

**Scheme of Assessment**  
**BSc (hons) Healthcare Science (Physiological Science) Year 3**  
**Academic Year 2024-2025**

Each programme of study shall have a Scheme of Assessment for each major stage (eg year) or module, as defined in its Regulations. Schemes of Assessment, and changes thereto, are approved by the monitoring committee responsible for the programme of study.

Qualification and Programme Title(s)	Year(s) of programme
BSc (hons) Healthcare Science (Physiological Science)	3

**Section A: Regulatory framework: Assessments, Modules, Progression & Award**

**1: Overview of marking scheme**

Each module has prescribed assessment elements as detailed in the following table(s). All assessment elements are **summative** unless otherwise indicated. *[Insert rows into each table as required, for additional assessment elements and modules. Example of completed table included at Appendix 2.]*

Year 3								
Module title	Credits (number)	Credits (level)	Core/Optional	Assessment elements	Learning Outcomes Assessed	Weighting % (or Pass/Fail only)	Timing (semester)	ACHIEVING A PASS
Professional Practice 3	15	6	C	In-course essay (2000 words)		60%	5	Each assessment element must be passed separately
				Oral presentation		40%	6	
Applying Cardiac Physiology to Practice OR Applying Respiratory and Sleep Physiology to Practice	45	6	C	Written examination (3hr): Single best Answer and / or Short Answer Questions	All	70%	6	Each assessment element must be passed separately
				In-course essay (4000 words)		30%	5/6	
Research Project in Cardiac Physiology OR Research Project in Respiratory and Sleep Physiology	30	6	C	Dissertation (9000 words)		80%	6	Each assessment element must be passed separately
				Oral viva		20%	6	

Clinical Training 3	30	6	C	Attendance at work-based placements		Pass / Fail	5&6	Each assessment element must be completed to a satisfactory level
				Demonstration of specified Clinical Competencies		Pass / Fail	5&6	
				Demonstration of specified Professional Competencies		Pass / Fail	5&6	
				Portfolio		Pass / Fail	5&6	

## 2: Modules – additional regulations (add rows as required)

Confirm any additional requirements to pass the modules listed in the above tables.

Module title	Regulation
Research Project in Cardiac Physiology OR Research Project in Respiratory and Sleep Physiology	Submit evidence of all necessary information governance training.  Submit evidence of all appropriate ethical and/or governance approvals (e.g. SAFE and study protocol).

## 3: Formative Assessments

Explain the opportunities provided for formative assessments [ref: course materials, module outlines, Canvas, etc]

None

## 4: Assessment elements

For assessment elements awarded a numerical mark, confirm the number of decimal places that the element mark is rounded to [ref: Appendix 1 Assessment Regulations, item 5]

Assessment elements which are awarded a numerical mark will be **rounded to 1dp**.

This is the mark that will be used for calculation of the module mark.

For an assessment element, or group of elements, that your programme has determined **must be passed separately**, confirm the minimum mark required [ref: Appendix 1 Assessment Regulations, items 1 & 2] and confirm that no compensation is permitted [ref: Appendix 1 Assessment Regulations, item 3]

Where an assessment element requires a numerical mark, the minimum mark required to pass is 40.0%

No compensation is permitted: the pass mark must be reached for all assessment elements in a module.

Confirm if the pass mark for any assessment element is standard-set (pre-normalisation to the L6 or L7 % scale) [ref: Appendix 1 Assessment Regulations, item 1]

No

## 5: Modules

For modules awarded a numerical mark, confirm the number of decimal places that the module mark is rounded to [ref: Appendix 1 Assessment Regulations, item 5]

Modules which are awarded a numerical mark will be **rounded to 1dp**.

This is the mark that will be used for calculation of the award.

