Not working effectively with others. Little or no evidence of ability to use of relevant computational tools and software packages. Little or no demonstration of digital literacy skills.	Significant weaknesses in communication of information and ideas in a given medium/genre. Style inappropriate. Very limited evidence of insight into own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional, digital and practical skills. Little or no evidence of ability to give or apply feedback to develop effective strategies for own learning or that of others. Serious flaws in personal or professional codes of conduct.
	FF	0	Non-submission or of no discernible merit.	Non-submission or of no discernible merit.	Non-submission or of no discernible merit.	Non-submission or of no discernible merit.

The College Generic Marking Criteria Level 6

UG Credit Level 6			<p>Subject Knowledge and Understanding Demonstrates systematic understanding of key aspects of the topic relevant to this level of study, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> systematic knowledge of key theories, concepts, terminology, and facts relevant to the task shows areas of some specialist knowledge in depth informed by specialist reading around a topic showing a rigorous approach to study a critical understanding of theories within the discipline including appreciation of interrelationship with other fields of study 	<p>Intellectual Skills Demonstrates abstract conceptualization, critical thinking, and scholarly practice, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> critical evaluation of ideas and construction of an abstract argument synthesizing competing perspectives independent identification of research foci and application of strategies/methods to solve complex problems evaluation and synthesis of digital and non-digital literature to inform responses within unfamiliar situations analysis of new data/theories, selecting appropriate techniques/ criteria and evaluating outcomes/results. 	<p>Practical Skills including Digital Capabilities Demonstrates command of a range of specialized skills across contexts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> confident application of discipline-specific specialist skills in flexible contexts processing and interpretation of data to generate new information contribution to teamwork, group organization, give and receive feedback and ability to modify behaviours, resolve conflicts and influence others confident use of discipline-specific computational tools and technologies in flexible contexts confident application and critical appreciation of other digital literacies including usage of media tools, creation, collaboration, and wellbeing. 	<p>Generic/Transferable Skills including Professional Competencies Demonstrates command of a range of enabling skills and competencies, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> effective communication in a range of multi-media formats (including structure, accuracy of grammar and awareness of audience/genre within discipline-specific outputs) chooses appropriate formats/genres/medium of presentation appropriate to the task where permitted sets own performance criteria to evaluate self and others, and demonstrates accountability for own performance through reflective techniques and plans to act on feedback ethical accountability in relation to self, others, and academic/work community
First	A+ High First 80-100	100 95 92	Highly detailed knowledge and systematic understanding of the key concepts, terminology and theories which form the knowledge base of the subject and/or one specialist area,	Takes an insightful critical approach with convincing, well-synthesised abstract arguments throughout. An independent well-defined focus of research enquiry, and discerning selection and application of	Highly proficient and flexible application of discipline-specific specialist skills. Processing and interpretation of data efficiently to generate new information. Exceptional team working, including	Excellent communication of information and ideas in a chosen/given medium/genre. Excellent awareness of audience and an appropriate style maintained throughout. Excellent demonstration of insight and autonomy in evaluating own

