The ROYAL MARSDEN School

The Royal Marsden School

Programme Handbook

Postgraduate

2024/25

Excellence in education

The ROYAL MARSDEN School

Welcome to the Royal Marsden School

Here at the Royal Marsden School (RMS) we aim to create an inclusive and stimulating learning environment, for everyone who works and studies with us. Our purpose, values and philosophy are driven by the desire to improve the care of people affected by cancer at all stages of the disease trajectory through the provision of excellent education. We aim to enable you to develop your knowledge and skills to enhance safe person-centred care and meet the evolving needs of cancer care/services. Your learning experiences should also empower you to champion and lead change within your working environments.

Everyone working in the RMS shares a commitment to ensuring that you will receive the best possible learning experience and support throughout your studies. The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust's values are pioneering change, pursuing excellence, working collaboratively, and showing kindness; values which underpin all our activities and relationships.

We value your feedback, so please do take advantage of the many opportunities to tell us about your experiences so we can continue to make improvements to enhance our modules and courses of study during your time with us.

I wish you success in your studies.

R. Verity

Professor Rebecca Verity
Director of School

Please note that whilst every care has been taken to ensure that the information in this Handbook is accurate, it must be read as subject to change over the coming year. The Handbook is intended as a guide only. Full reference should be made to the School's web pages for the full rules and regulations and updated information.

Contents

Click on the headings in the table of contents to go directly to each section of this document

1. Introduction

A very warm welcome to The Royal Marsden School (RMS). We are delighted that you have chosen to study with us, and hope that your course will be challenging, enriching and successful. This handbook is for all learners studying at The Royal Marsden School whether on a pathway (postgraduate courses) or on a 'stand-alone' basis. The handbook aims to give those who are new to the School and those continuing their studies a central reference point for information about regulations and processes and provide guidance to support their studies. You will also receive module-specific information within a Module Handbook.

All courses are delivered by The Royal Marsden School and are validated by the University of East Anglia (UEA). Oversight of the Quality Assurance arrangements of the Institutional Agreement between UEA and the RMS is monitored by the Academic Partnerships team at UEA and formally through the Joint Board of study (JBOS). JBOS is charged with assuring that the standards of awards for which the RMS is responsible have been appropriately set and maintained and there is continuous improvement of the academic experience and learner outcomes.

The Royal Marsden School has a commitment to deliver high quality, clinically relevant education and provide a supportive, personalised learning experience.

The Royal Marsden School's philosophy of teaching and learning is summarised in our education ethos and values:

Our Purpose

To lead, innovate and deliver excellent cancer education to all

Our Vision

Our vision is to be a world leader in the provision of cancer education

Our Values and Philosophy

We will Strive to Create a Safe, Engaged, Kind and Innovative Learning Environment for our Learners and Staff

The RMS's overarching philosophy is to foster a culture of safe, innovative, compassionate, and engaged learning. We aim to create an inclusive and stimulating environment for our staff, learners and partners who work with the RM School. Our purpose, values and philosophy are driven by the desire to improve the care of people affected by cancer at all stages of the disease trajectory through the provision of excellent education. At the end of their studies, those who have studied here will be able to apply their knowledge to practice, demonstrate academic mastery, and become leaders in cancer care.

Values underpin the culture of the organisation. As employees of The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust, we have a set of organisational values, which include:

1. Pioneering change,
2. Pursuing excellence,
3. Working collaboratively,
4. Showing kindness.

Quality is the responsibility of everyone in the School; we share an individual and collective commitment to providing you with the best possible experience. If you have concerns or queries about any aspect of your studies do not hesitate to contact any member of the School team. Your feedback is valuable to us, so please do take advantage of all the opportunities to share with us your experiences. This helps us to continually improve our education programmes.

This Handbook aims to guide and support you through your studies and provides pointers to relevant School regulations and processes. It should be read in conjunction with individual module handbooks, which provide details about modules, including reading lists and assignment guidelines.

We aim to be transparent, fair, and supportive, and our policies and procedures help to ensure consistency in this. All Module Handbooks and School policies and procedures are available via Moodle – the School's Virtual Learning Environment (VLE).

2. The Royal Marsden School

The Royal Marsden School is part of The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust (RM).
The School, based on Royal Marsden's Chelsea site, is well-established nationally and internationally as a leading provider of cancer education. We offer a portfolio of clinically relevant, transformative education which will enable you to translate your learning into practice. The School's ambition is to spread the ethos of excellent cancer care which is embedded in the Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust and taught in the School, to benefit all practitioners and patients, regardless of specialty or diagnosis. Many of our modules are now accessible by non-cancer practitioners, for example, enhancing clinical leadership; enhancing communication skills; physical assessment and clinical reasoning.

The Director of School is responsible for the academic quality and strategic management of the School, supported by the Course Leaders, Lecturer Practitioners, the Learning/Library Resources and the Student Support Services Teams.

2.1 Contacting the School

Email is the preferred method of communication. Please find information and contact details for the staff in the School:

Name	Title	Contact Details
Academic Team		
Dr Rebecca Verity	Director of School Undergraduate Programme Leader	Rebecca.Verity@rmh.nhs.uk 020 7808 2923
Chris McNamara	Deputy Director of School, Postgraduate Programme Leader Plagiarism Officer	Chris.Mcnamara@rmh.nhs.uk 020 7808 2929
Martin Galligan	Lecturer Practitioner	Martin.Galligan2@rmh.nhs.uk 0207 808 2521
Helene Hibbert	Lecturer Practitioner	Helene.Hibbert@rmh.nhs.uk 020 7808 2870
Louisa Jones	Lecturer Practitioner	Louisa.Jones@rmh.nhs.uk 020 7808 2905
Kay Bell	Lecturer Practitioner and Lead for Bespoke Work	Kay.Bell@rmh.nhs.uk 020 7808 2118
Victoria Nelson	Lecturer Practitioner	Victoria.Nelson@rmh.nhs.uk 020 7808 2118
Anne Corwin	Lecturer Practitioner	Anne.Corwin@rmh.nhs.uk 020 3186 5973

Gus Pendred	Lecturer Practitioner	Gustavo.pendred@rmh.nhs.uk 020 7808 2465
Laura Theodossy	Lecturer Practitioner and Lead for Preceptorship Programme	Laura.Theodossy@rmh.nhs.uk 020 7808 2118
Maggie Uzzell	Lecturer Researcher and Lead for Student Engagement	Maggie.Uzzell@rmh.nhs.uk 020 7808 2463
Hayley Leonard	Lecturer Practitioner	Hayley.Leonard@rmh.nhs.uk 020 7808 2118
Vanya Slavova-Boneva	Lecturer Practitioner	Vanya.Slavova-Boneva@rmh.nhs.uk 020 7808 1725
Library		
Paul Howell	Library Services Manager	Library@rmh.nhs.uk 020 7808 2515
Neil Pearson	Library Assistant	
Administration and Marketing team		
Mike Speakman	Business & Commercial Manager	Michael.Speakman@rmh.nhs.uk 020 7808 2117
Jennifer Shelden	Student Support Services Manager	Jennifer.Shelden@rmh.nhs.uk 020 7808 2953
Gary Etchell	Programme Administrator/ Moodle Lead	Gary.Etchell@rmh.nhs.uk 020 7808 2910
Giselle Rambaran	Supervisor - Student Support Services	Giselle.Rambaran@rmh.nhs.uk 020 7808 2551
Estelle Taylor-Noel	Student Support Services	Estelle.Taylor-Noel@rmh.nhs.uk 020 7808 2242
Steffi Ng	Student Support Services	Steffi.Ng@rmh.nhs.uk 020 7808 2902
Carol Turner	PA to School	Carol.Turner@rmh.nhs.uk 020 7808 2923
Sharon Williams	Marketing Lead	Sharon.Williams2@rmh.nhs.uk
Jenny Double	Digital Administrator	Jenny.Double@rmh.nhs.uk

2.2 Location Information

The Royal Marsden School is situated in The Education and Conference Centre on Stewart's Grove (off Fulham Road) next to The Royal Marsden Hospital. Information on how to get to The Royal Marsden Hospital is found in the link below:
https://www.royalmarsden.nhs.uk/contact-us/how-get-royal-marsden/chelsea.

Occasionally room allocation (for classroom teaching) may change, so please check the room allocation on the information screen in the ground floor reception area of the Education and Conference Centre on arrival.

3. Academic Support

The School hopes that you benefit from your studies and are successful in achieving your academic award. It is recognised that everyone who studies here will require varying levels of learning support. Support can be accessed from either the Programme or Module Leader, depending on the type of study being undertaken. This is explained below.

3.1 Academic Support: The Role of Programme Leader

If you are undertaking a programme of study, you should contact or meet with your programme leader three times per academic year. It is **your responsibility** to contact your programme leader to discuss your coursework marks and progress. You can contact them to ask for advice if you have any problems. Your Programme Leader will help you to reflect upon and benefit from the feedback and feed-forward supplied by Module Leaders regarding submitted work. In addition, your module leader will discuss and review your academic and professional development with you and with the relevant Programme Leader.

If you are having serious medical or personal problems, you may be able to take a break from your studies or repeat a semester or year. Please discuss your situation with your Programme Leader as soon as you can if this happens, so that they can give you the best advice and make a request for you to take a break in your studies if that is the most appropriate way forward for you (see section 3.7).

If you are on a Postgraduate Course and ready to commence the dissertation module, you will be assigned academic supervisors, to supervise and mentor you for this piece of work.

If, in the future, you require an academic reference, your Programme Leader is the person to ask. However, please note that if you have not met regularly, they are less likely to be able to write an effective reference.

3.2 Academic Support: The Role of the Module Leader

Module Leaders support and guide those who are enrolled on their modules to understand the content and to support successful assignment completion. If you are studying on a 'stand-alone' module, the Module Leader will also undertake an academic advisor role. They can provide academic and professional support. You can arrange to meet with your module leader at any mutually convenient time. While they are someone who can help with problems, academic or not, you should be aware that staff in the School are probably not trained counsellors. If they are unable to help you, they can suggest who else you could go to for help and support.

For routine appointments the preferred initial contact is via email, but if there is an urgent need to see the module leader, please do phone or email and ask.

3.3 Working Together

3.3.1 Your responsibilities

You are responsible for:

- Informing the module leader of any illness, learning difficulties or problems which might affect your studies.

Please inform the Module Leader of challenges and progress that may impact your studies or assignment submission. For example, progress following illness, return to work after a break, or change in personal circumstances.

3.3.2 Module Leader responsibilities

Your Module Leader is responsible for:

- Being available to provide tutorial support either face to face, via the telephone or on-line.
- Providing assignment guidance. However, the Module Leader will **NOT** proof-read written assignments.
- You should contact the relevant Module Leader for assignment support.
- Acknowledging *receipt* of an email within 2 working days. This might take the form of an '*out of office message'*, indicating either when they will be next in the office, or if absence is prolonged, (e.g. annual leave), contact details of another staff member who can be of assistance.

3.4 Advanced Clinical Practice Module Requirements If you are undertaking either an advanced clinical practice stand-alone module or the MSc in Advanced Clinical Practice in Cancer Care pathway there are specific requirements that need to be fulfilled in order to complete the practice-based assessments of the modules. The modules that have specific requirements regarding the assessment in practice include:

- Physical assessment and clinical reasoning in cancer care.
- Advanced clinical assessment in cancer care.
- Independent and supplementary prescribing.

The physical assessment and clinical reasoning in cancer care module and advanced clinical assessment in cancer care module require you to identify and work with a practice assessor and practice supervisor. For the Independent and supplementary prescribing module you are required to identify and work with a designated prescribing practitioner and if you are registered with the Nursing and Midwifery Council you are required to identify and work with a practice supervisor as well.

Full details of the requirements for the assessments and time to be spent with your practice assessor / supervisor / designated prescribing practitioner will be found In the module handbook. If you have any questions regarding these roles please contact the programme lead for the ACP pathway.

3.4.1 Role of the Practice Assessor and Supervisor

In line with the Nursing and Midwifery Council guidelines for student assessment and supervision (2018) we have adopted the terms "Practice Assessor" and "Practice Supervisor". These terms will be referred to throughout the program to ensure consistency regarding terminology. It is expected that each learner will have one practice assessor and two practice supervisors.

Practice Supervisor

The role of the practice supervisor will act as an additional source of support within their clinical area. This will be someone who can support the learner in the absence of the Practice Assessor but who has the knowledge, skills, and experience to provide supervision.

The practice supervisor will work with the practice assessor in supporting the learner through the completion of their studies. It is recommended that learners have multiple practice supervisors so that they can maximize their support network and learn from a range of experienced advanced clinical practitioners.

The practice supervisors will be able to sign off any formative assessments required by the learner. They can be involved in the summative assessment; however, this must be completed by the practice assessor.

Practice Supervisor Criteria

When selecting an appropriate Practice Supervisor, they must meet the following essential criteria:

1. Are health care professionals, employed at Agenda for Change band 7 or above (or equivalent); or medical doctor FY2 and above.
2. Have completed or undergoing either a Postgraduate Diploma or Master's in advanced clinical Practice or equivalent.
3. Must have at least 1 years' experience of working at an advanced practice level within the same specialty as the learner.
4. Are employed within your specialist area of practice
5. Have an awareness of the module requirements and the assessment documents
6. Have experience or training in teaching and / or supervising in practice.
7. Have successfully completed a suitable learning and teaching course or willingness to complete one.

Practice Supervisor Training

To ensure that learners get the best support during their studies we would like to ensure that the practice supervisors' role have the necessary knowledge and skills required to support learning within their areas.

Prior to taking on the role of practice supervisor they will need to demonstrate the ability to support learning activities. This can be achieved via two routes:

Completion of mentorship / teaching qualification:

Please supply evidence of any previous mentorship updates or teaching courses that you have completed. Evidence of this can be included in the ACP pre-application pack that the learner with complete prior to commencing study at The Royal Marsden School.

Completion of Practice Supervisors Training Package:

If you have not completed any previous training regarding supporting learning in practice, then we would suggest that you undertake the self-directed practice supervisors' package that has been developed by The Royal Marsden School. This is free to access and covers all aspects

required to take on the practice supervisors' role. This is available via the practice assessor / supervisor hub on The Royal Marsden School website. A link to the resources will be sent yo your identified practice supervisor at the start of your module. Once completed supervisors will complete an online deceleration to evidence, they have completed the required training for the practice assessor role.

Practice Assessor

The practice assessor will be the main source of support for the learner throughout their studies. The practice assessor will be responsible for the clinical supervision and sign-off the learner's competencies regarding their practice. They will work alongside the practice supervisors to ensure that the learner is supported in their development as advanced clinical practitioners.

When the learner is approaching potential practice assessors, they should ensure that they are selecting someone within their clinical areas that has the knowledge, skills, and experience to support them in their development as advanced clinical practitioners. Practice assessors should have the following attributes:

- An ability to optimize practice
- To provide constructive feedback
- To act as a good role model
- To act as a resource within the clinical setting
- To critically challenge and assess learner's practice

The practice assessor is responsible for ensuring all summative assessment have been completed. They can delegate the completion of formative assessments to the practice supervisors.

Practice Assessors Criteria

When selecting an appropriate Practice Assessor, they must meet the following essential criteria:

- Are health care professionals, employed at Agenda for Change band 7 or above (or equivalent); or medical doctor FY2 and above.
- Have completed either Postgraduate Diploma or MSc in Advanced Clinical Practice or equivalent.
- Must have at least 3 years' experience of working at an advanced practice level within the same specialty as the learner.
- Are employed within your specialist area of practice
- Are familiar with the module requirements and the use of the Practice Portfolio document
- Have experience or training in teaching and / or supervising in practice
- Have successfully completed a suitable learning and teaching course or willingness to complete one.