For a module awarded a numerical mark, confirm the pass mark required [ref: Appendix 1 Assessment Regulations, item 1] and confirm that no compensation is permitted [ref: Appendix 1 Assessment Regulations, item 3]. [Note: a module can only be passed if any minimum mark requirement for an assessment element(s) has also been met [ref: Appendix 1 Assessment Regulations, item 12]]

Where a module requires a numerical mark, the minimum numerical mark required to pass will be 40.0%.  
No compensation is permitted at module level: the pass mark for the module must be reached for all modules.

### 6: Year marks (only applicable for programmes >1 year in length)

Confirm if your programme issues an overall **year mark** for each year of the programme [ref: Appendix 1 Assessment Regulations, item 14]

A year mark is issued for each year of the programme.

This mark is provided for the information of the students.

If your programme issues year marks, explain how the year mark is calculated from the module marks [ref: Appendix 1 Assessment Regulations, item 14]

The overall year mark is the sum of the year's module marks weighted by credit value.  
Modules that are not allocated a numerical mark (clinical training modules) are excluded from the year mark calculation.

The following is given as a worked example:

Module	Credit value	Mark awarded
Professional Practice 3	15 credits	58.7
Applying Cardiac Physiology to Practice	45 credits	74.0
Research Project in Cardiac Physiology	30 credits	66.6
Clinical Training 3: Cardiac Physiology	30 credits	Pass

Weighted mark for Professional Practice 3 =  $(58.7 \times 15/90)$

Weighted mark for Applying Cardiac Physiology to Practice =  $(74.0 \times 45/90)$

Weighted mark for Research Project in Cardiac Physiology =  $(66.6 \times 30/90)$

$$\text{Year 3 overall: } ((58.7 \times 15/90) + (74.0 \times 45/90) + (66.6 \times 30/90)) \\ = 68.98\%$$

If your programme issues year marks, confirm the number of decimal places that the year mark is rounded to [ref: Appendix 1 Assessment Regulations, item 5]

The Year mark will formally be **rounded to 1dp**.

This mark is provided for the information of the student and to determine progression to the next year of the programme. The year mark is not used for the calculation of an award mark.

### 7: Progression (only applicable for programmes >1 year in length)

If your programme issues year marks, explain how it is determined whether a student can progress to the next year of the programme [ref: Appendix 1 Assessment Regulations, item 15 (& item 9)]

Progression (to the next year of the programme or to the award) requires successful completion of all individual assessment elements within each enrolled module for the academic year.

If your programme does **not** issue year marks, explain how it is determined whether a student can progress to the next year of the programme [ref: for example passing every module in the table in no.1 above]

N/A

### 8: Trailing failed assessments/credits

If your programme allows a student to carry failed assessments into the next year of the programme (to be passed whilst enrolled on the next year of the programme), provide details of what is permitted (this may be by number of assessment elements, modules, credits, or by type/method of assessment) [ref: course materials, module outlines, Canvas, etc]

Students must normally pass all programme modules before commencing the next year of studies.

### 9: Award

Confirm if your programme issues an overall **award mark** for the programme [ref: Appendix 1 Assessment Regulations, item 16/17]

The BSc Honours Healthcare Science degree will be awarded by the Board of Examiners to students who have completed all the course requirements and passed all modules for which they are enrolled.

If your programme issues overall award marks, explain how the award mark is calculated from the module marks [ref: Appendix 1 Assessment Regulations, item 16/17]

Marks from Year 1, Year 2 and Year 3 summative assessments will contribute to the final classification of the degree.

All modules must be passed in order to be eligible for the award of the degree. The final award mark is the sum of each year's module marks (including any final year credit enhancement), weighted by credit value and weighted by the year's contribution to the award.

Year 1 marks contribute 10%, year 2 marks 30% and year 3 marks 60% to the final award mark.

If your programme issues overall award marks, confirm the number of decimal places that the award mark is rounded to [ref: Appendix 1 Assessment Regulations, item 5]

The final award mark is rounded to a whole number.