		88 85 82	dependent on the task. Fully informed by specialist and/or new reading and showing critical appreciation of competing theories, principles and concepts. Shows insight in recognition of the interrelationship between fields of study.	strategies to address complex problems, showing originality. Extensive range of sources evaluated, referenced and applied to unfamiliar situations with flexibility, appropriate to the task and of excellent quality. Excellent discrimination between relevance of data/theories, analysis of new theory/data, showing critical judgment and originality/creativity.	enabling of others and responsibility taken for outcomes. Proficient use of relevant computational tools and technologies across a range of contexts. Exceptional digital literacy skills with critical appreciation and application.	strengths, weaknesses, and impact in relation to professional, digital and practical skills. Excellent provision of feedback to others based on external standards, and applies critical and technical reflection to set goals and plans for enhancement of performance/learning. Highly developed ethical accountability in relation to professional and personal codes of conduct.
	A First 70-79	78 75 72	Detailed knowledge and systematic understanding of the relevant concepts and theories which form the knowledge base of the subject and/or one specialist area, dependent on the task. Thorough understanding of key facts and use of terminology. Fully informed by specialist and/or new reading and showing awareness of contested theories principles and concepts. Shows some insight in recognition of the interrelationship between fields of study.	Takes a critical approach with convincing, well-synthesised abstract arguments. A well-defined focus of independent research enquiry and discerning selection and application of strategies to address complex problems, showing some originality. Comprehensive range of relevant literature evaluated, referenced and applied to unfamiliar situations with some flexibility, appropriate to the task and of very good quality. Very good application and discrimination between relevance of data/theories, analysis of new data/theories, showing critical judgment and some originality/creativity.	Very good application of discipline-specific specialist skills showing flexibility. Processing and interpretation of a range of data efficiently generate new information. Effective team working, showing leadership skills and responsibility where appropriate. Very good use of relevant computational tools and technologies across a range of contexts. Very good digital literacy skills with critical appreciation and application.	Very good communication of information and ideas in a chosen/given medium/genre. Very good awareness of audience and an appropriate style maintained throughout. Very good demonstration of insight and autonomy in evaluating own strengths, weaknesses, and impact in relation to professional, digital and practical skills. Very good provision of feedback to others based on external standards, and applies critical and technical reflection to set goals and plans for enhancement of performance/learning. Well-developed sense of ethical accountability in relation to professional and personal codes of conduct.
Second	B 2.1 60-69	68 65 62	Good knowledge and systematic understanding of key theories and main relevant concepts which form the knowledge base of the subject. Some good knowledge and understanding of specialist areas but may lack consistency. Generally accurate, but possibly incomplete description or application of facts/some misuse of	Takes a critical approach, with coherent and well-structured abstract arguments with only minor errors in synthesis. A defined focus of largely independent research enquiry, appropriate selection and application of relevant strategies to address complex problems. Good range of relevant literature evaluated and applied within unfamiliar contexts although may lack confidence and	Good application of discipline-specific specialist skills with some flexibility. Processing and interpretation of data effectively generate new information with only minor flaws. Good contribution to team working. Good use of relevant computational tools and technologies across a range of contexts. Good digital	Good communication of information and ideas in a chosen/given medium/genre. Appropriate style for the intended audience. Good demonstration of insight and able to evaluate own strengths, weaknesses, and impact in relation to professional, digital and practical skills. Good feedback to others based on external standards, and applies some critical and technical reflective techniques to set goals and plans for

			terminology in some specialist/new areas. Answers generally informed by specialist and/or new reading showing clarity of thought and recognizing competing perspectives. Some recognition of the interrelationship between fields of study.	flexibility. There may be a few relatively minor errors in referencing. Proficient analysis of data/ theories with only minor flaws in application/interpretation. Some evidence of ability to distinguish between the relevance of data/theories and analyse new data/theories.	literacy skills with some evidence of critical appreciation and application.	enhancement of performance/learning. Solid ethical accountability in relation to professional and personal codes of conduct.
	C 2.2 50-59	58 55 52	Knowledge and understanding of key theories, relevant concepts and terminology demonstrated, but may be incomplete/show some misunderstandings in specialist areas. Generally accurate, but incomplete description or application of relevant facts/some misuse of terminology. Answers informed by some specialist or new reading, showing a generalised understanding of key theories and some awareness of different perspectives. Some recognition of the interrelationship between fields of study but this may lack depth or be incomplete.	Some critical analysis and a clear structure but often descriptive with limited analysis or evaluation. May lack some confidence with abstract arguments. Arguments may lack coherence in places due to poor synthesis. Research enquiry is focused but requires guidance and mostly appropriate strategies are selected and applied but largely in familiar situations. Some appropriate relevant literature applied in unfamiliar contexts but there is more confidence with familiar contexts. There may be some errors in referencing. Strategies selected might not always be appropriate. Analysis of new data/theories but they may be flaws in application/interpretation.	Sufficient application of discipline-specific specialist skills but may lack flexibility. Mostly effective processing and interpretation of data to generate new information. Can work effectively with others but may not be able to resolve conflict or modify behaviour in response to group. Effective use of relevant computational tools and technologies but with a lack of flexibility. Generally good digital literacy skills, with weakness in some areas. Some basic critical appreciation and application.	Mostly appropriate communication of information and ideas in a given medium/genre. May not chose appropriate format/genre when given a choice. Mostly appropriate style and awareness of audience. Demonstration of insight and/or ability to evaluate own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional, digital and practical skills. Gives some feedback based on external standards. Applies some reflective techniques to set goals and plans for enhancement of performance/learning but these may be more technical than critical. Developing ethical accountability in adherence to personal and professional codes of conduct.
Third	D Third 40-49	48 45 42	General knowledge of theories and/or concepts demonstrated but may lack detail or be irrelevant to the task. Some specialist knowledge but incomplete or inaccurate. Basic understanding of main facts and use of terminology evident but there may be frequent inaccuracies/omissions. Answers generally informed by reading with some basic awareness of different	Some analysis given but may demonstrate flaws or points missing or be mainly descriptive. Lacks confidence with abstract concepts. Research enquiry has a basic focus with guidance, and some evidence of selection and application of strategies but there may be more inaccuracies or irrelevancies with complex problems. Mainly descriptive. Basic use of specified literature and/or limited material in unfamiliar	Sufficient application of discipline-specific specialist skills but lacks flexibility and confidence. Basic processing and interpretation of data with which may not generate new information and with some flaws. Mostly working effectively with others but generally not able to resolve conflict or modify behaviour in response to group. Mostly effective use of relevant	Communicates of information and ideas in a given medium/genre but with evident weaknesses. If given a choice, genre/format is largely inappropriate. Style may be inappropriate in places. Some evidence of ability to evaluate own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional, digital and practical skills identified by others. Gives basic feedback based on external standards. Applies some basic technical reflection to set goals and plans for