Practice Assessor Training

If you are taking on the role of the practice assessor, then you will need to have completed the training requirements of the practice supervisor's role plus complete additional training. Practice assessors are also required to watch a short, narrated presentation that will explore additional aspects around supporting learners as a practice assessor. This will include aspects

of communication skills, having difficult conversations and reflecting on clinical practice. This can be accessed via the Royal Marsden School Assessor Hub Website. Once completed assessors will complete an online deceleration to evidence, they have completed the required training for the practice assessor role

3.4.2 Independent and Supplementary Prescribing Requirements

The independent and supplementary prescribing module is run in combination with the University of East Anglia. Those undertaking this module will have contact with the teaching teams from both The Royal Marsden School and the University of East Anglia. There will also be the opportunity to join joint sessions with learners from the University of East Anglia. As this module results in a change to your professional registration there are additional steps that need to be completed prior to starting the module as set out by the NMC and HCPC. Full details of the admission process for this module can be found on The Royal Marsden School website. The requirements for the assessment in practice is also different from the other ACP modules that are run at The Royal Marsden School.

The Royal Pharmaceutical Society (RPS 2021) published a competency framework for Designated Prescribing Practitioners (DPP) which has been recognised by the regulators e.g., NMC & HCPC, hence this is the title when referring to the Practice Assessor (PA) or Practice Educator (PE) for independent prescribing students. It may be possible in exceptional circumstances for supervision to take place in another appropriate placement where the learning outcomes must be met.

All Practice Supervisors and DPPs are required to demonstrate that they are suitably experienced and prepared for the role as set out in the Standards for Student Supervision and Assessment (NMC 2018) and the HCPC Standards for Prescribing (HCPC, 2019). Full details can be found in the module handbook for the independent and supplementary prescribing module. Should you have any questions please contact the programme lead for MSc Advanced Clinical Practice in Cancer Care.

3.5 Communication with the School

It is very important that you keep the School updated regarding your contact details: home address, email address and phone number(s).

Email is the main method of communication, and it is your responsibility to provide the School with the most relevant email address for contacting you, and for checking your email account on a regular basis. Any communications will be assumed to be known to you within 48 hours of the date of issue.

Routine information about modules is made available via Moodle, which contains timetables and Module Handbooks.

Occasionally room allocation may change, so please check the room allocation on the information screen in the ground floor reception area of the Education and Conference Centre on arrival.

3.6 Disability

The School is committed to the fair and equal treatment of all individuals regardless of disability.

It is important to notify the School of any disability or special needs in order that the appropriate support can be provided and any necessary adjustments to teaching and learning made. Any information you provide will be treated sensitively and confidentially in accordance with General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

3.6.1 Students with Dyslexia or other Specific Learning Difficulties

If you require individual arrangements in respect of your teaching and learning and / or assessments, you should notify Student Support Services in the first instance. Concessions will always be granted where appropriate evidence has been provided, for example, a medical certificate or a recent Educational Psychologist's report.

The School has a supply of coloured transparency sheets, stored in the Student Support Services Team office, which can be borrowed in the classrooms if this would be helpful for reading written material more easily. Please ask for more information. Do not hesitate to contact your Module Leader at any time while you are studying at The Royal Marsden School if you require advice or practical help.

3.7 Attendance, Interruption, Withdrawal and Absence

You are required to attend all timetabled events as a compulsory part of your course and to register your attendance at morning and afternoon sessions. If you find that you are unable to attend, you must inform the School's Student Support Services Team as soon as possible (020 7808 2900). Should you attend less than 80% of the lectures you may not be allowed to complete the module of study.

Where your employer has funded your studies, your manager may be informed of any non-negotiated absence.

The full UEA *University Policy on Attendance, Engagement and Progression (Adapted for Royal Marsden School)* is available on Moodle.

3.7.1 Student Participation in Learning Activities

Classroom and on-line discussion is an important way of developing critical thinking. As adult learners, all those who study here bring rich personal and professional experiences from a diverse range of cultural and social backgrounds to the learning environment, and everyone's' contribution to discussions are highly valued.

3.7.2 Participation in E-Learning Activities

Failure to participate in any on-line activities is regarded as missing contact time and is managed in the same way as absence from the module.

3.7.3 Participation in your Learning

Classroom and on-line learning are only part of the activity you will need to do to understand the module focus and to prepare for your assignments to earn the credits. Before and during the taught element of the module, there will often be preparation work set to allow you to contribute in the sessions and to get the most from the group learning that happens. These are also opportunities to start to form ideas for your assignment focus. These activities are likely to be in the form of group work, scenario development and tutorials.

The tables below provide examples of the approximate time that is spent on learning activities, whether face to face or e-learning.

Face to face Contact	• Lectures • Group work and scenario-based discussions • Tutorials (individual and group)	**25 hours** **15 hours** **10 hours**
Blended Learning / Self-Directed Study	• Online activities • Discussion Boards • Self-directed reading • Revision/assessment preparation	**15 hours** **15 hours** **60 hours** **60 hours**
	Total	**200 Hours**

E-learning Content	• Lectures • Group work and scenario-based discussions • Tutorials (individual and group) • Online activities • Discussion Boards	**25 hours** **10 hours** **10 hours** **25 hours** **10 hours**
Self-Directed Study	• Self-directed reading • Revision/assessment preparation	**60 hours** **60 hours**
	Total	**200 Hours**

After the module sessions are complete, your learning continues with background reading, to consolidate your understanding from the module and to then discover more about your chosen assignment topic. Times will vary for this, depending on your experience, knowledge and distance away from the last time you encountered academic work. Skills based modules will also have practice elements that will need to be demonstrated. Be prepared to spend time reading, practicing, planning and drafting well before submission, in order to get the best possible marks. Module leaders will help to direct you with your topic and focus, through the module 'plan work' or in response to specific e-mail questions.

3.8 Cancellation of a study day

Very occasionally, due to unforeseen circumstances, i.e. adverse weather, the School may cancel a study session. You will be notified of this through Moodle and a telephone call/text message to numbers held on the database.

3.9 Interruption to your Studies

The University regulations make provision for students studying on a Course (i.e., BSc, PgCert, PgDip or MSc, etc.), who are facing particularly serious personal difficulties outside of their studies to interrupt the course for an agreed length of time. This is referred to as 'interruption of studies.' 'Interruptions of Studies' status is granted for a variety of reasons, usually these are medical, financial, or personal, or a combination of these reasons. Often the factors, which have led to the request for interruption of studies, will have affected academic progress.

If you think that you may need to interrupt your studies, you should contact your Programme Leader to discuss your options. Evidence of the circumstances will be required. Please note that a request to do this requires approval from UEA and you should not assume that your request has been granted until you are formally notified.

The full UEA *Notice regarding 'Interruption of Studies'– Taught Programmes (Adapted for Royal Marsden School)* can be found on Moodle.

3.10 Withdrawing from your Course

If you decide that your course of study or The Royal Marsden School is not right for you at present, please contact your Module Leader or the Programme Leader to discuss this. If, after talking things over with your Module Leader or the Programme Leader, you are sure that you wish to withdraw from the School, you should complete a Withdrawal Form (available on Moodle) and send it to the Course Administrator by email or by Royal Mail to confirm your decision.

3.11 Careers Advice

The School does not have a careers advice service. It should be noted that Module Leaders and Programme Leaders are not trained careers advisors. However, Programme Leaders and Module Leaders can provide advice and support on an individual basis if required. If they are unable to help with an issue, they will suggest who else to go to for advice and support.

3.12 The Chapels and Prayer Rooms

The chapels and prayer rooms at our Chelsea and Sutton sites are always open and available for prayer or as a quiet space.

Services are held during the week and all are welcome to worship with us. There are Prayer Boards for your prayer requests in both our chapels. In Chelsea the hospital chapel is near to the main reception (Fulham Road entrance). Services are at 1pm with Holy Communion.

There is a Muslim Prayer Room on the ground floor of the Wallace Wing which is always open.

4. Learning Resources

4.1 Library Resources

Library Services:

The David Adams Library provides access to online and physical material to support you in your studies. You can access our online material using your Shibboleth username and password login, this will have been emailed to you before the start of your course.

You can login to the Royal Marsden Discovery Search to access the specialist cancer, nursing, medical and allied health literature with your Shibboleth login https://bit.ly/DiscoveryShib as well as our eBooks and specialist resources. You have access to help and support via our Study kills and Library pages on Moodle, and timetabled training and workshops, Moodle Library and Study Skills.

The library space is located on the top floor of the Education and Conference Centre within the Royal Marsden School at Chelsea. The space includes our collection of books covering cancer specialisms, as well as study space, PCs, and printing facilities. The Library is staffed 9-5pm Mon – Fri and can be accessed 24/7 and at weekends with a swipe card (this can be arranged via Student Support Services for non-Royal Marsden Hospital staff).

Library Staff can be contacted via:
Email: library@rmh.nhs.uk
Telephone: 0207 808 2515

4.2 Virtual Learning Environment (Moodle)

Learning and teaching materials for modules will be accessible from the internet at the School On-Line Learning Environment called Moodle (school.royalmarsden.nhs.uk). Log-in details will be provided with the pre-course information email, two weeks before course commencement.

If you have any difficulties accessing your course, please contact 020 7808 2902 or StudentSupport.ServicesRMS@rmh.nhs.uk

5. Your Programme

Each programme is led by a Programme Leader who is responsible for the overall management of the Programme. Please consult them if you have queries about your course of study.

Programmes at the School are offered at Honours Degree (Level 6) or Postgraduate (Level 7) levels. When applying for a programme, you must indicate the relevant level (BSc, MSc) you wish to study.

Those who apply to study a **stand-alone module** will have indicated on the application form the level at which they wish to study; this will have been approved by a senior academic at the application stage. Once approved, ***it is not expected that you will need to change the level of study*** (e.g. from Level 6 (undergraduate) to Level 7 (postgraduate), or vice versa. However, on rare occasions, it may be desirable or necessary to re-consider the level of stand-alone study. In such an exceptional circumstance, the following process MUST be undertaken:

- Any request must be submitted by the last taught study day (if a week-long taught course) OR by 30 days from the start of the module, whichever is earlier
- Discussion must be held with the Module Leader in the first instance
- Completion of the Change of Level Request Form, following discussion with the Module Leader
- Approval of the change of level request, in writing, by the Programme Leader
- Confirmation of the decision of the Change of Level request by email from the Student Support Services Team

5.1 Programme Leaders

BSc Cancer care Undergraduate Course Lead	Janet Baker Janet.baker@rmh.nhs.uk
MSC Cancer Care Postgraduate Course Lead:	Chris McNamara Chris.McNamara@rmh.nhs.uk
MSc Cancer Care Advanced Practice Lead:	Martin Galligan Martin.Galligan2@rmh.nhs.uk
Course Administrator	Gary Etchell Gary.Etchell@rmh.nhs.uk

5.2 Programme Profiles

The following section provides information on the courses that are delivered at the School. Please see Appendix 1 for Programme Learning Outcomes.

5.2.1 Postgraduate Certificate / Postgraduate Diploma / MSc in Cancer Care

The MSc in Cancer Care is made of up 180 Level 7 credits as outlined below:

Students may study for a Postgraduate Certificate (60 Level 7 credits) or a Postgraduate Diploma (120 level 7 credits) or the full MSc pathway. Students intending to complete the full MSc pathway must do so within 5 years of the commencement of study.

Term	Postgraduate Certificate (Year 1) Postgraduate Diploma (Years 1 and 2) MSc (Years 1, 2 and 3)		
September to December	Core Module: Fundamentals of Cancer Care (20 Credits)*	Core Module: Research Applied to Clinical Practice (20 Credits)	**Core Module: Portfolio of Advanced Practice (20 Credits)
January to March	Optional Module 1 (20 Credits)	Optional Module 3 (20 Credits)	
April to July	Optional Module 2 (20 Credits)	Core Module: Leading in Cancer Care (20 Credits)	Core Module: Service Improvement Project (40 Credits)

* If a student has completed Foundations in Cancer Practice at Level 6, they will be required to choose a further optional module.
** This module can be taken as a standalone module if not enrolled on a pathway.

Optional Module Choices:

Developments in Cancer Care Exploring the Complexity of Cancer Related Pain Living With and Beyond Cancer Lymphoedema: Principles and Practice Non-Medical Prescribing Palliative and End of Life Care Physical Assessment and Clinical Reasoning Principles of Acute Oncology	Principles of Breast Cancer Care Principles of Gynaecological Cancer Care Principles of Haemato-Oncology Care Principles of Head, Neck and Thyroid Cancer Care Principles of Lung Cancer Care Principles of Stem Cell Transplantation and Cellular Therapy Principles of Systemic Anti-Cancer Therapy Work Based Learning (5 Credits, 10 Credits, 15 Credits)

All Core Modules must be passed to progress

5.2.2 Postgraduate Certificate Enhanced Clinical Practice in Cancer Care / Postgraduate Diploma Advancing Clinical Skills in Cancer Care / MSc Advanced Clinical Practice in Cancer Care

The MSc Advanced Clinical Practice (Cancer Care) is made of up 180 Level 7 credits as outlined below:

Students may study for a Postgraduate Certificate (60 Level 7 credits) or a Postgraduate Diploma (120 level 7 credits) or the full MSc pathway. Students intending to complete the full MSc pathway must do so within 5 years of the commencement of study.

<table>
<tr><th rowspan="3">Term</th><th colspan="2">Postgraduate Certificate (Year 1)</th><th></th><th></th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="3">Postgraduate Diploma (Years 1 and 2)</th><th></th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="4">MSc (Years 1, 2 and 3)</th></tr>
<tr><td>September to December</td><td colspan="2">Core Module: Physical Assessment and Clinical Reasoning (20 Credits)</td><td>Core Module: Research Applied to Clinical Practice (20 Credits)</td><td>Core Module: Portfolio of Advanced Practice (20 Credits)</td></tr>
<tr><td>January to March</td><td>Optional Module 1 (20 Credits)</td><td rowspan="2">OR
Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (40 Credits)</td><td>Optional Module 3 (20 Credits)</td><td rowspan="2">Core Module: Service Improvement Project (40 Credits)</td></tr>
<tr><td>April to July</td><td>Optional Module 2 (20 Credits)</td><td>Core Module: Advanced Clinical Assessment in Cancer Care (20 Credits)</td></tr>
</table>

Optional Module Choices:

Developments in Cancer Care
Exploring the Complexity of Cancer Related Pain
Leading in Cancer Care
Living with and Beyond Cancer
Lymphoedema: Principles and Practice
Independent and Supplementary Prescribing
Palliative and End of Life Care

Principles of Acute Oncology
Principles of Breast Cancer Care
Principles of Gynaecological Cancer Care
Principles of Haemato-Oncology Care
Principles of Lung Cancer Care
Principles of Stem Cell Transplantation and Cellular Therapy
Principles of Systemic Anti-Cancer Therapy
Work Based Learning (5 Credits. 10 Credits, 15 Credits)

All Core Modules must be passed to progress

5.2.4 Course and Assessment Definitions

Assessment	The process by which academic work is marked and overall progress monitored.
Core module	A module designated as one which students must take and pass in their chosen course You will automatically be enrolled on modules which are core for your course.
Course	A grouping of modules leading to an award.
Course code	The code which, with the title, defines a specific course or programme of study.
Course profile	The definition, for each course, of the modules which must be studied, and passed, for each stage of a specific course.
Coursework (CW)	Work of any type (essays, class presentations, course tests, practical laboratory work) excluding examinations, projects or dissertations.
Credit	An indicator of the volume of study associated with each module.
Dissertation (DS)	The module(s) representing independent research or investigation and assessed by a dissertation or its equivalent.
Examination (EX)	Examination which includes an element of the unseen and/or an element of strict time limitation.
Defined Choice module	A module that may be selected by students on certain programmes, within a defined range
Formative	'Formative feedback' is intended to help you develop your understanding and academic skills or to improve future work.
FHEQ Level	Framework for Higher Education Qualifications http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationandGuidance/Documents/FHEQ08.pdf Modules shall be classified at one of the following levels: Honours Degree level, counting towards the final degree classification (level 6) Masters (level 7)
Mark	Marks are expressed as a percentage, except where approval has been granted for marks to be expressed as pass/fail.
Module	A discrete block of study for on which a student is enrolled. Each module is classified by its level and credit value.
Programme Specification	An outline of a degree course which specifies its content and requirements; similar to the course profile.

