**Centre for Academic Practice **

**Cover Sheet for Coursework**

Participants must complete this cover sheet to accompany each piece of coursework submitted. **No work will be marked without completion of this sheet.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Participant Name:  | Filingeri, Long, Managh | Submission Date:  | 23/02/2018 |
| Programme Title: | TCP003 |
| Module Title: | Research and Scholarship |
| Assignment Title: | Poster |

If this coursework is part of a group activity, list the names of the other group members:

|  |
| --- |
| **Declaration**By making this submission I confirm that the attached coursework is my own work and that anything taken from or based upon the work of others – or previous work of mine – has its source clearly and explicitly cited; I understand that failure to do so may constitute Academic Misconduct.I have read the *‘Coursework Code of Practice’*, the ‘*Marking Descriptors*’ and the *‘Plagiarism as Academic Misconduct’* section of the *Programme Handbook* as well as the learning outcomes for the module and the programme, as available on Learn and set out in the *Programme Handbook*. |

Tutor’s Name: Tina Barnes-Powell

Markers Tina Barnes-Powell and Jo Gilman

Date: 08/03/2018 **Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice: coursework feedback sheet**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Student name:Module:Assignment: 1 Poster | Indicative Grade |
| Coherence: Is the work logically structured with a coherent argument? | 62 |
| Insight and Analysis: Does the work critically address a range of views? Is it self-reflective and analytical? | 58 |
| Originality: Does the work include original illustrations/examples? Is there a distinctive synthesis of material and relevance to own practice? | 62 |
| Use of evidence:Is the evidence related to practice used accurately, critically and effectively? | 58 |
| Use of Resources and Referencing: Is a range of reading and other resources used appropriately? Are sources fully and accurately cited using an appropriate style, e.g. Harvard? | 58 |
| Presentation: Is the work legible, grammatical and fluent? Are data presented accurately and appropriately? | 55 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Overall, what was good about the work?** |
| * Demonstrates that you have put a lot of work into the task and have worked effectively as a team
 |
| * Good introduction
 |
| * Good central visual
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Advice for improvement:** |
| * Your poster needed more graphics – to connect together in a more coherent way – the information flow on your poster almost works – arrows around the outside of the circle would have helped, for example.
 |
| * Your title doesn’t really address the topic set – the research/teaching nexus
 |
| * As a result of the above, your poster has oversimplified a complex and debatable subject that has a range of more fluid arguments than the solutions that are presented here.
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Overall Grade**N.B. This remains provisional until it has been confirmed by the external examiner and the review board | 58%  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | A+ | A | A- | B+ | B | B- | C+ | C | C- | D+ | D | D- | F+ | F | F- | U |
| Percentage | 100 | 85 | 75 | 68 | 65 | 62 | 58 | 55 | 52 | 48 | 45 | 42 | 35 | 25 | 15 | 0 |

**PGCAP Generic Marking Descriptors[[1]](#footnote-1)**

| **Criterion** | **Distinction****A+ A A- 100 85 75%** | **Merit****B+ B B- 68 65 62%** | **Pass****C+ C C- 58 55 52%** | **Fail** **D+ D D- 48 45 42%** | **Clear Fail****F+ F F- 35 25 15%** | **U 0%[[2]](#footnote-2)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Coherence**Is the work logically structured with a coherent argument?  | There is a clear and consistent line of argument with a coherent and effective underlying structure. Demonstrates an ability to deal with complex issues coherently, systematically and creatively. | Work is well-structured showing competent response.Work demonstrates continuity and coherence of argument that is logical and straightforward to follow. | Provides adequate response but lacks consistent argument.Work somewhat deficient in integration and coherence and/or showing some lack of intellectual engagement with the material. | Work is poorly organised and lacks logical structure.Lack of integration and coherence of issues with unclear argument. | Disorganised and no understanding of the issue, problem or task. Argument is poorly constructed and confused. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Insight and Analysis**Does the work critically address a range of views? Is it self-reflective and analytical? | Shows critical awareness and insightful understanding of the issue to be addressed, problem to be analysed or task to be executed. Demonstrates Informed reflection integrated into practice. | Shows strong grasp of the issue, problem or task, supported by clear understanding of relevant fields of academic knowledge. Evidence of reflection in most areas. | Adequate awareness of issue, problem or task. Analysis not entirely thorough or complete. Some evidence of reflection but lacks insight into impact on practice.  | Shows inadequate grasp of issue, problem or task; analysis thin with insufficient knowledge of critical and analytical questions; links to own practice are descriptive with little evidence of reflection.  | Shows misinterpretation of critical ideas and concepts. No evidence of reflection in relation to own practice. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Originality** Does the work include original illustrations/ examples? Is there a distinctive synthesis of material and relevance to own practice? | Marked evidence of independence of mind, originality in the application of knowledge, and imaginative use of evidence and concepts; evidence of challenging and changing practice. | Confident and appropriate use of concepts, methods, and forms of analysis. Reasonable attempt to apply knowledge and theory to own practice. | Shows insecure handling of analytical/ methodological issues; insufficient originality of view; narrow in scope and limited. | Lacks originality; shows inability to apply ideas to practice. | No originality is evident. No attempt to demonstrate impact on practice. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Use of Evidence**Is the evidence related to practice used accurately, critically and effectively? | Appropriate wide-ranging evidence is discussed and used accurately, critically and effectively throughout; including reference to relevant professional frameworks. Demonstrates independence of mind and originality in the application of knowledge and understanding linked to own practice and that of others. | Appropriate evidence is gathered, including reference to relevant professional frameworks, but work lacks breadth and depth in relation to own practice or that of others.  | Shows limited intellectual and critical engagement with own practice or that of others.  | Lacks appropriate evidence and no critical engagement with own practice or that of others.  | Draws on minimal and/or inappropriate evidence with serious factual errors and/or misinterpretation. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Use of Resources and Referencing**Is a range of reading and other resources used appropriately? Are sources fully and accurately cited using an appropriate style, e.g. Harvard? | Demonstrates wide range of reading and resources consulted with imaginative use of evidence and concepts. Evidence of a thorough grasp of relevant academic literature and scholarship in the field, and of wide, self-directed reading properly integrated in the assignment. Work is fully supported by appropriately cited references applied in a consistently accurate format.  | Evidence of some useful self-directed reading with awareness and use of relevant academic literature, both generic and subject-specific. Reference made to other resources. Use of references and citations relatively consistently applied. | Confined to standard generic literature and lacks critical engagement. Some use of other resources. Some inconsistencies in citations and references which detracts from the reading.  | Limited or inappropriate use of relevant academic literature. Little or no use of other resources. Lacks citations and demonstrates poor referencing style. | No apparent use of academic literature or other resources. Minimal or absent citations and references. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Presentation**Is the work legible, grammatical and fluent? Are data presented accurately and appropriately?  | Exemplary presentation with clarity of message and information. Fluent prose style with accurate spelling and grammar. | Well presented, with good prose style; clear, logical and generally error-free. | Satisfactory presentation with limited errors; straightforward to read. | Unsatisfactory presentation with textual errors; poor clarity of expression and inappropriate writing style. | Unsatisfactory presentation that is hard to read and navigate. Absence of clarity. |

1. Note: The generic criteria may not be applicable for all assessments [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. U or 0% No adequate attempt at an answer/failure to submit [↑](#footnote-ref-2)