			perspectives. Does not go beyond core knowledge/ideas. Lack of awareness of the interrelationship between fields of study.	contexts. There may be frequent errors in referencing although an overall system is used. Strategies selected not always appropriate. Some analysis of new data/theories with some significant flaws in application/interpretation.	computational tools and technologies but lacks confidence in some contexts. Sufficient digital literacy skills but may lack confidence in less familiar contexts. Lacks critical appreciation and application.	enhancement of performance/learning. Developing ethical accountability in adherence to personal and professional codes of conduct although there may be minor flaws/mistakes made.
Fail	F+ Marginal Fail 30-39	35	Some knowledge but limited understanding. Work contains inaccuracies/misunderstandings/omissions of key theories, concepts and facts in both specialist and non-specialist knowledge. Limited use of reading to inform answers. Minimal awareness of specialist knowledge and competing perspectives.	Mainly descriptive and minimal abstract or critical evaluation. Research enquiry lacks focus and independence, and selection and application of strategies have inaccuracies or irrelevancies in both complex and predictable problems. Limited and/or inappropriate literature/material and/or poorly referenced. Strategies selected are mainly inappropriate. Largely unsystematic, incomplete and/or inaccurate analysis of data/theories.	Basic discipline-specific specialist skills. Processing and/or interpretation of data flawed and/or does not generate new information. Not always working effectively with others. Issues with use of relevant computational tools and software packages and lack of flexibility/confidence. Basic digital literacy skills and lacks critical appreciation and application	Limited communication of information and ideas in a given medium/genre with evident weaknesses. Chooses inappropriate format/genre. Style not always appropriate. Limited evidence of ability to evaluate own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional, digital and practical skills identified by others. Limited evidence of ability to give feedback based on external standards. Limited reflection or setting goals and plans for enhancement of performance/learning. Does not adhere to personal or professional codes of conduct.
	F Fail 1-29	28 21 14 7	Major gaps in knowledge and understanding in all areas. Work is mainly inaccurate, and demonstrates misunderstandings of key theories, concepts and facts. Limited use of reading to inform answers. Lacks awareness of specialist knowledge and competing perspectives.	Purely descriptive and shows a lack of understanding of the task/concepts. Research enquiry lacks focus and selection and application of strategies are inaccurate or irrelevant in both predictable and complex problems. Limited and/or inappropriate literature, poorly referenced. Unsystematic, incomplete and/or inaccurate analysis of data/theories.	Little evidence of discipline-specific specialist skills. Processing and interpretation of data seriously flawed and does not generate new information. Not working effectively with others. Little or no evidence of ability to use of relevant computational tools and software packages. Minimal or no demonstration of digital literacy skills.	Significant weaknesses in communication of information and ideas in a given medium/genre. Genre/format wholly inappropriate. Style inappropriate. Very limited evidence of insight into own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional, digital and practical skills. Little or no evidence of ability to give feedback. Little or no evidence of ability to reflect on own learning. Serious flaws in personal or professional codes of conduct.
	FF	0	Non-submission or of no discernible merit.	Non-submission or of no discernible merit.	Non-submission or of no discernible merit.	Non-submission or of no discernible merit.