Project (PR)	A substantial piece of work, carried out by an individual student or group of students involving scholarly research and/or the analysis or application of data/knowledge in practical undertakings
Restrictions	Restrictions on enrolment for modules may take the form of: Pre-requisites – a module which a student must have already completed before enrolling on a module Co-requisites – a module on which a student must also enrol if taking a specific module Post-requisite – a module which must be taken after the module on which the student is enrolled Non-compatible – a module which may not be taken with a specified module
Rubric	In education terminology, rubric means "a scoring guide used to evaluate the quality of students' constructed responses". ... A scoring rubric is an attempt to communicate expectations of quality around a task. In many cases, scoring rubrics are used to delineate consistent criteria for grading.
Senate scales	The University Senate Scales outline the marking criteria for all types of assessment for students and assist in the development of marking guidelines and assessment rubrics for the marking of Coursework, Dissertations and Oral Presentations.
Summative	A formal mark is given in 'summative assessment'; this % or grade is awarded after the assessment of a final piece of work submitted at the end of the module.

6. Module Assessments

6.1 Assessment Methods

Assessments are individualised to each module. At the School we use a variety of assessment strategies. These include, for example, essays, reports, projects, oral and poster presentations, examinations, and practice assessment documents (PADS).

Formative assessments are used to help you prepare for the summative assessment. Module Leaders will use a range of methods.. More guidance about formative assessments/feedback is provided below.

6.2 Presentation of Written Assessments

The assignment template on Moodle (in ***Final Assignment Submission***) for written assessments is a Microsoft Word Document and is correctly formatted. It contains the Assignment Front Cover Sheet. Download the template to your computer before beginning to type your work.

Written assessments are submitted via Turnitin. Details on file types and sizes via Turnitin can be found here: https://guides.turnitin.com/03_Integrations/Turnitin_Partner_Integrations/Desire2Learn_(BrightSpace)/BrightSpace_LTI_Student/File_Types_and_Size

- All written work must be word processed in Arial font in no less than size 12 (except for elements of practice assessment documents, which may be handwritten)
- Work must be double line-spaced for ease of reading and giving feedback
- All pages must be numbered
- Assignments are marked anonymously - therefore students should NOT put their name on any page within the assignment or in running headers / footers – the student identification number ONLY should be used within the assignment
- Students must also keep a copy for reference in the 'as submitted' state without any further changes
- Students are responsible for selecting and uploading the correct (FINAL) version of their assignment to be marked before the submission deadline.

6.3 Referencing

All sources of information used and discussed within written work should be accurately cited or referenced, using the Harvard referencing system.

UEA uses a modified version of the Harvard Referencing system and guidance can be found on Moodle in the *Assignment Resources* section. More detailed guidance can be obtained from Pears and Shields (2013) *Cite Them Right: The Essential Referencing Guide*. 9th edition. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, available from the David Adams Library.

6.4 Word Limits and Word Count Penalties

A maximum word limit is set for most written assignments and is clearly published in the Module Handbook. You should declare the *actual* word count (as distinct from the word limit) of the text of your assignment on the Assignment Front Cover Sheet (electronic or hard copy) submitted with your piece of work.

The actual word count is defined as any words included in the text of the assignment (counted electronically by the word processing programme). The word count for coursework, written assignments, projects, reports and dissertations shall include: footnotes and endnotes, references in the main text, tables and illustrations and if applicable the abstract, title page and contents page.

The word count DOES NOT include any appendicised material, the reference list or bibliography.

Intentional misrepresentation of the word count will result in the mark being capped at the pass mark.

Should an assignment excessively exceed the word limit, the marker will only read up to the limit (plus 10%) and the cut-off point will be clearly identified on the script by the marker. The awarded mark will reflect the assignment content up to that cut-off point. In addition, this awarded mark will have a 10-mark deduction penalty.

For Pass/Fail assignments where the word count is found to exceed the word limit plus 10%, the judgement on whether the grade is a pass, or a fail should made only on the text up to the word limit plus 10%.

The penalties for exceeding the word limit are:

Up to 10% over word limit	No Penalty
10% or more over the word limit	Deduction of **10 marks** off original mark
Intentional misrepresentation of the word count on the coversheet	Mark capped at the pass mark
Note: When the original mark awarded is within 10 marks of the pass mark, the penalty will be capped at the pass mark	
Original marks below the pass mark will not be penalised	

Students will be made aware that a penalty has been applied and the reason for it. Students will also be made aware of their original mark prior to the application of a penalty as well as the mark awarded following penalty.

6.5 Submission of Summative Assessments

All written assignments are submitted online via Turnitin on Moodle and must be received by no later than 4pm on the submission deadline stated. The earliest you can submit your final assignment will be the day after the deadline for submitting your draft has passed.

Final submission
You can resubmit your final assignment multiple times up until the submission deadline; each upload will overwrite the previous submission. Assignments cannot be replaced after the submission deadline. A similarity score will be generated by Turnitin but may not be accessible for up to 24 hours.

You can review and download your final assignment after it has been uploaded and submitted on Turnitin.

You are responsible for uploading the correct final version of their assignment to be marked before the submission deadline.

Turnitin submission process:

- You must be logged on to Moodle and be using a PC or laptop. Tablets and mobile devices are not currently supported by Turnitin.
- The submission page is only accessible after you have completed the Module Evaluation. Please ensure you complete the correct evaluation for your academic level.
- Have the final version of the assignment already saved (using the assignment template) and ready to upload.

A step by step guide to help you submit your final assignment can be found on Moodle: https://school.royalmarsden.nhs.uk/mod/page/view.php?id=18211

If you require any assistance, please contact Student Support ServicesStudentSupport.ServicesRMS@rmh.nhs.uk or 020 7808 2551/2902.
Assignments submitted as a 'hard copy' (practice assessment documents, portfolios, or one copy of BSc (Hons) and MSc degree projects) can be either deposited into the assignment submission box outside the Oratory Room on the 4th floor of the School, or posted to:

Student Support Services
The Royal Marsden School
Fulham Road
London
SW3 6JJ

You should plan for your work to arrive at the School by no later than the submission deadline. You must retain receipts/records of postage.

Confirmation of submission:
An email will be sent to confirm that assignments have been received by whichever means submitted – retain this as proof of submission. If a confirmation email is not received within 24 hours, please contact StudentSupport.ServicesRMS@rmh.nhs.uk or call 020 7808 2551/2902.

Unauthorised late submission of assignments
Assignments cannot be submitted after the deadline. If you miss the deadline and wish to make a late submission you must first contact Student Support Services.

Assignments submitted after the published deadline without an agreed extension will be subject to a penalty as set out below:

Work submitted	Marks deducted
After 16:00 on the due date and before 16:00 on the day following the due date	3 marks
After 16:00 on the second day after the due date and before 16:00 on the third day after the due date	10 marks
After 16:00 on the third day after the due date	work will not be marked and a mark of zero will be entered.
Note: The penalties assume the work will have a maximum of 100 possible marks. The penalties should be adjusted pro-rata for any other (numerical) marking scheme.	
Late submission of pass/fail marked work for assessment in the absence of acceptable extenuating circumstances will be awarded a fail mark.	

The full UEA Submission of Work for Assessment (Taught Programmes):

Submission of Anonymised Work for Assessment, Word Limits and Penalties, Extensions and Penalties for Unauthorised Late Submission, Provisional Marks and Feedback, are available on Moodle.

6.6 Marking Assessments

Assessments are marked by the Module Leader/Lecturer Practitioner and moderated by another member of the academic team. Degree dissertations are double marked, usually by your Academic Supervisor and second marked by another member of the academic team.

6.6.1 Marking Criteria

The School uses the UEA assessment criteria ('Senate Scales') to aid the marking and feedback of assessed work.

There are separate scales for Undergraduate (Level 6) and Postgraduate (Level 7) work, and separate assessment criteria for coursework, annotated posters, dissertations and oral presentations. The Senate Scales can be found in Section 9 of this Handbook. The scales relevant to the assessment for individual modules will be placed in the Module Handbook. Assignments are assessed and feedback is given according to the following criteria:

- Achievement of learning outcomes and level of scholarship
- Presentation
- Argument and understanding
- Criticality and analysis
- Use of sources and evidence
- Academic referencing

- Written Communication *or* Projection, language & spoken English

6.6.2 Feedback

There are two main types of feedback: 'formative' and 'summative'.

'Formative feedback' is provided by Module Leads to help you develop your understanding and academic skills, to link theory to practice and to improve future work. A mark is not usually given. The type of formative feedback you will receive is specific to each module, but can include, comments and advice on essay plans, ideas and draft assignments. Formative feedback is also given to you in person during seminars or class discussions, in tutorials, in practical sessions and mock exams. Formative feedback may also be given by your peers in class discussions, online or sometimes when learners assess the merits of each other's work ('peer assessment').

Formative feedback is intended to guide the development of the work prior to submission; it is not an indication of the likely success or otherwise of the final grading or assessment.

Further guidance on the methods used for formative assessment/feedback can be found in the Module Handbooks

A formal mark is given in 'summative assessment'; this % or grade is awarded after the assessment of a final piece of work submitted at the end of the module. The grade or % will count towards the classification of your final degree. Summative feedback will also include 'feed forward' which is designed to help you develop your academic skills, apply theory to practice and enhance future grades. When preparing your next assignment, please discuss the feed forward comments that you have been given from your completed assignments with your module leader.

6.6.3 Results

The pass mark for Level 7 work is 50%.

The School aims to mark assignments and release the ***provisional*** mark for each assignment with feedback within 25 days of submission. Provisional results will be made available via Turnitin on Moodle.

When all assignments have been marked and moderated, a sample of work from the cohort is reviewed by an external examiner. The numerical marks for each assignment will be ratified (confirmed) after the Board of Examiners has considered all the assignments making up an individual module.

If students are sponsored by their employer, information on whether they have passed or failed will also be emailed to their employer. Marks will not be given to anyone other than the candidate concerned.

You will be sent an email by student support services the day of your scheduled final submission result. This will instruct you to access your grade and feedback via Turnitin (on Moodle). Your grade will be cited on the top of the page. For all assignments, lecturer / module leader feedback can be found in the side column and categorised as;

- What was done well
- Area's for improvement or development
- Future development

For written assignments, additional specific feedback can be accessed by clicking on the blue icons within the assignment text.

6.6.4 Assignment Failure and Resubmission

Students are entitled to two attempts at each assignment. Those who fail an assignment at the first attempt will normally be given a provisional re-submission date when they are initially informed of their result. The re-submission date is normally a minimum of 6 weeks after the date of the Exam Board meeting, when a confirmation letter of the ratified mark will be sent.

The mark for the second attempt shall be capped at the pass mark.

Students are strongly advised to contact the Module Leader for advice and/or support to help them develop their work prior to re-submission.

If work fails a second time, the student may not re-take the module.

Further guidance on marking and moderation can be found in the following policies on Moodle:
- Regulations for Bachelors and Integrated Masters Awards 2019/2020
- UEA Moderation Policy (adapted for The Royal Marsden School) check most updated policy

6.7 Plagiarism and Collusion

Plagiarism is defined as the reproduction (or 'quotation'), without acknowledgement, of the work of others (including the work of fellow students), published or unpublished, either verbatim or in close paraphrase, including material downloaded from computer files and the internet. It can occur in coursework assessments, which may take a variety of forms, including, but not exclusively confined to essays, reports, presentations, dissertations, projects.

Collusion is a form of plagiarism, involving unauthorised co-operation between at least two people, with the intent to deceive.

By formally registering with the Royal Marsden School, you sign to declare that any work handed in is your own work, free from plagiarism and collusion. All work, summative and formative, submitted for assessment by you is accepted on the understanding that it is your own effort without falsification of any kind. You are expected to offer your own analysis and presentation of information gleaned from research, even when group exercises are carried out. In so far as you rely on sources, you should indicate what these are in accordance with the appropriate convention in your discipline.

6.7.1 Plagiarism:

Plagiarism involves representing another person's work (whether published or unpublished), as the candidate's own without acknowledgement of the source. Failure to acknowledge sources (e.g. books, journal articles or web sites) with appropriate references will be treated as plagiarism which is a form of academic misconduct.

Examples of plagiarism include:

- The reproduction, without acknowledgement, of work (including the work of fellow students), published or unpublished, either verbatim or in close paraphrase.
- Poor academic practice which is unintentional.
- The reproduction, without acknowledgement, of a student's own previously submitted work (sometimes referred to as self-plagiarism). This refers to any coursework material, which is identical or substantially like material, which has already been assessed at the Royal Marsden School or elsewhere.
- The use of generative artificial intelligence (AI) to generate text within the assignment.

Most written assessments are submitted online via Turnitin (similarity detection software) which compares submissions against more than 24 billion web pages, 300 million student essays and leading library databases and publications.

There is a Similarity Test Area within each module on Moodle to enable you to check the level of similarity between your work and other's. You can submit your work to this area as many times as you wish in order to check the Similarity Index – it will NOT be marked at this stage.

Aim to keep the Similarity Index as low as possible.

Each upload in the Similarity area will overwrite the previous submission - your assignment can be re-submitted up until the assignment deadline.

A new Originality Report will be generated for each submission but may not be accessible for 24 hours.

You should enter the latest similarity score into the appropriate section of the Assignment Front Cover Sheet prior to submitting your final assignment.
All cases of suspected plagiarism will be investigated thoroughly by the School and referred to a disciplinary panel who will prescribe the appropriate penalty. This may include termination of registration as a student or revocation of any marks already achieved.

Artificial Intelligence and academic assignments, and using text -matching software and AI screening tools to detect plagiarism.

> **There has been an increase in the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) platforms in writing academic assignments with tools such as ChatGPT. These are useful tools in planning academic work but they must not be used to write academic work on your behalf. This is still considered plagiarism.**

We may use text-matching software and tools that screen for the use of text written by artificial intelligence to help us find cases of plagiarism, collusion, or contract cheating on our undergraduate and postgraduate assessments. This is software that searches submitted work

for matches against text contained in its databases or identifies work that is likely to have the characteristics of something not written by a person. Your work may be subject to screening in this way. The text-matching software will identify text that is the same as other work, whether that is another student's work or something available online or a published book or journal article. It can also find work that is similar, or which has some words swapped out. Screening tools are capable of detecting the use of artificial intelligence to write material.