For programmes that are >1 year in length, confirm the award algorithm (ratio between levels/years of the programme, for example L4:5:6 = 0:3:7) [ref: General Regulation 7.5 and Appendix 1 Assessment Regulations, item 17]

Year 1 contributes 10%, Year 2 contributes 30% and Year 3 contributes 60% of the total percentage marks

If your programme does **not** issue overall award marks, explain how it is determined whether a student can be awarded a qualification [ref: for example passing every module in the table in no.1 above]

N/A

### 10: Classification

If your programme issues overall award marks, confirm that the classification is determined from the overall award mark (rounded to 1dp) rounded to a whole number [ref: Appendix 1 Assessment Regulations, item 5]

For final **classification** purposes, the final award mark is rounded to a **whole number**.

Confirm the classification boundaries for the award [ref: Appendix 1 Assessment Regulations, item 18]

70% and above First Class Honours (1st)

60% - 69% Upper Second Class Honours (2.1)

50% - 59% Lower Second Class Honours (2.2)

40% - 49% Third Class Honours (3rd)

39% - 0% Fail

There is no provision for a 'pass' classification or award of the degree without Honours.

### 11: Boundaries and Borderlines

Explain any particular requirements that apply at a classification boundary [ref: particular modules, like research projects at L7, that need to reach the classification threshold separately to the overall mark; or modules that need to be passed at first attempt for a distinction]

Candidates shall stay in the classification indicated by their overall final mark, except where the candidate falls into a borderline category as defined below, in which case the candidate may be eligible to be promoted to the next highest degree classification.

Explain the regulations for considering students at a classification borderline [ref: General Regulations para 7.6(b)]

A borderline zone of 1% will be used at all the BSc degree classification boundaries, effectively operating at 68.5% (First class honours), 58.5% (Second class honours (upper division)), 48.5% (Second class honours (lower division)) and 38.5% (Third class honours) due to rounding.

Students who achieve **both** of the following two requirements will automatically be promoted to the next highest degree classification. Students will be identified by the Chair of the Board of Examiners and approved by the exam board.

Boundary	Requirement 1:	Requirement 2:
	Final Weighted Average	Year 3 modules totalling at least 30 credits with the following marks:
1 <sup>st</sup>	68.5	≥ 70
2i	58.5	≥ 60
2ii	48.5	≥ 50
3rd	38.5	≥ 40

The following is given as a worked example:

Module	Credit value	Mark awarded
Professional Practice 3	15 credits	54.8
Applying Cardiac Physiology to Practice	45 credits	65.5
Research Project in Cardiac Physiology	30 credits	72.3
Clinical Training 3	30 credits	Pass

Final weighted average = 68.9

In this example the student would be promoted to a to a 1<sup>st</sup> class degree classification as with they have:

A) Met requirement 1 (final weighted average of 68.9 is greater than threshold of 68.5 average)

**and**

B) Met requirement 2 (module mark of 72.3 in Research Project in Cardiac Physiology is greater than 70 required in a module totalling at least 30 credits).

## 12: Compulsory transfer to other programmes (if applicable)

Explain the regulations regarding the compulsory transfer of students to an alternative pathway/programme on account of not achieving the required marks [ref: Programme Regulations, course materials, module outlines, Canvas, etc]

N/A

## 13: Exit qualifications

Explain the exit qualifications available and the requirements for them [ref: Programme Regulations, course materials, module outlines, Canvas, etc]

Students who have successfully completed all modules of the first two years of the programme shall be eligible for the SGUL award of **Undergraduate Diploma in Healthcare Science**.