The College Generic Marking Criteria Level 7

PGT Credit Level 7			Subject Knowledge and Understanding Demonstrates deep and systematic understanding of specialist areas relevant to this level of study, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> depth of knowledge of key theories, concepts, terminology, and facts relevant to the task shows mastery of specialist knowledge in depth informed by specialist reading around a topic demonstration of a critical approach to existing theories and approaches within the discipline, including appreciation of interrelationship with other disciplines may suggest new approaches and concepts where relevant 	Intellectual Skills Demonstrates highly abstract conceptualization in familiar and unfamiliar contexts, critical thinking, application and scholarly practice, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> critical evaluation of ideas and construction of an abstract argument, arguing for alternative approaches where relevant. independently designs and undertakes investigations to address areas of practice/theory, selection, and evaluation of methodological approaches to generate data for transformative solutions. evaluation and synthesis of digital and non-digital literature to inform responses within unfamiliar situations flexible and creative analysis of complex or contradictory data/theories/evidence. 	Practical Skills including Digital Capabilities Demonstrates command of a range of advanced specialized skills adapted to multiple contexts, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> mastery of discipline-specific advanced specialist skills in multiple contexts processing and interpretation of complex data to generate new information or insights works effectively with multiple teams in a variety of contexts as a leader or member, taking into account diversity, recognizes and employs the capacity of others, works with others to anticipate and resolve conflict mastery of discipline-specific advanced computational tools and technologies in flexible contexts confident application and critical appreciation of other digital literacies including usage of media tools, creation, collaboration and wellbeing. 	Generic/Transferable Skills including Professional Competencies Demonstrates autonomy and responsibility through a range of enabling skills and competencies, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> effective communication in a range of multi-media formats (including structure, accuracy of grammar and awareness of audience/genre within discipline-specific outputs) selects and evaluates appropriate formats/genres/medium of presentation appropriate to the task where permitted autonomously identifies and implements improvements to performance and demonstrates accountability for own performance through reflective techniques and plans to act on feedback (including in relationship with supervisors) incorporates a critical ethical accountability in relation to self, others, and academic/practice community
Distinction	A+ Distinction 80-100	100 95 92	Authoritative, deep understanding of the key concepts, terminology and theories which form specialist areas of knowledge. Fully informed by specialist reading, critically aware of new	Takes a highly original critical approach with convincing well-structured abstract arguments throughout. Takes a clear authoritative position on alternative approaches where relevant. Shows a very	Highly proficient and flexible application of advanced discipline-specific specialist skills across all relevant contexts, drawing on innovative sector practice. Processing and interpretation of complex data creatively	Excellent communication of information and ideas in a chosen/given medium/genre. Excellent awareness of audience and an appropriate style maintained throughout. Excellent demonstration of insight and autonomy in evaluating own