6.7.2 Collusion

Collusion is a form of plagiarism, involving unauthorised co-operation between at least two people (various forms of collaborative assessment undertaken in accordance with published requirements do not fall under the heading of collusion)

Collusion can take the following forms:

- The conspiring by two or more students to produce a piece of work together with the intention that at least one passes it off as his or her own work.
- The submission by a student of the work of another student in circumstances where the latter has willingly provided the work and where it should be evident that the recipient of the work is likely to submit it as their own. In such cases, **both** students are guilty of collusion.
- Unauthorised co-operation between a student and another person in the preparation and production of work which is presented as the student's own.
- The commissioning and submission of work as the student's own, where the student has purchased or solicited another individual to produce work on the student's behalf.

All work, summative and formative, submitted for assessment by you is accepted on the understanding that it is your own effort without falsification of any kind. You are expected to offer your own analysis and presentation of information gleaned from research, even when group exercises are carried out. In so far as you rely on sources, you should indicate what these are in accordance with the appropriate convention in your discipline.

When submitting a summative assignment, you formally declare that:

- I certify that it is my own original work. Any material taken from other sources has been referenced with the authors' name in all cases;
- I confirm that I give consent for my work to be submitted electronically through the Turnitin database, and for my work to be held on the database for checking against the work of future students.

The full UEA University Policy on Plagiarism and Collusion (Adapted for Royal Marsden School) is available on Moodle. Link to new updated policy

6.8 Anonymity and Confidentiality

Confidentiality and anonymity are required in order to protect service users and carers, student working environments, placement providers, supervisors and mentors, other individuals and the assessment candidate. It is also necessary in order to comply with good ethical principles, professional codes of conduct and data protection legislation.

When submitting a summative assignment you formally declare that:

'I certify that I have not breached client/patient confidentiality in this submission and that pseudonyms have been used where appropriate. This includes names of healthcare professionals, locations, Trusts, workplaces etc. consent to use information in this assignment has been obtained where appropriate'.

General principles and expectations:

Anonymity should be maintained in all activities associated with the module such as group work, class discussion, on-line discussions, and the actual assignment at all stages of development, from conception to completion. This applies to **ALL** submitted work including, case studies, essays, posters, reports, presentations, proposals, projects, images, and work in any other format. It covers paper, hard copy, electronic and any other format. *It **DOES NOT**, however, apply to practice assessment documents or portfolios which must include the names and locations of staff involved in the assessment, but **NOT** service users, carers or colleagues.*

Advice on maintaining anonymity and confidentiality:

- Information must not be disclosed where it is unlawful to disclose it by reason of the common law or any legislation, including the Data Protection Act 1998. This means that inclusion of information in your work, such as names, dates of birth, contact details, clinical locations and photographs, or any other material through which an individual might be identified is prohibited.
- If an assignment requires reference to individuals, they should be referred to using either a pseudo name or by use of the format - Mrs "Jones ". Where pseudo names are used it must be made clear that these are not the service user's real names using the form of words *"all names have been changed in order to preserve anonymity"*.
- Do not write down, store on computer or memory stick or share any information by which patients / clients, their relatives, health professionals or organisations could be identified.
- Use generic descriptors where appropriate e.g. a cohort of students, a hospital in the South of England.
- Relevant printed material (e.g. oral assessment tools or pain charts) incorporated into an assignment should be rendered anonymous and any personal details (<u>including signatures</u>) must be removed.
- It is permissible to use local information that is currently in the public or professional domain – such as in Trust publications or on Trust websites – this should be referenced in the normal way in accordance with the UEA Learning Enhancement Service document *Referencing your Work* (available on Moodle).
- If referring to local information that is NOT in the public domain – such as policies

or other organisational documents, the reference should be anonymised – for example: NHS Trust (name withheld) (2010) *Disciplinary policy*.

Best Practice and professional guidance:

Best practice changes over time and is formulated for each profession through specific professional codes of conduct. You should at all times ensure that you are familiar with and follow the code of conduct for your professions.

Examples of these are given below:

- British Dietetic Society - *Code of Professional Conduct*: www.bda.uk.com

- Chartered Society of Physiotherapy - Code of Professional Values and Behaviour: www.csp.org.uk

- Royal College of Occupational Therapists - *Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct*: www.rcot.co.uk

- Health & Care Professions Council - Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics: www.hcpc-uk.org

- Nursing and Midwifery Council - *The Code, Professional Standards of Practice and Behaviour for Nurses and Midwives*: http://www.nmc.org.uk

- Society of Radiographers – *Code of Professional Conduct:* www.sor.org

Support within the Royal Marsden School:

We appreciate that there may be situations when exactly how confidentiality should be maintained may be unclear. Because of this there will be an opportunity to clarify your understandings with academic staff in the preparation of assignment tasks.

'Assessment specific' guidance will also be provided by Module Leaders regarding any considerations that may apply to atypical coursework or assessment activity (e.g. use of video-work, testimonials etc.)

Actions following the identification of a breach of confidentiality:

A framework is provided below which summarises the considerations and actions that may arise following identification of a breach of confidentiality within students work.

It is underpinned by the shared view across the Schools within the Faculty of Medical and Health Sciences at UEA that a failure to protect confidential information is primarily of professional concern.

It is also recognised that it is possible where a breach has occurred that a student may also not meet relevant assessment learning outcomes, which refer to themes of professional behaviour / awareness and therefore, may receive a referral or fail grade.

BREACH OF CONFIDENTIALITY FRAMEWORK

This framework will be used where a breach of confidentiality is identified in work submitted for assessment and will inform judgements made to determine the 'level' of that breach and identify any action to be taken.

Any work which breaches the rules of confidentiality may incur a penalty. The sanction will depend upon the nature of the disclosure and the risk this could present to the parties involved, taking into consideration the level of professional awareness expected from the student, and their academic experience.

Please be aware that the examples given below are provided to indicate the type of scenarios that may present but is not an exhaustive list.

Where the level of breach is inconsistent across the differing criteria an overarching outcome will be identified which appears to most accurately reflect the context in which the brief has occurred.

There are three categories of risk and associated penalties:

Criteria	Low Level	Medium Level	High Level
Academic Experience of the Student	An inexperienced student who may be unaware of the expected practice within academic work. For example: A within the first written submission of post-qualifying study where there is no other recent relevant study experience; Where there are significant cultural considerations;	A student who is likely to be aware of expected practice. For example: A student who holds a professional registration who is beyond their first module of study but still within the first year; A student who has received a previous LOW level warning regarding breach of confidentiality;	An experienced student who is aware of expected practice. For example: A student who holds a professional registration who has completed more than a year of post-qualifying study; A student who has received a previous MEDIUM or HIGH level warning, sanction or fitness to practice referral relating to a breach of confidentiality;
Nature of the Breach of Confidentiality	Raises only minor professional concern For example: Appears to be an oversight on the part of the student who has ensured confidentiality elsewhere in the work; Includes identification of a large organisation;	Is a cause of significant concern For example: Identification of a specific practice setting; Inclusion of unnecessary detail that may jeopardise confidentiality of individuals or the care context; Inadequate 'blacking out' or removal of confidential information;	Is a cause for major concern and clearly contravenes the relevant professional code For example: Explicit identification of an individual (service user, carer or practitioner); Inclusion of unnecessary detail that indirectly breaches the confidentiality of an individual;

Extent of the Breach of Confidentiality	Minor. For example: In one instance within the body of the work; Where the student appears to have taken steps to ensure confidentiality throughout the majority of the work;	Significant. For example: Two or three instances within a piece of work;	Substantial. For example: Throughout the work; In several instances; In all sections of the work;
Expected Level of Professional Awareness	The student would not be expected to have awareness of the professional expectations regarding protection of confidentiality. For example: A student who has not received any explicit guidance (in theory or practice) regarding the necessity to protect confidential information;	The student would be expected to be aware of the need to ensure confidentiality but may not fully appreciate the range of implications arising from this, or has superficial understanding. For example: A student who has received a previous LOW level warning regarding breach of confidentiality;	The student is expected to be fully aware of the necessity to protect confidentiality; For example: Any registered practitioner;
Overall Outcome	Low Level Breach	Medium Level Breach	High Level Breach
Action to be taken	The relevant Course Leader should be informed; A written warning should be given on assessment feedback documentation by the marker identifying the specific nature of the breach; Where a script has also received a referral grade the breach MUST be rectified on resubmission.		
		The student may be referred to the School Student Affairs Committee for consideration.	The student should be referred to the School Student Affairs Committee for consideration

The full UEA *Anonymity and Confidentiality Guidelines (Adapted for Royal Marsden School)* are available on Moodle.

6.9 Extenuating Circumstances (Extension or Deferment of an Assessment Event)

6.9.1 Definition of extenuating circumstance

An extenuating circumstance (EC) is narrowly characterised by the negative impact of the reported event or state of affairs on the student's capacity to perform to the best of their ability with respect to an individual assessment or assessments rather than the effect on other aspects of the student's life. To qualify as an EC each of the following conditions must be met:

a) The situation must have been unforeseeable, i.e. untypical of customary day-to-day experience, and/or beyond the student's control;

(b) The situation must have been such as to be reasonably judged to have had a significant negative impact on the student's ability to undertake the assessment(s) to the best of their capabilities;

(c) The situation should or normally have occurred at a time close enough to the assessment(s) submission deadline or Event date such that there was insufficient time to resolve the impact of the experienced difficulties. The precise length of this time will depend upon the nature and severity of the ECs and the type of assessment but would usually be expected to be no longer than 3 weeks before the assessment submission deadline or Event date;

(d) The reporting of the situation must, where it can be reasonably acquired, be corroborated by independent evidence provided by appropriately qualified individuals.

6.9.2 Extenuating circumstances may be considered in relation to:

- Extension requests for those items of assessment classified as 'Deadline' (coursework, written assignments, dissertation, project, etc.)
- Requests for Delayed Assessment for those items of assessment classified as 'Event' (exam, OSCE, presentations etc.)
- Decisions about progression and / or final classification.

6.9.3 Supporting evidence for extenuating circumstances

The following non-exhaustive grid provides an indication of the types of evidence which are likely to be supportive for various types of EC.

EC request	Examples of the type of evidence that are likely to support
Bereavement	An obituary; order of service; death certificate; legal or medical letters; letter from undertaker. The EC application must also state the student's relationship to the deceased. It is unlikely that further professional evidence detailing the effects on the student will be required.
A serious short-term illness, accident or mental health crisis	Letter from a health professional such as a GP, psychiatrist or mental health counsellor confirming the diagnosis and stating an opinion as to the nature and duration of any impact on the student; medical certificate; prescription; hospital admissions record; photographs of injuries (ideally identifying the student with the photograph). Since evidence such as a photograph, prescription or admissions record, does not constitute a qualified medical opinion, evidence from a relevant health professional should also be submitted.

	Any evidence that only records the student's self-reporting of the health problems will be normally deemed insufficient.
Unforeseen recent illness of dependents or close family members	Medical certificate or GP's letter relating to the dependent/family member confirming the recent sudden or severe nature of the illness. If this evidence does not also confirm the impact on the student, then independent professional third-party evidence should also be submitted.
A long-term health condition worsening	Medical certificate or GP's letter reporting the specific deterioration or sudden change and the time period it applies to. The evidence should refer to how the change in conditions has impacted on the student. Evidence simply confirming the long-term condition without mentioning the recent deterioration will be normally deemed insufficient.
Long-term health condition where reasonable adjustments are not yet in place	Letter or e-mail from the institution's Student Support Services (or equivalent) confirming that the delay in support was beyond the student's control.
Victim of a serious crime	Police crime number, legal letters, crime report from the police or other investigating authority; an insurance claim. Since such evidence does not refer to the impact of the event on the student, further evidence may also be required for ECs claimed to have affected the student *for more than a week*. Claims relating to injuries or trauma suffered as a result of a motor traffic accident would normally be considered as a medical circumstance and require suitable medical evidence as outlined above.
Representative participation in a national or international cultural or sports event	Formal notification from the relevant official body or bodies involved. Although independent professional third-party evidence outlining the impact on the student's preparation and completion of the assessment may be supplied, it is likely that impact on the student may be reasonably inferred.
Exceptional and unforeseeable transport difficulties	Evidence of a major transportation incident from a relevant and appropriate source (including media reports). Evidence will also need to demonstrate that the student was both affected and that there was no reasonable means of foreseeing or overcoming the difficulties.
Significant adverse recent personal/family circumstances	Independent professional third-party evidence describing the circumstances, the time period affected and the impact on the student. Where this is not possible, sufficient detail should be submitted so that the likely effects can be reasonably inferred.

The Regulations are consistent with the precepts and expectations contained in the Quality Assurance Agency's (QAA) *Chapter B6 – Assessment of Students and the Recognition of Prior Learning* of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (2013) and the recommendations and guidance contained in the Academic Registrars' Council's (ARC) *A Reference Document on Academic Appeals and Extenuating Circumstances for University Practitioners* (2011).

6.9.4 Self-Certification of Extenuating Circumstances - 5 working days

In a limited set of conditions a student may self-declare extenuating circumstances (ECs) without the need to submit supporting evidence. These "self-certification" requests (SCRs) will be automatically approved on receipt of an Extenuating Circumstances Request (ECR).

The purpose of an SCR is to cover unforeseen, very short-term problems which impact on a student's ability to submit their coursework by the deadline but where obtaining third party evidence is either unreasonable or impractical. SCRs are intended to cover minor illnesses, urgent family emergencies and other personal circumstances which only impact for a maximum of 2 or 3 days.

SCRs can only be used with respect to' Deadline' assessments (e.g. coursework, written assignment, dissertation, project) and are permitted up to twice per academic year. Although there is no requirement to submit supporting evidence with an SCR, the request must indicate the ECs which have led to the request and within the range of acceptable circumstances outlined for ECR's.

6.9.5 Deadline for applications

	Application Required	Deadline
Self-Certification Request (SCR)	Up to 5 days before submit deadline	4pm on submit deadline
Extenuating Circumstances Request (ECR)	As soon as possible	Within 2 working days of submit deadline
Supporting Evidence	With EC request	Within 5 working days of EC submit

6.9.6 Applications and Approval

Students should report any circumstances affecting their study to the Assessment Administrator (StudentSupport.ServicesRMS@rmh.nhs.uk or 020 7808 2551/2902), using an *Extenuating Circumstances Report Form* (available on Moodle) as soon as possible.

All requests for an extension for a 'deadline' assessment or a delay to an 'event' assessment shall be considered and approved by the Assessment Administrator ***within 3 working days*** where they meet the criteria.

Where cases are complex or where rejection is recommended by the Assessment Officer, they shall be referred to the School's Extenuating Circumstances Panel (ECP).

ECPs shall normally reach their decision and the student will be advised of the outcome ***within 3 working days*** of the ECR being received. In some instances, it may be necessary to extend this deadline and the student shall be advised in writing where this is the case.

Self-Certification Requests; for a 5 working day extension to 'Deadline' assessments will be ***automatically approved*** on receipt of a fully completed Extenuating Circumstances Report Form. A confirmatory e-mail will be issued by Student Support Services. If this is not received students should contact StudentSupport.ServicesRMS@rmh.nhs.uk

6.10 Classification of Awards

The average mark for the MSc award is calculated as follows:

- The final marks for each module are added together and divided by the total number of modules in the programme. Thus, marks for 20 credit modules will count once, 40 credit modules twice.
- The final classification of any UEA award will be based solely on the studies undertaken at RMS on the course on which a student has enrolled. Therefore, marks received for modules which are not UEA-validated but are approved as APL towards a UEA award, will not be included in the classification calculation.

Where students have completed more than the required number of credits at the appropriate academic level, the best 20 credit modules will be used to calculate the total (unless the lower mark is for a core module).