## 14: Reassessment regulations

Confirm the number of reassessment opportunities permitted for each assessment element [ref: Appendix 1 Assessment Regulations, item 6]

One automatic resit attempt will be permitted at each assessment element that has not met the minimum numerical mark (or a Pass, for assessment elements marked Pass/Fail only)
Explain any limitations for the reassessment of practice-based elements/modules <i>[ref: course materials, module outlines, Canvas, etc]</i>
A student who fails the Clinical Training module may be required to undertake remedial assessments and/or attend additional placement weeks to enable fulfilment of attendance requirements, completion of competency requirements or other work-based assessments, or to gather further evidence required for resubmission of the portfolio.  The reassessment may take place outside of scheduled term dates for the programme. In some cases, the student may be required to re-sit the entire placement in the following academic year. The arrangements for reassessment will be negotiated between the SGUL Work-Based Placement Co-ordinator and the NHS Work-Based Placement Supervisor according to the student's needs and may fall outside of the standard academic year.
If a reassessment <b>meets</b> the pass standard, confirm the mark capping arrangement for the assessment element and the module <i>[ref: Appendix 1 Assessment Regulations, item 7]</i>
Following a successful resit of an assessment element, the <b>assessment element mark is capped</b> at the base numerical pass mark; the <b>module mark is not capped</b> at the bare module pass mark.
If a reassessment does <b>not meet</b> the pass standard, confirm how the final mark for the assessment element and module are determined <i>[ref: Appendix 1 Assessment Regulations, item 8]</i>
In the case of an assessment element that has been resat and still not reached the minimum mark required to pass, the <b>highest (not the latest) assessment element fail mark will apply</b>
Explain the regulations and limitations regarding discretionary 3 <sup>rd</sup> attempts at assessment elements/modules for your programme <i>[ref: General Regulation para 4.10, fast-track criteria, and limitations to number of times a student on your programme can be considered during their programme]</i>
The discretionary panel fast-track criteria for the programme will be published in the Regulations and Policies section of the course VLE homepage.

<b>15: Board of Examiners</b>
Explain any additional responsibilities for Boards of Examiners' or procedures for the conduct of meetings, beyond those in the General regulations <i>[ref: General Regulations section 8]</i>
N/A
Explain any additional roles or responsibilities of external examiners, beyond those in the General Regulations and Quality Manual <i>[ref: General Regulations section 9 and Quality Manual, Section I QM of Assessment, paras 13-27]</i>
N/A

<b>16: Date of Award</b>
Confirm how the date of award is determined <i>[ref: General Regulations para 2.5(14) and Programme Regulations]</i>
The date of the award of the degree shall be the date of the Board of Examiners meeting at which the award is conferred

## Section B: Policies and procedures

<b>17: Assessment criteria and Marking schemes</b>
Confirm the <b>assessment criteria</b> used for assessments <i>[ref: Quality Manual, Section I QM of Assessment, para 8. The criteria which each programme issues, explaining how different levels of achievement will be rewarded through the allocation of marks, should be inserted separately as an appendix; if there are separate criteria for different types of assessment, include all criteria.]</i>
Non-competency based examinations and in-course written assessments will be marked on a percentage scale. Generic assessment criteria for these assessments are appended to this Scheme.
Year 3: Appendix A

Confirm that <b>marking schemes</b> , which explain how marks are allocated to a piece of assessed work, are issued to students (they do <i>not</i> need to be included here) <i>[ref: Quality Manual, Section I QM of Assessment, para 8]</i>
Students are given a detailed assessment briefing for each assessment element. Records of assessment briefings, including PowerPoint presentations and Panopto recording are made available to students within the VLE.  For in-course assessments marking schemes are available as rubrics within the specific assignment VLE page, with further explanation of how marks are applied confirmed in the assessment briefings.  For written examinations assessment briefings confirm the number, type and weighting of questions asked within the examination paper. Students are also shown worked examples of how individual questions will be marked and how total marks for the examination will be calculated.