		88 85 82	<p>developments in the field.</p> <p>Demonstrating an insightful and original critical response to existing theories, principles, practices and concepts. New concepts or approaches where relevant are insightful and original. Shows insight in recognition of the interrelationship between disciplines.</p>	<p>high level of autonomy in designing a focus of research enquiry, critically evaluates and selects appropriate methods/techniques, showing flexibility and creativity. Data generated is of excellent quality and interpreted to provide transformative solutions/implications. Extensive range of sources evaluated, referenced and applied to unfamiliar situations with flexibility, appropriate to the task and of excellent quality. A very high level of flexibility and creativity in analysis of complex/contradictory data/theories and/or evidence.</p>	<p>and/or flexibly to generate new information and insights. Exemplary team working in a variety of contexts, shows respect for diversity, enabling of others and anticipates and resolves conflict with a high degree of autonomy. Highly proficient and flexible use of relevant computational tools and technologies across all relevant contexts. Exceptional digital literacy skills with critical appreciation and application.</p>	<p>strengths, weaknesses, and impact in relation to professional, digital and practical skills. Excellent quality feedback to others based on external standards, and applies critical and technical reflection to set goals and plans for enhancement of performance/learning. Highly developed ethical accountability in relation to professional and personal codes of conduct.</p>
	A Distinction 70-79	78 75 72	<p>Highly detailed knowledge and deep understanding of the key concepts, terminologies and theories which form specialist areas of knowledge. Well informed by specialist reading, aware of new developments in the field. Demonstrating an often insightful response to existing theories, principles, practices and concepts. New concepts or approaches suggested where relevant are insightful. Shows recognition of the interrelationship between disciplines.</p>	<p>Takes an original critical approach with convincing well-structured abstract arguments. Takes a clear position on alternative approaches where relevant. Shows a high level of autonomy in designing a focus of research enquiry, critically evaluates and selects appropriate methods/techniques, showing some flexibility and creativity. Data generated is of very good quality and interpreted to provide transformative solutions/implications. Comprehensive range of sources evaluated, referenced and applied to unfamiliar situations with flexibility, appropriate to the task and of very good quality. A high level of flexibility and creativity in analysis of complex/contradictory data/theories and/or evidence.</p>	<p>Highly proficient application of advanced discipline-specific specialist skills adapting to a variety of contexts, sometimes drawing on sector best practice. Processing and interpretation of complex data efficiently and flexibly generate new information and insights. Effective team working in a variety of contexts, shows respect for diversity, enabling of others and anticipates and resolves conflict. Highly proficient use of relevant computational tools and technologies adapting to a variety of contexts. Very good digital literacy skills with critical appreciation and application.</p>	<p>Very effective communication of information and ideas in a chosen/given medium/genre. Very good awareness of audience and an appropriate style maintained throughout. Very good demonstration of insight and autonomy in evaluating own strengths, weaknesses, and impact in relation to professional, digital and practical skills. Very good quality feedback to others based on external standards, and applies critical and technical reflection to set goals and plans for enhancement of performance/learning. Well- developed sense of ethical accountability in relation to professional and personal codes of conduct.</p>

Merit	B	68	Detailed knowledge and deep understanding of key theories and main relevant concepts which form specialist areas of knowledge, but with some minor gaps. Informed by specialist reading, although there may be omissions. Demonstrating a critical response to existing theories, principles, practices and concepts. New concepts or approaches suggested where relevant are applicable but may lack critical appraisal. Shows some recognition of the interrelationship between disciplines.	Takes a critical approach with mostly well-structured convincing arguments but may lack confidence at the level of abstraction. Takes a clear position on alternative approaches where relevant although these vary in quality. Shows autonomy in designing a focus of research enquiry, evaluates and selects appropriate methods/techniques but may lack flexibility and creativity. Data generated is of good quality and interpreted to provide new solutions/implications. A wide range of sources evaluated, referenced and applied to unfamiliar situations with some flexibility, appropriate to the task and of good quality. Some flexibility and creativity in analysis of complex/contradictory data/theories and/or evidence but this may lack consistency.	Very effective application of most advanced discipline-specific specialist skills but not equally proficient in all contexts. Processing and interpretation of data effectively to generate new information and insights with only minor flaws. Effective team working in most contexts, shows respect for diversity, shows awareness of the capacities of others, and resolves conflict. Very good use of relevant computational tools and technologies but not equally proficient in all contexts. Good digital literacy skills with some evidence of critical appreciation and application.	Effective communication of information and ideas in a chosen/given medium/genre. Appropriate style for the intended audience. Good demonstration of insight and able to evaluate own strengths, weaknesses, and impact in relation to professional, digital and practical skills. Quality feedback to others based on external standards, and applies some critical and technical reflective techniques to set goals and plans for enhancement of performance/learning. Solid ethical accountability in relation to professional and personal codes of conduct.
	Merit	65				
	60-69	62				
Pass	C	58	Knowledge and understanding of key theories, relevant concepts and terminology demonstrated in specialist areas, but may be incomplete/show some misunderstandings or focus on breadth over depth. Informed by specialist reading, but showing a generalised understanding of key theories and there may be some major works omitted. Demonstrating some critical response to existing theories, principles, practices and concepts but this may lack depth or be generalised in places. New concepts or approaches suggested where relevant	Some critical analysis but may be flawed in places or lack coherence due to weak structure. Often more descriptive with limited analysis or evaluation. Lacks some confidence with abstract arguments. Offers some alternative approaches where relevant although these may lack applicability. Designs a focus of research enquiry and methods selected are mostly appropriate, but requires assistance. Some evaluation of methods/techniques. Data generated is of satisfactory quality and interpreted to provide solutions/implications but lacks originality or flexibility. A range of sources applied to unfamiliar situations but	Effective application of most discipline-specific specialist skills but may be less proficient in more advanced skills and some contexts. Mostly effective processing and interpretation of data to generate new information but may lack proficiency or insights. Good contribution to teamwork in most contexts, shows respect for diversity in most situations, shows some awareness of the capacities of others and can resolve conflict in some situations. Mostly effective use of relevant computational tools and technologies but less confident in some contexts. Generally good digital literacy	Communicates information and ideas in a given medium/genre with evident weaknesses. May not chose appropriate format/genre when given a choice. Style may be inappropriate in places. Demonstration of insight and/or ability to evaluate own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional, digital and practical skills. Gives feedback based on external standards. Applies some reflective techniques to set goals and plans for enhancement of performance/learning but these may be more technical than critical. Developing ethical accountability in adherence to personal and professional codes of conduct.
	Pass	55				
	50-59	52				