6.10.1 Postgraduate Awards

In order to be awarded a Postgraduate Certificate or Diploma, students must achieve at least 50% in all their modules.

The MSc will be awarded as follows, based on average marks achieved throughout the pathway:

MSc Degree Award	***% Mark Range***
Distinction	70% - 100%
Merit	60% - 69%
Pass	50% - 59%

6.11 Award parchments and transcripts

6.11.1 Your official name for display on your parchment and transcript

Please note that the name you use for registration will be the name used on transcripts and Degree Parchments. It is important to correct any spelling mistakes or other errors. The order of appearance of your names may also be important to you if you want your degree recognised by external organisations. Once published, your degree parchment can only be changed on request and you will be charged a fee for this service.

6.11.2 What your degree transcript will contain

Please be aware that although your degree parchment lists only your degree title and classification, the transcript (Diploma Supplement) which you will receive to accompany your parchment, lists all your modules along with the overall mark for each module. Many employers and university admissions officers (if you are applying for further study) will wish to see your full transcript.

7 Our Commitment to Equal Opportunities for Students

The Royal Marsden School is committed to equality of opportunity and fair treatment for all its students and staff and aims to create an atmosphere of learning that is tolerant and respectful of differences.

The School's procedures are consistent with The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust's *Equality and Diversity Policy* which states that the Trust 'believes in providing equity in its services, in treating people fairly with respect and dignity and in valuing diversity both as a health services provider and as an employer'. The School strives to promote equality of opportunity for students, to ensure that no student receives less favourable treatment on grounds of sex, marital status, race, colour, ethnic origin, age, sexual orientation, disability, political or religious belief.

If you have any concerns or queries related to equal opportunities, you may seek advice from your Course Leader.

8 Student Representation and Feedback

It is very important that our modules and programmes meet students' learning needs and enhances clinical care of patients. Student feedback, both positive and negative, is important in helping us to improve existing courses and influence our plans for future developments. There are several ways in which students can express their views.

8.1 Comments, compliments or concerns

Pre-printed postcards are available throughout the School (outside the Oratory Room, at the top of the staircase near the library, and outside the fifth-floor offices). The cards can either be placed in the comment boxes in these locations, handed to a member of staff or posted to the address on the front of the card. Alternatively, comments can be emailed to school@rmh.nhs.uk.

There is no need to include your name if you would prefer to comment anonymously

8.2 Student representation

Each course of study within the School has an elected student representative who attends Programme Committee meetings, which take place three times a year, and are chaired by a Course Leader. The functions of this committee include:

- monitoring the delivery of courses, thereby assuring their quality through presentation of module evaluation reports;
- discussing and implementing the action points from module and course evaluation reports;
- providing a forum for student representatives to feedback comments and discuss issues arising from the courses;
- formulating proposals for future curriculum developments and analysing and recommending resource requirements for future curriculum developments.

The membership of the Programme Committee includes Module Leaders, student representatives, practice colleagues and the Academic Liaison Officer from UEA. It provides an opportunity for students to raise issues related to the course via their elected representatives as well as regular review of the implementation of the programme.

Further information about contributions, student rep roles and feedback are found on the Student Hub in Moodle.

8.3 Student evaluation of modules

Evaluation is an essential part of any module development, as it is very important that the module meets the needs of students. The module is evaluated in two ways:

a) **Last Day of the Module:** On the last day of teaching of each module, students are invited to share their initial feedback of the module. This will be completed via Moodle using an interactive discussion board (Padlet). You will be asked to give feedback under four headings: What you enjoyed most about the module, what would you change about the module, what will you take back into clinical practice and any other comments. All responses are anonymous and will aid in the development of the module in the future.

b) **On-line:** A generic module evaluation questionnaire will be available on Moodle prior to the submission date. This must be completed in order to submit an assignment via Turnitin.

The Module Leader will use all feedback to compile a report for the Programme Leader and Director of School. This report will be discussed at the Programme Committee, which is held three times a year and if appropriate, changes will be made to the module to improve the learning experience. Feedback from all modules is included in the annual report prepared for the University. This will be available to all students through their student representative.

At the end of your course: you will be invited to respond to a Survey questionnaire which will ask you to review your experience of learning in the School. Your feedback is important, and we will use it to maintain, improve, develop and amend our education provision. However, should there be something that we could improve - please do not wait until the course ends. Let us know so that we can address it. Please email the Director of School or the generic school mailbox (school@rmh.nhs.uk) or complete a comment card and post it in the white post boxes outside the library and the student support services offices.

8.4 Making an Appeal or Complaint

The Royal Marsden School is committed to providing the best possible service to students. We seek and welcome feedback – either positive or negative. Your comments will be handled in accordance with the School's formal complaint handling procedures.

The Academic Appeals Regulations are intended to allow students undertaking taught courses to formally raise concerns about their academic results or circumstances relating to them. The Academic Complaints Regulations are intended to allow students undertaking taught courses to formally raise concerns not relating to academic results.

The full UEA Partner *Institution Academic Appeals and Academic Complaints Regulations* are available on Moodle.

8.4.1 Submitting an Academic Appeal

The Academic Appeals Regulations are intended to allow students formally to raise concerns about their academic results or circumstances relating to them. The School takes such concerns seriously and the Procedure is designed to enable a student's concerns to be considered fully and action taken to remedy the situation, where appropriate, in a timely manner.

You may appeal any of the following:

- A degree result
- Marks (that have not been independently double marked)

- Required withdrawal from a course
- A verdict of plagiarism and/or collusion
- A penalty applied in respect of plagiarism and/or collusion
- A refusal to permit the late submission of work for assessment or to approve a delayed first sit

Any appeal based on other grounds shall be rejected without consideration.

Academic complaints may address any aspect of a student's academic experience about which s/he is dissatisfied except for those grounds detailed above.

The Academic Appeals and Complaints Procedure comprises three parts:

1. An informal stage where students try to resolve the matter in the School, by contacting either their Module Leader, Course Leader or Student Support Services. Informal explorations of possible resolutions will not prejudice the consideration of a later formal submission.
2. A formal Stage One in which a School Panel considers the appeal
3. a formal Stage Two managed by UEA, which a Student may follow if dissatisfied with the outcome of the Stage One Appeal or Complaint, and if the submission meets the required conditions for further consideration

Students who submit a case under this procedure will not be unfavourably treated for having done so. Any student who believes that s/he has been less favourably treated as a result of submitting a case should contact the Head of Partnerships at UEA immediately.

It is expected that students will not engage in frivolous or malicious Appeals and Complaints. It should be noted that if an appeal or complaint is found to have been brought with mischievous or malicious intent this may prove grounds for disciplinary action against the appellant / complainant.

The full UEA Partner Institution *Academic Appeals and Academic Complaints Regulations* are available on Moodle.

8.4.2 Submitting a non-academic Complaint

The School takes expressions of student dissatisfaction seriously – whether they take the form of a comment or a formal complaint – and promise to:

- Respond to complaints speedily
- Investigate complaints thoroughly and fairly
- Deal with complaints honestly, politely and confidentially
- Apologise for any mistakes
- Rectify the situation wherever possible

The following is an outline of how to make complaints and how they are dealt with.

Step 1 – Informal

The School endeavours to handle complaints informally at the point at which they arise. Many apparent concerns arise from misunderstandings that can quickly be resolved by discussion. You are welcome to discuss any concerns with your Module Leader. You can also make an appointment to speak to the Director of School – Dr Rebecca Verity.

Step 2 – Formal

Should you feel unable to make an informal approach or consider that your complaint has not been satisfactorily resolved informally, you are recommended to contact the Director of School by either letter or e-mail detailing the nature of the complaint.

You will receive an acknowledgement within 2 working days of receipt of your complaint, and a response will normally be sent within 25 working days. If the complaint is likely to take longer to investigate, the School will keep you informed of progress on a regular basis.

The School will provide full written details of the findings of the investigation, together with an apology, if appropriate, and what will be done to rectify the situation.

Further information on the complaints policy is available from the School.

Contact Details
Dr Rebecca Verity
Director of School
The Royal Marsden School
Fulham Road
London SW3 6JJ

Email: Rebecca.Verity@rmh.nhs.uk
Tel: 020 7808 2923

The full Royal Marsden School *Complaints Policy and Procedure* is available on Moodle.

Information can be found at the following websites:

www.uea.ac.uk/services/students/disability
https://www.uea.ac.uk/services/students/wellbeing

9. Marking Criteria

The Royal Marsden School follows the University of East Anglia's 'Senate Scales' at Undergraduate and Masters' levels to aid the marking and feedback of assessed Coursework, Dissertations and Oral Presentations.

Module leaders adapt these frameworks to create individual rubrics which reflect the specific requirements of the assessment. Please study these in the module handbook to understand the expectations for your module assignment.

The tables for the Senate Scales are reproduced below:

Table 1: Coursework at Postgraduate Level
Table 2: Projects and Dissertations at Postgraduate Level
Table 3: Oral Presentations at Postgraduate Level
Table 4: Poster and Oral Presentation at Postgraduate Level

Appendix 1 – Course Learning Outcomes

Postgraduate Certificate Cancer Care

Clinical Practice	• Critically explore the prevalence, impact, and nature of cancer within society. • Critically discuss the physiology of cancer and how these impacts on treatment options and the development of novel treatment modalities. • Undertake holistic health assessment applying clinical decision making and diagnostic strategies when initiating and evaluating a range of interventions for people living with, through and beyond the uncertainty of cancer. • Critical understanding of the factors underpinning person-centred cancer care and applying these within specialist and unpredictable contexts
Management / Leadership	• The ability to display clinical credibility by communicating and working effectively across boundaries • Demonstrate an awareness of their own role when fostering relationships with teams, acting as a role model within an organisation and engaging in peer review of their own practice and that of the wider team and service
Education	• The ability to critically reflect and evaluate professional practice through self-awareness, emotional intelligence, and openness to change, addressing learning needs through ongoing professional development to continually develop practice. • The ability to evaluate and respond appropriately to an individuals' learning style, motivation, development stage and capacity by acting as a role model to instil and develop confidence in others. • The ability to work collaboratively to support health literacy and empower individuals to participate in decisions about their care and to maximise their health and well-being. • Critically analyse the organisational culture of their clinical area / team and contribute to a culture of organisational learning to inspire and develop colleagues professionally.
Research	• Demonstrate the ability to access appropriate information systems and conduct a systematic literature search. • Demonstrate an awareness of research activity and the importance of audit in the evaluation of practice and the wider service

Postgraduate Diploma Cancer Care

Clinical Practice	• To develop and maintain therapeutic relationships for the co-design of personalised care plans using effective communication skills. Empowering them whenever possible to make decisions about their care, health, and wellbeing. • Critical awareness of advanced reasoning skills in complex situations and an ability to reconcile uncertainty, constraints, and dilemmas within the changing context of cancer practice. • Demonstrate an awareness of their own scope of practice, limitations the importance of working in partnership with individuals, families, carers, multi-agency, and inter-professional teams when managing the complexity of cancer care. • Identify the impact of cancer and its treatments and undertake holistic assessment and management that address the physical, psychological, emotional, social, and spiritual wellbeing of those impacted by cancer.
Management / Leadership	• The ability to display clinical credibility by communicating and working effectively across boundaries, providing supervision, and mentoring in challenging situations. • A critical appreciation of organisational culture and its potential impact on their personal leadership style and its wider impact on advanced practice roles • Work collaboratively in the development of cancer services by utilising specialist knowledge • To enhance the quality of cancer care
Education	• The ability to critically reflect and evaluate professional practice through self-awareness, emotional intelligence, and openness to change, addressing learning needs through ongoing professional development to continually develop practice. • The ability to evaluate and respond appropriately to an individuals' learning style, motivation, development stage and capacity by acting as a role model to instil and develop confidence in others. • The ability to work collaboratively to support health literacy and empower individuals to participate in decisions about their care and to maximise their health and well-being. • Critically analyse the organisational culture of their clinical area / team and contribute to a culture of organisational learning to inspire and develop colleagues professionally.
Research	• Demonstrate the ability to access appropriate information systems and conduct a systematic literature search. • To critically appraise current research, audit, health initiatives, clinical guidance and policies pertaining to cancer practice, demonstrating an understanding of research methodologies. • Demonstrate the ability to analyse and integrate diverse contemporary sources, evidence and concepts and apply this to the enhancement of quality, safety, and productivity of a service.

	• Engage in research activity and develop links between clinical practice and research by networking with clinical academics and researchers.

MSc Cancer Care

Clinical Practice	• Mastery of knowledge and in-depth understanding of person-centred, cancer care provision, including the wider socio-political, financial, and cultural influences and articulate its' application to professional practice within complex, specialist, and inter-professional contexts. • Comprehensive understanding of the wider ethical, legal, and professional perspectives of cancer care. • The ability to apply advanced reasoning skills to complex situations and an ability to reconcile uncertainty, constraints, and dilemmas within the changing context of cancer practice.
Management / Leadership	• An ability to utilise change management theories by the identification of the need for change within a service through critical reflection and feedback, proposing, consulting on, planning and leading innovative and evidence-based solutions relative to the learner's scope of practice. • Work collaboratively in the development and transformation of cancer services by influencing practices to enhance quality, productivity, and value within cancer care.
Education	• The ability to critically reflect and evaluate professional practice through self-awareness, emotional intelligence, and openness to change, addressing learning needs through ongoing professional development to continually develop practice. • The ability to evaluate and respond appropriately to an individuals' learning style, motivation, development stage and capacity by acting as a role model to instil and develop confidence in others. • The ability to work collaboratively to support health literacy and empower individuals to participate in decisions about their care and to maximise their health and well-being. • Critically analyse the organisational culture of their clinical area / team and contribute to a culture of organisational learning to inspire and develop colleagues professionally.
Research	• Demonstrate the ability to access appropriate information systems and conduct a systematic literature search. • To proficiently critically appraise and synthesise current research, audit, health initiatives, clinical guidance and policies pertaining to cancer practice, demonstrating a critical understanding of research methodologies. • Demonstrate the ability to synthesise and integrate diverse and contradictory contemporary sources, evidence and concepts and apply this to the enhancement of quality, safety, and productivity of a service.

	• The ability to disseminate research, audit, and service developments through appropriate media to further advance clinical practice. • Engage in research activity and develop links between clinical practice and research by networking with clinical academics and researchers.

Postgraduate Certificate Enhanced Clinical Practice in Cancer Care

Please note that each learning outcome has been mapped to The Multi-professional framework for advanced practice (HEE 2017).