<b>18: Marking Procedures</b>
Confirm the arrangements for ensuring candidate anonymity <i>[ref: General Regulations para 11.6]</i>
Students are given a candidate number to ensure anonymity during marking for all summative assessments, with the exception of elements where this is not feasible (e.g. Oral Presentations and Research Projects). For on-line assessments the anonymous marking facility is used
Confirm the procedure for 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> marking? <i>[ref: General Regulations paras 11.7-11.9, plus any additional procedures for your programme]</i>
Confirm the procedure for finalising a student's mark if there is divergence between 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> marker?
Written assessments will be marked in detail by one Internal Examiner or Assessor, with a second Internal Examiner or Assessor having at least an overview of the work. Written examination components in which an objective scheme for the award of marks is pre-determined (e.g. Short Answer Questions) may be marked by one Internal Examiner or Assessor  Where an assessment element for an entire cohort has been double marked and the two marks for an individual candidate diverge significantly, the two examiners will discuss and agree a mark. Where agreement between the two examiners cannot be reached, this shall be referred to the Chief Examiner who shall allocate the final mark.  Where an assessment element has been marked by one Internal Examiner or Assessor, with a second Internal Examiner or Assessor having an overview of the work, and the two marks for an individual candidate reviewed by both assessors diverge significantly this shall be referred to the Chief Examiner with the practice of double marking the assessment element for the entire applied.
Explain any additional marking procedures not covered above
N/A

<b>19: Marking practice-based assessments</b>
Explain any specific procedures for marking practice-based assessment elements/modules <i>[ref: course materials, module outlines, Canvas, etc]</i>
The assessment of clinical and professional competency elements within Clinical Training modules will be undertaken by qualified NHS Work-Based Placement Supervisors. All supervisors are required to undertake assessor training with a SGUL Work-Based Placement Co-ordinator.

<b>20: Moderation of marks</b>
Confirm the circumstances and procedure for <b>internally</b> moderating a set of module marks [ref: General Regulations section 9 and Quality Manual, Section I QM of Assessment, paras 28-29]
Robust marking procedures generally preclude the need for the moderation of a set of module marks. Under exceptional circumstances standard setting may be applied in order to adjust the whole cohort's marks whilst maintaining the pass mark at 40.0%. This will be achieved using a recognised method selected to suit the variables of the assessment.
Confirm the extent of an <b>external examiner's</b> influence in endorsing a set of module marks [ref: General Regulations section 9 and Quality Manual, Section I QM of Assessment, paras 28-29]
Through the sampling of student work the external examiner is asked to review the accuracy and fairness of marking including the effectiveness of the approach to internal moderation.

<b>21: Release of results and feedback to students</b>
Confirm the arrangements for the release of <b>provisional marks</b> to students [ref: General Regulations para 13.1 and SGUL Feedback Policy]
Provisional examination and in-course assessment marks may be issued throughout the academic year.
Confirm the arrangements for the release of <b>finalised marks</b> to students [ref: General Regulations para 13.1 and SGUL Feedback Policy]
Candidates will be given formal notice via email of their confirmed assessment marks, module marks and end of year mark as soon as possible after the meeting of the Board of Examiners has confirmed the results.
Confirm the arrangements for the provision of <b>qualitative feedback</b> to students [ref: SGUL Feedback Policy]
Qualitative feedback for in-course assessments will be provided via the module VLE within 20 working days of the submission date. Qualitative feedback is not routinely released for written examinations.
Confirm that assessment elements and modules are <b>not</b> assigned alphabetical letter grades [ref: Appendix 1 Assessment Regulations, item 4]
Alphabetical letter grades will not be used in any part of the summative assessment process and there will be no conversion system from numerical mark to letter grade for an assessment element.