			may lack relevance/applicability. Shows some recognition of the interrelationship between disciplines.	there may be errors in evaluation/appropriateness to the task/referencing. Analysis of complex/contradictory data/theories and/or evidence but this may be incomplete or inaccurate in places.	skills, with weakness in some areas. Some basic critical appreciation and application.	
Fail	D Marginal Fail 40-49	48 45 42	General knowledge of theories and/or concepts demonstrated but lack depth / are irrelevant to the task/ have frequent inaccuracies. Some specialist knowledge but with major omissions. May be informed by more general reading or uses some specialist works with major omissions/misunderstandings. New concepts or approaches not suggested where relevant, or lack relevance/applicability. Lack of awareness of the interrelationship between disciplines.	Some analysis attempted but may demonstrate flaws or points missing or be mainly descriptive. Largely unable to work with abstract concepts. Alternative approaches where relevant lack applicability or are not present. Requires significant help in designing a focus of research enquiry, selecting or evaluating methods. Methods selected are not always appropriate. Limited evaluation of methods/techniques. Data generated is of generally poor quality and interpretation provides inappropriate or basic solutions/implications. Sources are used but there may be significant errors or lack of evaluation/appropriateness to the task/referencing. Analysis of complex/contradictory data/theories and/or evidence is often incomplete or inaccurate.	Some application of discipline-specific specialist skills but lacks confidence in advanced skills and is only able to work in some contexts. Basic processing and interpretation of data with which may not generate new information and with some flaws. Some ability to work effectively with others but generally not able to respond to the group diversity and capabilities or resolve conflict. Some use of relevant computational tools and technologies but within a limited range of contexts. Some digital literacy skills but lacks confidence in less familiar contexts. Lacks critical appreciation and application.	Communicates information and ideas in a given medium/genre but with significant weaknesses. If given a choice, genre/format is largely inappropriate. Style not always appropriate. Some evidence of ability to evaluate own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional, digital and practical skills identified by others. Gives basic feedback based on external standards. Applies only basic technical reflection to set goals and plans for enhancement of performance/learning and /or relies on others to identify these. Developing ethical accountability in adherence to personal and professional codes of conduct although there are flaws/mistakes made.
Fail	F+ Fail 30-39	35	Some knowledge but limited depth. Work contains inaccuracies/misunderstandings/omissions of key theories, concepts and facts in both specialist and non-specialist knowledge. Limited use of reading to inform answers. No new concepts or approaches suggested where relevant. Minimal or no	Mainly descriptive and minimal abstract or critical evaluation. Alternative approaches where relevant are not present or significantly flawed. Unable to designing a focus of research enquiry, select or evaluate methods without help. Limited or significantly flawed evaluation of methods/techniques. Data generated is of poor quality and interpretation provides	Basic discipline-specific specialist skills. Processing and/or interpretation of data flawed and/or does not generate new information. Not always working effectively with others. Minimal use of relevant computational tools and software packages. Basic digital literacy skills and lacks critical appreciation and application	Limited communication of information and ideas in a given medium/genre. Chooses inappropriate format/genre. Style inappropriate. Limited evidence of ability to evaluate own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional, digital and practical skills identified by others. Limited evidence of ability to give feedback based on external standards. Limited reflection or setting goals and plans for enhancement of