Clinical Practice	• Critically explore the prevalence, impact, and nature of cancer within society. • Critically discuss the physiology of cancer and how these impacts on treatment options and the development of novel treatment modalities. • Undertake holistic health assessment applying clinical decision making and diagnostic strategies when initiating and evaluating a range of interventions for people living with, through and beyond the uncertainty of cancer. (1.4, 1.6, 1.7) • Critical understanding of the factors underpinning person-centred cancer care and applying these within specialist and unpredictable contexts. (1.4, 1.5, 1.6) • To develop and maintain therapeutic relationships for the co-design of personalised care plans using effective communication skills. Empowering them whenever possible to make decisions about their care, health, and wellbeing. (1.4, 1.5, 1.11) • The broadened level of professional responsibility, accountability, and autonomy for advanced practice. (1.1, 1.2,1.3) • Demonstrate an awareness of their own scope of practice, limitations the importance of working in partnership with individuals, families, carers, multi-agency and inter-professional teams when managing the complexity of cancer care. (1.3, 1.4, 1.9, 1.11)
Management / Leadership	• The ability to display clinical credibility by communicating and working effectively across boundaries. (2.3, 2.5, 2.7) • An ability to critique change management theories and their potential application in complex and unpredictable clinical situations to maintain patient safety and ensure best practice. (2.7, 2.8) • Critical awareness of own scope of practice in the wider ethical, legal, and professional perspectives of advanced cancer practice. (2.11) • Demonstrate an awareness of their own role when fostering relationships with teams, acting as a role model within an organisation and engaging in peer review of their own practice and that of the wider team and service. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4)

Education	• The ability to critically reflect and evaluate your professional practice through self-awareness, emotional intelligence, and openness to change, addressing your own learning needs through ongoing professional development to continually develop practice. (3.1, 3.2) • The ability to evaluate and respond appropriately to an individuals' learning style, motivation, development stage and capacity by acting as a role model to instil and develop confidence in others. (3.3, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8) • The ability to work collaboratively to support health literacy and empower individuals to participate in decisions about their care and to maximise their health and well-being. (3.3) • Critically analyse the organisational culture of their clinical area / team and contribute to a culture of organisational learning to inspire and develop colleagues professionally. (3.4, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8).
Research	• Demonstrate the ability to access appropriate information systems and conduct a systematic literature search. (4.3, 4.4, 4.5) • Demonstrate an awareness of research activity and the importance of audit in the evaluation of your own practice and the wider service. (4.1, 4.2)

Postgraduate Diploma Advancing Clinical Practice in Cancer Care

Please note that each learning outcome has been mapped to The Multi-professional framework for advanced practice (HEE 2017).

Clinical Practice	• Undertake advanced holistic health assessment and integrating clinical decision making and reasoning skills in the evaluation of people, families and carers living with, through and beyond the complexity of cancer. (1.4, 1.5, 1.6) • Demonstrate expertise and decision making when initiating and evaluating a range of interventions to ensure safety of people living with, through and beyond the uncertainty of cancer. (1.6, 1.7, 1.8) • Critical understanding of the factors underpinning person-centred cancer care, and applying these within complex, specialist and unpredictable contexts. (1.4, 1.5, 1.6) • To develop and maintain therapeutic relationships using expert knowledge for the co-design of personalised care plans using effective communication skills, recognising and responding to the changing needs and wishes of people. Empowering them whenever possible to make decisions about their care, health and wellbeing (1.4,1.5,1.11) • A critical understanding of pharmacology, medicines management, social & psychological interventions when supporting treatment decisions for individuals, families and carers living with, through and beyond cancer. (1.4, 1.5,1.7,1.8,1.10)

	• The broadened level of professional responsibility, accountability and autonomy for advanced practice including professional, ethical and legal perspectives; local and national policies and perspectives of advanced practice; and the research and evidence that informs advanced practice. (1.1,1.2, 1.3, 1.11) • Demonstrates high level of self-reflection and insight into their own scope of practice and recognises their responsibilities as a role model within the wider multi-agency and inter-professional team. (1.9, 1.10, 1.11)
Management / Leadership	• The ability to display clinical credibility by communicating and working effectively across boundaries, providing supervision, and mentoring in challenging situations. (2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, 2.7, 2.8) • A critical appreciation of organisational culture and its potential impact on their personal leadership style and its wider impact on advanced practice roles. (2.2, 2.3, 2.11) • An ability to utilise change management theories by the identification of the need for change within a service through critical reflection and engagement with service users. (2.4, 2.6, 2.10) • Work collaboratively in the development of services by utilising advanced clinical practices to enhance the quality of cancer care. (2.1, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.9, 2.11) • Critical awareness of the wider ethical, legal and professional perspectives of advanced cancer practice and an ability to incorporate a critical and ethical/professional dimension into decision-making when leading services and managing complex / unpredictable situations. (2.3, 2.8, 2.11)
Education	• The ability to critically reflect and evaluate your professional practice through self-awareness, emotional intelligence, and openness to change, addressing your own learning needs through ongoing professional development to continually develop practice. (3.1, 3.2) • The ability to evaluate and respond appropriately to an individuals' learning style, motivation, development stage and capacity by acting as a role model to instil and develop confidence in others. (3.3, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8) • The ability to work collaboratively to support health literacy and empower individuals to participate in decisions about their care and to maximise their health and well-being. (3.3) • Critically analyse the organisational culture of their clinical area / team and contribute to a culture of organisational learning to inspire and develop colleagues professionally. (3.4, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8).
Research	• Demonstrate the ability to access appropriate information systems and conduct a systematic literature search. (4.3, 4.4, 4.5) • To critically appraise current research, audit, health initiatives, clinical guidance and policies pertaining to cancer practice, demonstrating an understanding of research methodologies. (4.2, 4.3, 4.4)

	• Demonstrate the ability to analyse and integrate diverse contemporary sources, evidence and concepts and apply this to the enhancement of quality, safety, and productivity of a service. (4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6) • Engage in research activity and develop links between clinical practice and research by networking with clinical academics and researchers. (4.1, 4.5, 4.8)

MSc Advanced Clinical Practice in Cancer Care

Please note that each learning outcome has been mapped to The Multi-professional framework for advanced practice (HEE 2017).

Clinical Practice	• Undertake advanced holistic health assessment and integrating clinical decision making and reasoning skills in the evaluation of people, families and carers living with, through and beyond the complexity of cancer. (1.4, 1.5, 1.6) • Mastery of knowledge of the factors underpinning person-centred cancer care, and applying these when supporting individuals, families and carers living within complex, specialist and unpredictable contexts. 1.6, 1.7, 1.8) • To develop and maintain therapeutic relationships using expert knowledge for the co-design of personalised care plans using effective communication skills, recognising and responding to the changing needs and wishes of people. Empowering them whenever possible to make decisions about their care, health and wellbeing (1.4,1.5,1.11) • A critical understanding of pharmacology, medicines management, social & psychological interventions when supporting treatment decisions for individuals, families and carers living with, through and beyond cancer. (1.4, 1.5,1.7,1.8,1.10) • The broadened level of professional responsibility, accountability and autonomy for advanced practice including professional, ethical and legal perspectives; local, national and international policies and perspectives of advanced practice; governance systems; and the research and evidence that informs advanced practice. (1.1,1.2, 1.3, 1.11) • Demonstrate the ability to apply advanced reasoning skills to deal effectively and creatively with complex issues arising in the care of people affected by cancer. (1.8, 1.11) • Demonstrates high level of self-reflection and insight into their own scope of practice and recognises their responsibilities as a role model within the wider multi-agency and inter-professional team. (1.9, 1.10, 1.11)

Management / Leadership	• The ability to display clinical credibility by communicating and working effectively across boundaries, providing professional leadership, supervision, role modelling and mentoring in complex situations. (2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, 2.7, 2.8, 2.8) • A critical appreciation of organisational culture and its potential impact on their personal leadership style and its wider impact on advanced practice roles. (2.2, 2.3, 2.11) • An ability to utilise change management theories by the identification of the need for change within a service through critical reflection and feedback, proposing, consulting on, planning and leading innovative and evidence-based solutions relative to your scope of practice. (2.4,2.6,2.10, 2.11) • Work collaboratively in the development and transformation of services by influencing advanced clinical practices to enhance quality, productivity, and value within cancer care. (2.1, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.9, 2.11) • Critical awareness of the wider ethical, legal and professional perspectives of cancer care and an ability to incorporate a critical and ethical/professional dimension into complex decision-making when leading services and managing complex / unpredictable situations. (2.3, 2.8, 2.11)
Education	• The ability to critically reflect and evaluate your professional practice through self-awareness, emotional intelligence, and openness to change, addressing your own learning needs through ongoing professional development to continually develop practice. (3.1, 3.2) • The ability to evaluate and respond appropriately to an individuals' learning style, motivation, development stage and capacity by acting as a role model to instil and develop confidence in others. (3.3, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8) • The ability to work collaboratively to support health literacy and empower individuals to participate in decisions about their care and to maximise their health and well-being. (3.3) • Critically analyse the organisational culture of their clinical area / team and contribute to a culture of organisational learning to inspire and develop colleagues professionally. (3.4, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8).
Research	• Demonstrate the ability to access appropriate information systems and conduct a systematic literature search. (4.3, 4.4, 4.5) • To proficiently critically appraise and synthesise current research, audit, health initiatives, clinical guidance and policies pertaining to cancer practice, demonstrating a critical understanding of research methodologies. (4.2, 4.3, 4.4) • Demonstrate the ability to synthesise and integrate diverse and contradictory contemporary sources, evidence and concepts and apply this to the enhancement of quality, safety and productivity of a service. (4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6)

	• The ability to disseminate research, audit and service developments through appropriate media to further advance clinical practice. (4.7) • Engage in research activity and develop links between clinical practice and research by networking with clinical academics and researchers. (4.1, 4.5, 4.8)

Table 1 - UEA SENATE SCALE (Postgraduate level): COURSEWORK							
Classification	**Learning outcomes & scholarship**	**Presentation**	**Argument & understanding**	**Criticality & analysis**	**Use of sources and evidence**	**Academic referencing**	**Written communication**
90-100% Distinction (Upper Range)	Significant learning outcomes are met at an exemplary standard showing creativity, inventiveness, independence of judgement and consistent evidence of originality of thought and expression. Demonstrates an exemplary understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains the highest standards of scholarship that can be expected of a Masters level submission.	Exemplary presentation: clear, logical, imaginative, creative and original. Almost flawless. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level submission.	Highly effective and sustained arguments, demonstrating exemplary level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Addresses all aspects of the assignment to exemplary standard. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level submission.	Work demonstrates exemplary standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Exemplary in its use of ideas, concepts and theory. Exemplary analysis of data. Exemplary level of self-reflection. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level submission.	Exemplary use of sources/case studies and/or evidence. Demonstrates deeply impressive command of data or literature, drawing on an exemplary range of material/evidence and/or examining the topic in considerable detail. Demonstrates an exemplary sensitivity to the limitations of evidence. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level submission.	Exemplary in all respects. Outstanding bibliography with academic referencing conventions employed accurately, consistently and according to established practice within the discipline. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level submission.	Exemplary standard of written English. Written communication, including use of subject-specific language, is of highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level submission.
80-89% Distinction (Middle Range)	Significant learning outcomes have been fully met to a very high standard. The submission shows clear signs of perceptiveness and some originality of thought and expression. Demonstrates a strong understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a very high level of scholarship, though small potential improvements can be readily identified.	A very high standard of presentation: clear, logical and few errors.	Coherent, articulate and resourcefully constructed arguments, demonstrating a very high level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment to a very high standard.	Work demonstrates a very high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts and theory to good effect. Very high level of self-reflection.	Work demonstrates a very strong command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail. Also demonstrates a very high level of awareness of, and sensitivity to, the limits of evidence.	A very high standard of referencing throughout. Bibliography conforms to a very high standard. Errors very few and mostly very minor.	A very high standard of written English.
70-79% Distinction	Significant learning outcomes have been fully met to a high standard. Demonstrates a strong understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains an impressive level of scholarship, though there may be scope for improvement in a number of areas.	A high standard of presentation: clear, logical and few errors.	Coherent and articulate arguments, demonstrating a high level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment to a high standard.	Work demonstrates a high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts and theory to good effect. High level of self-reflection.	Work demonstrates a strong command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail. The submission shows awareness of, the limits/limitations of evidence.	A high standard of referencing throughout. Bibliography conforms to a high standard, though there may be a number of small errors which can be easily corrected in future submissions.	A high standard of written English.

Table 1 - UEA SENATE SCALE (Postgraduate level): COURSEWORK							
Classification	**Learning outcomes & scholarship**	**Presentation**	**Argument & understanding**	**Criticality & analysis**	**Use of sources and evidence**	**Academic referencing**	**Written communication**
65-69% High Merit	Significant learning outcomes have been met to a good standard. Demonstrates a good understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a good level of scholarship but lacks sophistication of distinction.	A good standard of presentation: clear, mostly logical, and errors are mostly very minor.	The submission shows a thorough grasp of the subject and contains evidence of insight. Though it may lack finesse, it is thorough, clear and shows an understanding of the subject/topic. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment. Lacks intellectual independence required for a distinction.	The work contains some good examples of critical analysis but limited originality and creativity in use of ideas, concepts, case studies etc. Good level of self-reflection though some scope for development.	The student draws on a good range of material but lacks breadth of engagement with the secondary literature required for a distinction. Judicious use of sources and evidence appropriate to the discipline. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Partial awareness of the limits of evidence.	A good standard of referencing, though a number of errors or inconsistencies may be present. Good bibliography but possibly containing technical errors, some minor, some more serious.	A good standard of written English, with only minor errors present.
60-64% Merit	Significant learning outcomes have been met, mostly to a good standard. Demonstrates understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a good level of scholarship and demonstrates clear evidence of engagement in the discipline that lifts it above the merely 'competent'. Exceeds the requirements of a Pass.	A good standard of presentation: clear, mostly logical, and errors are mostly very minor. There may be occasional and relatively minor flaws in structure.	The student has submitted work which contains evidence of insight. Though it may lack finesse, it is thorough, clear and shows an understanding of the subject context. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment.	The work contains some good examples of critical analysis but limited originality and creativity in use of ideas, concepts, case studies etc. Good level of self-reflection, but plenty of scope for development.	The student draws on a good range of material but lacks breadth of engagement with the secondary literature required for a distinction. Good use of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Partial awareness of the limits of evidence.	A good standard of referencing, though a number of errors or inconsistencies may be present. Good bibliography but possibly containing technical errors, some minor, some more serious.	A good standard of written English, with only minor errors present.
55-59% Pass	Significant learning outcomes have been met satisfactorily. Some may have been met to a good standard. Demonstrates a satisfactory understanding of the subject and some understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Standard of scholarship likely to be undermined by poor linkage of issues/themes, poor use of evidence, unsubstantiated claims etc.	A satisfactory standard achieved: mostly clear, some evidence of logical progression. Some minor inaccuracies. There may be a number of flaws in structure, some of them serious.	Competent work, with evidence of engagement in the relevant issues, but little originality and only occasional insight. Gaps in understanding and knowledge; may not have addressed all aspects of the assignment.	Conscientious work and attentive to subject matter and/or task set but balanced more towards a descriptive rather than a critical, analytical treatment.	Draws on a satisfactory but relatively limited range of sources. Some assessment of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Some use of examples. Treatment of data or literature is basically sound but too narrow in scope and underdeveloped. Understanding of the limits of evidence not fully articulated or understood.	Referencing satisfactory on the whole, though some inconsistencies or instances of poor/ limited citation may be present. Satisfactory bibliography but likely to reveal some weaknesses in composition and use of referencing conventions.	A reasonable standard of written English, though a number of errors may be present.