<b>22: Mitigating circumstances (deferral) /Failure to attend /Discounting assessments</b>
Explain the mitigating circumstances policy [ref: General Regulations paras 10.7 & 11.11]
A candidate who is prevented from completing at the normal time the assessment or part of the assessment towards an award for reason of illness (for which acceptable medical certification from a doctor not related to the student must be provided) or other good cause accepted by the Principal or their nominee may, subject to the agreement of the Principal or their nominee either:  (a) Enter the assessment in those elements in which they are able to be examined on the next occasion when the assessment is held in order to complete the assessment; or  (b) At the discretion of the Chair of the Board of Examiners, be set a special assessment in those elements of the assessment missed as soon as possible and/or be permitted to submit any work prescribed at a date specified. Any special assessment shall be in the same format as the assessment missed.
If a student fails to attend an assessment, having not sought permission to do so, confirm the result of the assessment [ref: General Regulations paras 10.6 & 11.12]
For any element of an assessment where a candidate is absent or fails to submit assessed work by the stipulated date, and no mitigating circumstances application has been approved, they will receive a mark zero for that attempt.
In determining decisions concerning re-entry to assessment for reasons of mitigating circumstances, the Board of Examiners may deem the affected entry to be <b>not</b> valid [ref: General Regulations para 10.8]. Confirm the circumstances under which you would discount a failed assessment on your programme
The Board of Examiners may discount a failed assessment if said assessment was deemed to have been invalidated by acute mitigating circumstances, for example significant illness judged to render the student unfit to complete an ongoing examination, or circumstances that delay submission of an in-course assessment without the opportunity to acquire an extension.



<b>23: Assessment Policies</b>
Confirm the word limit policy <i>[ref: SGUL Word Count Limit Policy for Assignments]</i>
The SGUL policy applies: <a href="http://www.sgul.ac.uk/for-students/your-academic-life/student-conduct-and-compliance/word-count-limit-policy-for-assignments">Word Count Limit Policy for Assignments (sgul.ac.uk)</a>
Confirm the late submission policy <i>[ref: course materials, module outlines, Canvas, etc]</i>
The SGUL policy applies: <a href="http://www.sgul.ac.uk/for-students/your-academic-life/student-conduct-and-compliance/late-submission-policy-for-assignments">Late submission policy for assignments (sgul.ac.uk)</a>
Confirm the breach of confidentiality policy (if applicable) <i>[ref: course materials, module outlines, Canvas, etc]</i>
<p>The programme policy applies:</p> <p>Any patient identifiable data or breach of confidentiality evident in submitted assessments will lead to an automatic 'fail' in that assessment element.</p> <p>Any work-based breach of patient confidentiality will lead to an automatic 'fail' in the professional competencies' element of the relevant Clinical Training module.</p>
<b>24: Student procedures</b>
Student procedures can be found on the SGUL web-site, link below (procedures include the investigation of an examination offence by students or the making of a representation against results)
<a href="https://www.sgul.ac.uk/for-students/your-academic-life/student-conduct-and-compliance/student-procedures">https://www.sgul.ac.uk/for-students/your-academic-life/student-conduct-and-compliance/student-procedures</a>