			awareness of specialist knowledge and lacks awareness of interdisciplinary issues.	inappropriate solutions/implications. Limited and/or inappropriate literature/material and/or poorly referenced. Analysis of complex/contradictory data/theories and/or evidence is incomplete or inaccurate		performance/learning. Does not adhere to personal or professional codes of conduct.
F Fail 1-29	28 21 14 7	Major gaps in knowledge and understanding in all areas. Work is mainly inaccurate, and demonstrates misunderstandings of key theories, concepts and facts. Limited use of reading to inform answers. Lacks awareness of specialist knowledge and interdisciplinary issues.	Purely descriptive and shows a lack of understanding of the task/concepts. Alternative approaches where relevant are not present. Unable to designing a focus of research enquiry, select or evaluate methods. No or significantly flawed evaluation of methods/techniques. Data generated is of very poor quality or absent and interpretation provides inappropriate solutions/implications/is absent. Inappropriate literature/material and poorly referenced. Analysis of complex/contradictory data/theories and/or evidence is absent or significantly flawed.	Little evidence of discipline-specific specialist skills. Processing and interpretation of data seriously flawed and does not generate new information. Not working effectively with others. Little or no evidence of ability to use of relevant computational tools and software packages. Minimal or no demonstration of digital literacy skills.	Significant weaknesses in communication of information and ideas in a given medium/genre. Genre/format wholly inappropriate. Style wholly inappropriate. Very limited evidence of insight into own strengths and weaknesses in relation to professional, digital and practical skills. Little or no evidence of ability to give feedback. Little or no evidence of ability to reflect on own learning. Serious flaws in personal or professional codes of conduct.	
FF	0	Non-submission or of no discernible merit.	Non-submission or of no discernible merit.	Non-submission or of no discernible merit.	Non-submission or of no discernible merit.	

6. Implementation of the Marking Frame

In their meetings in November 2021, ASSC/CEC agreed that the new KCL Marking Frame will be available for interested faculties to be piloted in the academic year 2022/23. The pilot may entail the complete marking frame or parts of it, i.e. marking models, step-marking, and/or the new marking criteria. Similarly, the pilot may be used by the whole faculty or in interested departments only. For further details and support please contact [Lauren Cracknell](#) / King's Academy. ASSC will be looking for feedback throughout the year to feed into a revised final policy and will report to CEC, with the anticipation that a recommendation for full implementation can be made for 2023/24.

Marking models: A faculty may decide to pilot the set of new marking models. The implementation requires the Faculty Assessment Board to agree on the changes. Assessment sub-boards will then select the most appropriate marking model for each assessment type within a module. Programmes must provide students with details of the College Marking Framework and the models that they intend to apply, so student handbooks need to be amended before the start of the academic year to illustrate which model is used for an assessment. Markers may need training on the new models.

Step-Marking: Step-marking can be used for many types of assessment and may be applied to a single assessment or the whole programme, where appropriate. It may necessitate a new set of marking criteria (see below), but it does not require changes to mark input as the agreed band will be reported as a numerical mark to SITS.

Introducing a step-marking scheme will need marking training at departmental level plus changes to student handbooks, KEATS, etc. Students will have to be introduced to the new scheme as well, and the application of the steps and the corresponding marking criteria would also need to be trained. This should be done within the module so staff would be able to embed some criteria training exercises for students. Examples on how to do this can be sourced via King's Academy.

Marking criteria: The new set of Level 4 generic criteria has been approved by CEC, and the remaining Levels 5-7 will go to ASSC in March 2022. Faculties as well as departments can evaluate their need to adjust/replace their own local criteria. This will involve guidance or training on how to adapt the generic criteria for an assessment specific rubric, and DEC/FEC input may be required. External Examiners should also be asked for comment. Once established, all markers can be trained. The new marking criteria should be made available to students at the start of the academic year.