Table 1 - UEA SENATE SCALE (Postgraduate level): COURSEWORK

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
50-54% Pass	Significant learning outcomes have been met satisfactorily. Demonstrates a barely satisfactory understanding of the subject. Some understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards but falls well short of the standard required for a Merit. Standard of scholarship likely to be undermined by poor linkage of issues/themes, poor use of evidence, unsubstantiated claims etc. Overall conception lacks ambition. A narrow pass in which there is plenty of scope for improvement.	A barely satisfactory standard achieved. Mostly clear, some evidence of logical progression. Some more significant inaccuracies. There may be a number of flaws in structure, some of them of a more fundamental nature. A narrow pass.	Work shows some evidence of engagement in the relevant issues, but may be rather crude in its interpretation and argumentative purpose/focus. Little originality and only occasional insight. Gaps in understanding and knowledge; may not have addressed all aspects of the assignment. A narrow pass.	Work is attentive to the subject matter and/or task set, but mostly descriptive rather than critical or analytical in its approach. It may contain some useful observations, but insights offered are very limited in scope and sophistication. A narrow pass.	Barely satisfactory range of sources. Some assessment of evidence, but the latter may be simplistic and partial. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Some use of examples, but not necessarily well-chosen or employed. Treatment of data or literature is basically sound but too narrow in scope and underdeveloped. Some evidence of the limits of evidence, but these may not always be properly articulated or understood. A narrow pass.	Referencing barely satisfactory. A number of inconsistencies in citation may be present. Satisfactory bibliography but likely to reveal some serious weaknesses in composition and use of referencing conventions. A narrow pass.	A barely satisfactory standard of written English. A small number of serious errors may be present. A narrow pass.
Marks awarded in the range below indicate that the candidate has failed to achieve the standards required for a pass mark at Masters Level on this occasion. It is recommended that the student receiving marks in this range meet with their adviser (or the marker) to review the factors that may have influenced the mark and ways in which their performance might be enhanced in subsequent assessments. Work representing unsafe practice will be marked as a fail in professional Schools.							
40-49% Fail	Submission fails to demonstrate achievement of the learning outcomes. Some understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is present but lacks the sophistication required for a Pass. Standard of scholarship undermined by poorly constructed ideas, arguments, use of evidence, partial response to the question etc. There may be some evidence of reflection but it is partial and lacks insight expected at Masters level.	Submission fails to meet the presentational standard required for a Pass at Masters level. Some errors may be of a more serious nature. Work rushed to completion.	Work shows some understanding of the topic and some relevant knowledge, but its treatment is basic, unimaginative, and superficial. Construction of arguments lacks the sophistication required of a Pass at Masters level. Grasp of key concepts is weak. Arguments employed are poorly evidenced and/or contain flaws.	Range of data and/or literature employed is very limited and too narrow to justify a Pass at Masters level. Over-reliance on material provided on Blackboard or in lectures/seminars.	Draws on a limited range of sources. Little attempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided but are poorly chosen or employed. Lacking in sophistication or finesse. The submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence/ability in the use of evidence. Limits of evidence very poorly articulated or understood. Submission lacks the evidential base required for a Pass at Masters level.	Citations may be present, but referencing is poor, suggesting that little effort has been made to follow guidance. Work is vulnerable to unwitting plagiarism. Bibliography inadequate. Many errors, some serious, revealing an insufficient awareness of mechanics of scholarship.	Standard of written English fails to meet the standard required for a Pass at Masters level; a number of serious errors may be present; Poorly structured and written, with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. The student should consider seeking additional support in the development of their written English.

Table 1 - UEA SENATE SCALE (Postgraduate level): COURSEWORK

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
30-39% Fail	Insufficient demonstration of learning outcomes to justify a pass grade. Understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is not sufficient for a Pass. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in several areas. Limited evidence of reflection.	Poor standard, lacking sufficient clarity, and a logical progression, with serious errors/ inaccuracies.	The submission contains some material of merit, but it is only a partial attempt to address the question and fails to answer the question fully or in a robust manner, with few (and mostly unsuccessful) attempts to construct argument(s). Poor understanding of key issues or concepts.	The treatment is mostly descriptive. Whilst the work contains some evidence of criticality or analysis, it is too limited or partial or lacking in depth to justify a pass.	Draws on a very limited range of sources. No real attempt to assess evidence. Examples are occasionally provided but are poorly chosen and employed. Entirely lacking in sophistication or finesse. The submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence/ability in the choice and use of evidence.	Citations present but very limited. Referencing is very poor. Bibliography is omitted, partial or poorly structured. Guidance not followed. Poor referencing means work is highly vulnerable to unwitting plagiarism. Many serious errors, revealing very limited awareness of mechanics of scholarship.	Unsatisfactory standard of written English; too many serious errors present. Weaknesses undermine clarity of meaning. Text occasionally incomprehensible. Includes significant flaws in spelling, grammar, and basic sentence/paragraph composition. The student should consider seeking additional support in the development of their written English.
20-29% Fail	One or two learning outcomes have been met in a limited way. Understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is considerably below that required for a pass. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in many areas. Very limited evidence of reflection.	Very poor standard of presentation, lacking sufficient clarity, and a sufficiently logical progression, with many serious inaccuracies.	Little material of merit or relevance, revealing a paucity of understanding of key issues or concepts. Fails to address most aspects of the task or question set. Work lacks any sustained argument(s).	The treatment is almost wholly descriptive. Contains little evidence of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic.	Draws on minimal range of sources. Rarely goes beyond paraphrasing bits of lecture notes or easily accessible web sources. No attempt to assess evidence. Examples are very rarely provided and those that are are very poorly employed. Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citation almost or entirely absent. Guidance largely ignored. Bibliography omitted or very poorly assembled. Poor referencing means work is highly vulnerable to unwitting plagiarism. Awareness of mechanics of scholarship very weak.	A poor standard of written English. All of the flaws mentioned above, but of an even more serious nature. The student should consider seeking additional support in the development of their written English.
10-19% Fail	The work submitted will have very limited relevance to any of the stated learning outcomes. Understanding of link between theory and practice is very weak. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in all areas. Reflection almost entirely lacking.	Little evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation. Many serious errors/inaccuracies.	No material of merit or relevance, revealing a complete lack of understanding of key issues or concepts. Fails to address all aspects of the task or question set. No attempt to construct argument(s).	The treatment is wholly descriptive. No evidence of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic.	Almost complete absence of evidence. Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citations absent. Guidance entirely ignored. No bibliography that could merit description as such. Very poor referencing Highly vulnerable to unwitting plagiarism. Work shows no real attempt to apply the mechanics of scholarship.	A very poor standard of written English throughout with little care taken in the composition of proper sentences or paragraphs. The student should consider seeking additional support in the development of their written English.
0-9% Fail	Lacks any understanding of learning outcomes. No understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Standard of scholarship very poor throughout. No evidence of reflection.	No evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation.	No understanding is demonstrated. Arguments notable for their complete absence.	The treatment is wholly descriptive.	Evidence absent Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citation entirely absent. Bibliography omitted. Highly vulnerable to unwitting plagiarism. Application of the mechanics of scholarship entirely absent.	Incomprehensible. No attempt to compose proper sentences or paragraphs. The student should consider seeking additional support in the development of their written English.

Table 2 - UEA SENATE SCALE (Postgraduate level): PROJECTS & DISSERTATIONS								
Classification	**Learning outcomes & scholarship**	**Presentation**	**Methodology**	**Argument & understanding**	**Criticality & analysis**	**Use of sources and evidence**	**Academic referencing**	**Written communication**
90-100% Distinction (Upper Range)	Significant learning outcomes are met to an exemplary standard showing creativity, inventiveness, independence of judgement and consistent evidence of originality of thought and expression. Demonstrates an exemplary understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains the highest standards of scholarship that can be expected of a Masters level project or dissertation.	Exemplary presentation: clear, logical, imaginative, creative and original. Almost flawless. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level project or dissertation.	A highly sophisticated methodology. Demonstrates exemplary sensitivity in the use of quantitative and/or qualitative methods. Research tools employed are of exemplary standard. Exemplary awareness of research ethics. Methodology conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level project or dissertation.	Highly effective and sustained arguments, demonstrating exemplary level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Addresses all aspects of the assignment to exemplary standard. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level project or dissertation.	Work demonstrates exemplary standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Exemplary in its use of ideas, concepts and theory. Exemplary analysis of data. Exemplary level of self-reflection. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level project or dissertation.	Exemplary use of sources/case studies and/or evidence. Demonstrates deeply impressive command of data or literature, drawing on an exemplary range of material/evidence and/or examining the topic in considerable detail. Demonstrates an exemplary sensitivity to the limits/limitations of evidence. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level project or dissertation.	Exemplary in all respects. Outstanding bibliography with academic referencing conventions employed accurately, consistently and according to established practice within the discipline. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level project or dissertation.	Exemplary standard of written English. Written communication, including use of subject-specific language, is of highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level project or dissertation.
80-89% Distinction (Middle Range)	Significant learning outcomes have been fully met to a very high standard. The submission shows clear signs of perceptiveness and some originality of thought and expression. Demonstrates a strong understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a very high level of scholarship, though small potential improvements can be readily identified.	A very high standard of presentation: clear, logical and very few errors.	Coherent and articulate arguments, demonstrating a very high level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment to a very high standard. Understanding of research ethics demonstrated to a very high standard.	Coherent, articulate and resourcefully constructed arguments, demonstrating a very high level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment to a very high standard.	Work demonstrates a very high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts and theories with confidence. Very high level of self-reflection.	Work demonstrates a very strong command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail. Demonstrates a very high level of awareness of, and sensitivity to, the limits of evidence.	A very high standard of referencing throughout. Bibliography conforms to a very high standard. Errors very few and mostly very minor.	A very high standard of written English

Table 2 - UEA SENATE SCALE (Postgraduate level): PROJECTS & DISSERTATIONS								
Classification	**Learning outcomes & scholarship**	**Presentation**	**Methodology**	**Argument & understanding**	**Criticality & analysis**	**Use of sources and evidence**	**Academic referencing**	**Written communication**
70-79% Distinction	Significant learning outcomes have been fully met to a high standard. Demonstrates a strong understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains an impressive level of scholarship, though there may be scope for improvement in a number of areas.	A high standard of presentation: clear, logical and few errors.	The dissertation is underpinned by a sound methodology. Demonstrates a high level of skill and sensitivity in the use of quantitative and/or qualitative methods. Research tools employed are of a high standard. Understanding of research ethics demonstrated to a high standard.	Coherent and articulate arguments, demonstrating a high level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment to a high standard.	Work demonstrates a high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts and theories to good effect. High level of self-reflection.	Work demonstrates a strong command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail. Demonstrates a high level of awareness of, and sensitivity to, the limits of evidence.	A high standard of referencing throughout. Bibliography conforms to a high standard, though there may be a number of small errors which can be easily corrected in future submissions.	A high standard of written English
65-69% High Merit	Significant learning outcomes have been met to a very good standard. Demonstrates a good understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a good level of scholarship but lacks the sophistication of execution required for a distinction.	A very good standard of presentation: clear, mostly logical, and errors are mostly very minor. Lacks the presentational sophistication required for a distinction.	Some weaknesses in methodology or use of research tools, but very good attempt at the research process. Competent use of quantitative & qualitative methods. Research tools of good standard. Very good awareness of research ethics. Methodological approach lacks the sophistication required for a distinction.	The submission shows a very good grasp of the subject and contains evidence of insight. Though it may lack finesse, it is thorough, clear and shows a very good understanding of the subject/topic. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment. Lacks intellectual independence required for a distinction.	The work contains some very good examples of critical analysis and but limited originality and creativity in use of ideas, concepts, case studies etc. Very good level of self-reflection though some scope for development. Critical approach lacks the sophistication required for a distinction.	The student draws on a very good range of material but lacks breadth of engagement with the secondary literature required for a distinction. Judicious use of sources and evidence appropriate to the discipline. Topics are mostly addressed mostly examined in sufficient detail. Very good awareness of the limits of evidence.	A very good standard of referencing, though a number of errors or inconsistencies may be present. Very good bibliography but possibly containing technical errors, some minor, some more serious. Referencing practice lacks sophistication required for a distinction.	A very good standard of written English, with only minor errors present. Lacks the sophistication required for a distinction.

Table 2 - UEA SENATE SCALE (Postgraduate level): PROJECTS & DISSERTATIONS								
Classification	**Learning outcomes & scholarship**	**Presentation**	**Methodology**	**Argument & understanding**	**Criticality & analysis**	**Use of sources and evidence**	**Academic referencing**	**Written communication**
60-64% Merit	Significant learning outcomes have been met, mostly to a good standard. Demonstrates understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a good level of scholarship and demonstrates clear evidence of engagement in the discipline that lifts it above the merely 'competent'. Exceeds the requirements of a Pass.	A good standard of presentation: clear, mostly logical, and errors are mostly very minor. There may be occasional and relatively minor flaws in structure.	Methodology good but may contain a number of minor flaws. Research tools are functional but lack finesse. The research approach is competent but unimaginative. Competent but basic use of quantitative & qualitative methods. Good awareness of research ethics.	The submission shows a good grasp of the subject and contains evidence of insight. Though it may lack finesse, it is mostly thorough, largely clear and shows a good understanding of the subject/topic. Has addressed most aspects of the assignment.	The work contains some good examples of critical analysis and but limited originality and creativity in use of ideas, concepts, case studies etc. Good level of self-reflection, but plenty of scope for development.	The student draws on a good range but range may be rather predictable. Good use of evidence. Good awareness of the limits of evidence.	A good standard of referencing, though a number of errors or inconsistencies may be present. Good bibliography but possibly containing technical errors, some minor, some more serious.	A good standard of written English, with only minor errors present
55-59% Pass	Significant learning outcomes have been met satisfactorily. Some may have been met to a good standard. Demonstrates a satisfactory understanding of the subject and some understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Standard of scholarship likely to be undermined by poor linkage of issues/themes, poor use of evidence, unsubstantiated claims etc.	A satisfactory standard achieved: mostly clear, some evidence of logical progression. Some minor inaccuracies. There may be a number of flaws in structure, some of them serious.	Methodology approach is basic but sound. It is under-developed and lacking in sophistication. Research tools employed are satisfactory but very basic. Data retrieved may be of limited, breadth, veracity or reliability. Only a basic awareness of issues associated with use of qualitative/qualitative data. Awareness of research ethics is mostly good.	Competent work, with evidence of engagement in the relevant issues, but little originality and only occasional insight. Gaps in understanding and knowledge; may not have addressed all aspects of the assignment.	Conscientious work and attentive to subject matter and/or task set, but balanced more towards a descriptive rather than a critical, analytical treatment.	Draws on a limited range of sources. Some assessment of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Some use of examples. Treatment of data or literature is basically sound but too narrow in scope and underdeveloped. Understanding of the limits of evidence not fully articulated or understood.	Referencing satisfactory on the whole, though some inconsistencies or instances of poor/limited citation may be present. Satisfactory bibliography but likely to reveal some weaknesses in composition and use of referencing conventions.	A reasonable standard of written English, though a number of errors may be present.

Table 2 - UEA SENATE SCALE (Postgraduate level): PROJECTS & DISSERTATIONS								
Classification	**Learning outcomes & scholarship**	**Presentation**	**Methodology**	**Argument & understanding**	**Criticality & analysis**	**Use of sources and evidence**	**Academic referencing**	**Written communication**
50-54% **Pass**	Significant learning outcomes have been met satisfactorily. Demonstrates a barely satisfactory understanding of the subject. Some understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards, but falls well short of the standard required for a Merit. Standard of scholarship likely to be undermined by poor linkage of issues/themes, poor use of evidence, unsubstantiated claims etc. Overall conception lacks ambition. A narrow pass in which there is plenty of scope for improvement.	A barely satisfactory standard achieved. Mostly clear, some evidence of logical progression. Some more significant inaccuracies. There may be a number of flaws in structure, some of them of a more fundamental nature. A narrow pass.	Methodological approach is barely adequate and flawed in some areas. Research tool simplistic and under-developed. Data may be of very limited breadth or reliability. Very little awareness of issues associated with use of qualitative/ qualitative data. Awareness of research ethics only satisfactory – it narrowly meets the standard required for a Pass but this aspect of the project / dissertation reveals a limited engagement with the key issues.	Work shows some evidence of engagement in the relevant issues but may be rather basic and unimaginative in its interpretation and argumentative purpose/focus. Little originality and only occasional insights. Gaps in understanding and knowledge; may not have addressed all aspects of the project/dissertation. A narrow pass.	Work is attentive to the subject matter and/or task set but balanced mostly descriptive rather than critical or analytical in its approach. It may contain some useful observations, but insights offered are very limited in scope and sophistication. A narrow pass.	Barely satisfactory range of sources. Some assessment of evidence, but the latter may be simplistic and partial. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Some use of examples, but not necessarily well-chosen or employed. Treatment of data or literature is basically sound but too narrow in scope and underdeveloped. Some evidence of the limits of evidence, but these may not always be properly articulated or understood. A narrow pass.	Referencing barely satisfactory. A number of inconsistencies in citation may be present. Satisfactory bibliography but likely to reveal some serious weaknesses in composition and use of referencing conventions. A narrow pass.	A barely satisfactory standard of written English. A small number of serious errors may be present. A narrow pass.