APPENDIX A

Marking criteria for Year 3 (Level 6) non-competency based examinations and in-course written assessments						
LEVEL 6	1* (70-100%)	2.1 (60-69%)	2.2 (50-59%)	3 <sup>rd</sup> (40-49%)	Borderline Fail (35-39%)	Fail (0-35%)
<b>Addressing the task</b>	Clear comprehensive evidence of addressing the task.	Sound evidence of addressing the task	Adequate evidence of addressing the task	Limited evidence of addressing the task	Largely fails to address the task set	Fails to address the task set
<b>Structure/ content/ focus</b>	Clear and well structured, logical, concise, focused, comprehensive	Clear and appropriate structure. Covers main areas. Logical, focused in the main	Structure apparent but some inconsistencies. Covers most of the key areas	Some attempt at appropriate and relevant structure but lacks focus and clarity at times. Although the majority of key areas are included there are one or two key omissions	The structure is inconsistent but some of the key areas are introduced	Lacks structure, focus and clarity in the main. The key areas are only addressed superficially and there are a number of omissions
<b>Use of literature</b>	The ability to select, critically appraise and apply relevant literature is demonstrated consistently. Evidence of broad reading.	Uses a variety of relevant literature with evidence of critical appraisal but not consistently. Evidence of wide reading.	The literature included is relevant and is critically appraised in the main. Reasonable range of reading evident.	Some relevant literature is included but the range is limited as is the critique and some elements are descriptive	Although some relevant literature is used, the work is mainly descriptive. Limited range.	No literature used.
<b>Demonstration of understanding and knowledge</b>	Demonstrates excellent insight and awareness of a variety of ideas, contexts and frameworks.	Demonstrates good insight and awareness of a variety of ideas, contexts and frameworks.	Demonstrates some insight and awareness of key ideas, contexts and frameworks.	Limited demonstration of key ideas, contexts and frameworks.	Knowledge and/or understanding is limited and superficial.	Fails to demonstrate knowledge and understanding. Fails to acknowledge key issues.
<b>Application</b>	Consistent application of topic to personal, societal and/or professional practice. In-depth, evaluative, reflective and relevant.	Relevant application of topic to personal, societal and/or professional practice. Appropriate and thoughtful but lacks depth or completeness of argument at times.	Begins to demonstrate application to personal, societal and/or professional practice.	Superficial but correct application to personal, societal and/or professional practice.	Limited but relevant application to personal, societal and/or professional practice but with many omissions and inaccuracies.	Inappropriate application of topic to personal, societal and/or professional practice in the main with many omissions and inaccuracies.
<b>Analysis</b>	Rigorous and relevant analysis consistently applied	Good evidence of relevant analysis	Evidence of analysis but not always consistently applied	Limited evidence of analysis	Superficial analysis	No analysis demonstrated
<b>Synthesis</b>	Shows novel and innovative thinking, creativity, originality and the development of new concepts. Clear conclusions well- grounded in theory	Shows innovative thinking in the development of concepts. Consistent evidence of findings and conclusions well-grounded in theory and literature.	Shows some innovative thinking. Good evidence of findings and conclusions well- grounded in theory and literature but lacks depth and completeness of argument at times	Occasional innovative thinking. Superficial evidence of findings and conclusions	Limited innovative thinking. Conclusions appropriate but unsubstantiated in the main	No innovative thinking. Conclusions are mainly inaccurate/unsubstantiated/ invalid and based on anecdotes and generalisations in the main
<b>Evaluation</b>	Evidence of rigorous critical thought and evaluation used consistently	Evidence of critical thought and evaluation, but not applied consistently	Some evidence of critical thought and evaluation	Limited evidence of critical thought and evaluation	There is little evidence of critical thought or evaluation	No evidence of critical thought or evaluation

<b>Referencing</b>	Consistently accurate and appropriate	Relevant and mainly accurate	Minor inconsistencies and inaccuracies in referencing	Referencing evident but with a few omissions and some inaccuracy/ inconsistency	Limited referencing with omissions, inaccuracies and inconsistencies	Referencing very limited or non-existent
<b>Ethics</b>	Thorough consideration of ethical issues	Adequate consideration of ethical issues	Some consideration of ethical issues	Limited consideration of ethical issues	Cursory consideration of ethical issues	No consideration of ethical issues
<b>Presentation</b>	Excellent organisation and presentation.	Good organisation and presentation	Generally good organisation and presentation.	Organisation and/or presentation could be improved.	Poor organisation and /or presentation.	Very poor organisation and presentation
<b>Numeracy</b>	Uses correct notation and units. Figures are accurately calculated / quoted without exception	Uses correct notation and units. Figures are accurately calculated / quoted	Uses correct notation and units. Figures are generally accurately quoted / calculated.	Figures are quoted without units or with incorrect units. Values imprecise or inaccurate.	Figures are wildly out. Values are grossly inaccurate. Calculations are incorrect.	No numeric work has been done when it would be expected.