7. Glossary

Assessment marking criteria: a set of marking criteria designed to help students know what is expected of them for a specific assessment type.

Internal Markers: Internal examiners, i.e., members of academic staff (Professors, Readers, Senior Lecturers or Lecturers) of King's College London. **NOTE: Advice is sought from ASSC for an exact definition.**

College generic marking criteria: a common set of marking criteria set across levels 4 – 7 by the College, aligning level 6 to the [QAA Outcome Qualification Descriptors](#). See also Marking Criteria.

Faculty marking criteria: a set of marking criteria set by the faculty across levels 4 – 7. The criteria will adapt and supplement the College Generic Marking Criteria to reflect the style and nature of assessments in the particular faculty. See also Marking Criteria.

Formative assessment: assessment to monitor student learning and provide ongoing feedback to staff and students. It is assessment for learning. It helps students identify their strengths and weaknesses and will 'feed forward' towards the next assessment.

Local marking criteria: a set of marking criteria across levels 4 – 7, adapted from the generic or Faculty criteria to make them applicable to the discipline/department. See also Marking Criteria.

Marking criteria: The learning outcome knowledge, understanding and skills requirements that are taken into account in awarding assessment marks. Criteria are set across levels 4 – 7.

Marking models: a set of models that describes how assessments should be marked and the marking checked e.g., use of single marking, double marking, etc. Assessment Sub-Boards will select the most appropriate marking

model for each assessment type within a module from the marking models approved for use in the College Marking Framework.

Marking scale: assessment is marked against a scale of 0–100% or against defined bands (step-marking scheme).

Marking scheme: A detailed structure for assigning marks where a specific number of marks are given to individual components of the answer.

QAA Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ): framework for UK degree awards, from levels 4 – 8.

Self-assessment: a student self-assesses their own assignment using lecturer’s criteria.

Peer-assessment: students assess another student’s assignment using a lecturer’s criteria.

Relevant, timely feedback: feedback on an assessment is returned to the student to enable the student to learn how to improve for their next piece of assessment. King’s timescale for returning feedback is within 4 weeks from submission of the assessment. This can be individual feedback on a student’s work or feedback to a whole cohort.

Rubrics: a set of criteria used for assessing a submitted work or a presentation.

Step-Marking Scheme/Stepped Marking: using a restricted number of marks within the range of 0-100%

Summative assessment: An assessment which contributes to the marks recorded on a student’s transcript.

Third marker: an experienced internal examiner who is brought in to assist in agreeing a mark where the 1st and 2nd marker have discrepancies that are unable to be resolved.

Transparency of markers: clear notes on how a mark has been reached between 1st and 2nd markers.

8. Members of the Working Group

Ms Lynne Barker, Associate Director, Quality, Standards and Enhancement

Professor Richard Brown, Emeritus Professor of Neuropsychology and Clinical Neuroscience, IoPPN

Dr Jocelyn Cornish, Lecturer, Florence Nightingale Faculty of Nursing, Midwifery & Palliative Care

Dr Anatoliy Markiv, Director of Distance Learning Programmes, FoLSM

Dr Mark Packer, Associate Dean Postgraduate Taught, Faculty of Dentistry, Oral & Craniofacial Sciences

Dr Jayne Pearson, Senior Teaching Fellow, Kings Academy

Dr Tim Rakow, Reader and Deputy Director, BSc Psychology, IoPPN

Dr Marc Schelhase, Lecturer in Defence Studies, SSPP

Mr James Toner, Head of Digital Education and the Centre for Technology Enhanced Learning

Dr Victor Turcanu, Senior Lecturer in Allergy, FoLSM

Professor Gérard Watts, Professor in Theoretical Physics, NMES

Ms Irene Zeller, Lecturer, Florence Nightingale Faculty of Nursing, Midwifery & Palliative Care

Dr Claire Wardell, Associate Director (Education), King’s Business School

Ms Meher Bhalla, Student Representative (For Step-Marking)

Mr Dan Alefounder (Officer), TEF Manager, Academic Regulations, Policy & Compliance (For Step-Marking)

Ms Eirona Morgan (Officer), Policy Manager (Education Transformation), Academic Regulation, Policy & Compliance

Ms Anette Schroeder-Rossell (Chair), Deputy Director, Modern Language Centre, PACE