Table 2 - UEA SENATE SCALE (Postgraduate level): PROJECTS & DISSERTATIONS

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Methodology	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
Marks awarded in the range below indicate that the candidate has failed to achieve the standards required for a pass mark at Masters Level on this occasion. It is recommended that the student receiving marks in this range meet with their adviser (or the marker) to review the factors that may have influenced the mark and ways in which their performance might be enhanced in subsequent assessments. Work representing unsafe practice will be marked as a fail in professional Schools.								
40-49% Fail	Submission fails to demonstrate achievement of the learning outcomes. Some understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is present but lacks the sophistication required for a Pass. Standard of scholarship undermined by poorly constructed ideas, arguments, use of evidence, partial response to the question etc. There may be some evidence of reflection but it is partial and lacks insight expected at Masters level.	Submission fails to meet the presentational standard required for a Pass at Masters level. Some errors may be of a more serious nature. Work rushed to completion.	Methodological approach is unsound and flawed in too many areas. Research tools under-developed and/or inadequate. Data of insufficient breadth or reliability. Awareness of issues associated with use of qualitative/qualitative data appears to be minimal or non-existent. Poor awareness of research ethics.	Work shows some understanding of the topic and some relevant knowledge, but its treatment is basic, unimaginative and superficial and construction of arguments lacks the sophistication required of a Pass at Masters level. Grasp of key concepts is weak. Arguments employed are poorly evidenced and/or contain flaws.	Range of data and/or literature employed is very limited and too narrow to justify a Pass at Masters level. Over-reliance on material provided on Blackboard or in lectures/seminars.	Draws on a limited range of sources. Little attempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided but are poorly chosen or employed. Lacking in sophistication or finesse. The submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence/ability in the use of evidence. Limits of evidence very poorly articulated or understood. Submission lacks the evidential base required for a Pass at Masters level.	Citations may be present, but referencing is poor, suggesting that little effort has been made to follow guidance. Work is vulnerable to unwitting plagiarism. Bibliography inadequate. Many errors, some serious, revealing an insufficient awareness of mechanics of scholarship. Fails to conform to the standard required for a Pass.	Standard of written English fails to meet the standard required for a Pass at Masters level; a number of serious errors may be present; Poorly structured and written, with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar. The student should consider seeking additional support in the development of their written English.
30-39% Fail	Insufficient demonstration of learning outcomes to justify a Pass grade. Understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is not sufficient for a Pass. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in several areas. Limited evidence of reflection.	Poor standard, lacking sufficient clarity, and a logical progression, with serious errors / inaccuracies.	Methodological approach is unsound and flawed in too many areas. Research tools under-developed and/or inadequate. Data of insufficient breadth or reliability. Awareness of issues associated with use of qualitative/qualitative data appears to be minimal or non-existent. Very poor awareness of research ethics.	The submission contains some material of merit, but it is only a partial attempt to address the question and fails to answer the question fully or in a robust manner with few (and mostly unsuccessful) attempts to construct argument(s). Poor understanding of key issues or concepts.	The treatment is predominantly descriptive. Whilst the work contains some evidence of criticality or analysis, it is too limited or partial or lacking in depth to justify a pass.	Draws on a very limited range of sources. No real attempt to assess evidence. Examples are occasionally provided but are poorly chosen and employed. Entirely lacking in sophistication or finesse. The submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence/ability in the choice and use of evidence.	Citations present but very limited. Referencing is very poor. Bibliography is omitted, partial or poorly structured. Guidance not followed. Poor referencing means work is highly vulnerable to unwitting plagiarism. Many serious errors, revealing very limited awareness of mechanics of scholarship.	Unsatisfactory standard of written English; too many serious errors present. Weaknesses undermine clarity of meaning. Text occasionally incomprehensible. Includes significant flaws in spelling, grammar, and basic sentence / paragraph composition. The student should consider seeking additional support in the development of their written English

Table 2 - UEA SENATE SCALE (Postgraduate level): PROJECTS & DISSERTATIONS								
Classification	**Learning outcomes & scholarship**	**Presentation**	**Methodology**	**Argument & understanding**	**Criticality & analysis**	**Use of sources and evidence**	**Academic referencing**	**Written communication**
20-29% Fail	One or two learning outcomes have been met in a limited way. Understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is considerably below that required for a pass. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in many areas. Very limited evidence of reflection.	Very poor standard of presentation, lacking sufficient clarity, and a sufficiently logical progression, with many serious inaccuracies.	Dissertation reflects a very poor understanding of what a 'methodology' is. Approach is unsound and flawed at a fundamental level. Research tools under-developed and/or inadequate. Data minimal. Research ethics are mentioned but not examined / discussed.	Little material of merit or relevance, revealing a paucity of understanding of key issues or concepts. Fails to address most aspects of the task or question set. Work lacks any sustained argument(s).	The treatment is almost wholly descriptive. Contains little evidence of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic.	Draws on minimal range of sources. Rarely goes beyond paraphrasing bits of lecture notes or easily accessible web sources. No attempt to assess evidence. Examples are very rarely provided and those that are very poorly employed. Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citation almost or entirely absent. Guidance largely ignored. Bibliography omitted or very poorly assembled. Poor referencing means work is highly vulnerable to unwitting plagiarism. Awareness of mechanics of scholarship very weak.	A poor standard of written English. All of the flaws mentioned above, but of an even more serious nature. The student should consider seeking additional support in the development of their written English.
10-19% Fail	The work submitted will have very limited relevance to any of the stated learning outcomes. Understanding of link between theory and practice is very weak. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in all areas. Reflection almost entirely lacking.	Little evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation. Many serious errors/ inaccuracies.	Little understanding of 'methodology' is apparent. Approach is entirely unsound and seriously flawed at a fundamental level. Tools and data unreliable/unsound. No engagement with research ethics at all.	No material of merit or relevance, revealing a complete lack of understanding of key issues or concepts. Fails to address all aspects of the task or question set. No attempt to construct argument(s).	The treatment is wholly descriptive. Contains very little evidence of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic.	Almost complete absence of evidence. Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citations absent. Guidance entirely ignored. No bibliography that could merit description as such. Very poor referencing Highly vulnerable to unwitting plagiarism. Work shows no attempt to apply the mechanics of scholarship.	A very poor standard of written English throughout with little care taken in the composition of proper sentences or paragraphs. The student should consider seeking additional support in the development of their written English.
0-9% Fail	Lacks any understanding of learning outcomes. No understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Standard of scholarship very poor throughout. No evidence of reflection.	No evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation.	Nothing that might be described as a 'methodology' is apparent. Total absence of proper research tools or usable data. No evidence that the student is even aware that research ethics exist.	No understanding is demonstrated. Arguments notable for their complete absence.	No evidence of criticality or analysis.	Evidence conspicuous by its complete absence. Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citation entirely absent. Bibliography omitted. Highly vulnerable to unwitting plagiarism. Application of the mechanics of scholarship entirely absent.	Incomprehensible. No attempt to compose proper sentences or paragraphs. The student should consider seeking additional support in the development of their written English.

Table 3 - UEA SENATE SCALE (Postgraduate level): ORAL PRESENTATION							
Classification	**Learning outcomes & scholarship**	**Presentation**	**Argument & understanding**	**Criticality & analysis**	**Use of sources and evidence**	**Academic referencing**	**Written communication**
90-100% Distinction (Upper Range)	Significant learning outcomes are met at an exemplary standard showing creativity, inventiveness, independence of judgement and consistent evidence of originality of thought and expression. Demonstrates an exemplary understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains the highest standards of scholarship that can be expected of a Masters level presentation.	Exemplary oral presentation: exceptionally clear, logical, imaginative, creative and original. Almost flawless in delivery. Exemplary use of visual aids (slides, hand-outs etc.). Conveys even the most difficult/complex issues clearly and concisely. Exemplary in terms of audience engagement. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level presentation. **In the case of group presentation:** Exemplary level of planning, choreography and group-level coordination.	Exemplary standard of spoken English and diverse vocabulary. Exemplary use of discipline-specific terminology and/or technical language. Exemplary voice projection and body language/eye contact. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level presentation.	Highly effective arguments, demonstrating exemplary, deeply impressive understanding of the theoretical or empirical aspects of the topic and associated issues/debates. Addresses all aspects of the assignment to exemplary standard. Key points are rigorously argued and convincingly presented with exemplary use of supporting evidence. Questions handled with impressive 'aplomb'. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level presentation.	Exemplary structure with clear, logical progression. Organisation exemplary. Presentation has razor-sharp focus and sense of purpose. Time management excellent. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level presentation.	Presentation demonstrates exemplary standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Exemplary in its use of ideas, concepts and theory. Exemplary analysis of data. Exemplary level of self-reflection. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level presentation.	Exemplary use of sources/case studies and/or evidence. Demonstrates deeply impressive command of data or literature, drawing on an exemplary range of material/evidence and/or examining the topic in considerable detail. Demonstrates an exemplary sensitivity to the limits/limitations of evidence. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level presentation.
80-89% Distinction (Middle Range)	Significant learning outcomes have been fully met to a very high standard. The presentation shows clear signs of perceptiveness and some originality of thought and expression. Demonstrates a strong understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a very high level of scholarship, though small potential improvements can be readily identified.	A very high standard of presentation: clear, logical and few errors. The delivery, whilst not exemplary, is lively, with excellent use of visual aids (if appropriate) and some evidence of practice and choreography. Encouraged group participation and discussion. **In the case of group presentation:** Very high level of planning, choreography and group-level coordination.	A very high standard of spoken English. Very good breadth of vocabulary. Very good use of discipline-specific terminology. Good voice projection and eye contact/use of body language.	Coherent, articulate and resourcefully constructed arguments, demonstrating a very high level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment to a very high standard. Questions handled very well and with ease.	Structure clear and well-suited to topic. Whilst not entirely without flaws, there is evidence of careful planning and attention to detail. Logical progression. Time management very good.	Presentation demonstrates a very high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts and theory to good effect. Very high level of self-reflection.	Presentation demonstrates a very strong command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail. Also demonstrates a very high level of awareness of, and sensitivity to, the limits of evidence.

Table 3 - UEA SENATE SCALE (Postgraduate level): ORAL PRESENTATION							
Classification	**Learning outcomes & scholarship**	**Presentation**	**Argument & understanding**	**Criticality & analysis**	**Use of sources and evidence**	**Academic referencing**	**Written communication**
70-79% Distinction	Significant learning outcomes have been fully met to a high standard. Demonstrates a strong understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains an impressive level of scholarship, though there may be scope for improvement in a number of areas.	A high standard of presentation: clear, logical and few errors.	A high standard of spoken English. Good breadth of vocabulary. Good use of discipline-specific terminology. Good voice projection and eye contact/use of body language.	Coherent and articulate arguments, demonstrating a high level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Has addressed most or all aspects of the presentation topic to a high standard. Questions handled very well.	Structure clear and well-suited to topic. Whilst there is evidence of careful planning and attention to detail, there is some scope for refinement. Logical progression. Time management good.	Presentation demonstrates a high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts and theory to good effect. High level of self-reflection.	Presentation demonstrates a strong command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail. The presentation shows awareness of, the limits/limitations of evidence.
65-69% High Merit	Significant learning outcomes have been met to a good standard. Demonstrates a good understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a good level of scholarship but lacks sophistication of distinction.	A good standard of presentation: clear, mostly logical, and errors are mostly very minor.	A good standard of spoken English and vocabulary. Good use of disciplinary terminology and language. Voice projection and eye contact/body language are better than average, though some room for improvement.	The presentation shows a good grasp of the subject and contains evidence of insight. Though it may lack finesse, it is thorough, clear and shows an understanding of the subject/topic. Has addressed most or all aspects of the presentation topic. Lacks intellectual independence required for a distinction. Questions handled well most of the time.	Structure clear and there is logical progression. Whilst the presentation shows evidence of care in its planning, needs more careful 'honing', and clearer focus.	Presentation contains some good examples of critical analysis but limited originality and creativity in use of ideas, concepts, case studies etc. Good level of self-reflection though some scope for development.	Presentation draws on a good range of material but lacks breadth of engagement with the secondary literature required for a distinction. Judicious use of sources and evidence appropriate to the discipline. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Partial awareness of the limits of evidence.
60-64% Merit	Significant learning outcomes have been met, mostly to a good standard. Demonstrates understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a good level of scholarship and demonstrates clear evidence of engagement in the discipline that lifts it above the merely 'competent'. Exceeds the requirements of a Pass.	A good standard of presentation: clear, mostly logical, and errors are mostly very minor. There may be occasional and relatively minor flaws in structure.	A good standard of spoken English and vocabulary. Good use of disciplinary terminology and language. Voice projection and eye contact/body language are better than average, though some room for improvement.	The presentation contains evidence of insight. Though it may lack finesse, it is thorough, clear and shows an understanding of the subject context. Has addressed most or all aspects of the presentation topic. Capable of responding to most questions in a competent manner.	Structure mostly clear and there is, for the most part, a logical progression. Whilst the presentation shows evidence of care in its planning, needs more careful 'honing', and a clearer focus. Falls some way short of the standard required for a distinction.	Presentation contains some good examples of critical analysis but limited originality and creativity in use of ideas, concepts, case studies etc. Good level of self-reflection, but plenty of scope for development.	The student draws on a good range of material but lacks breadth of engagement with the secondary literature. Mostly good use of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Partial awareness of the limits of evidence.

Table 3 - UEA SENATE SCALE (Postgraduate level): ORAL PRESENTATION							
Classification	**Learning outcomes & scholarship**	**Presentation**	**Argument & understanding**	**Criticality & analysis**	**Use of sources and evidence**	**Academic referencing**	**Written communication**
55-59% Pass	Significant learning outcomes have been met satisfactorily. Some may have been met to a good standard. Demonstrates a satisfactory understanding of the subject and some understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Standard of scholarship likely to be undermined by poor linkage of issues/themes, poor use of evidence, unsubstantiated claims.	A competent standard achieved: mostly clear, some evidence of logical progression. Some minor inaccuracies. There may be a number of flaws in structure, some of them serious.	Satisfactory standard of spoken English and vocabulary. Some discipline-specific terminology and language are used, mostly accurately. Voice projection/eye contact/body language are no more than satisfactory.	Competent work, with evidence of engagement in the relevant issues, but little originality and only occasional insight. Gaps in understanding and knowledge; may not have addressed all aspects of the presentation topic. Responses to questions very variable, struggled with some.	Generally accurate and relevant but some gaps and or irrelevant material. Not always clear or logical.	Presentation is attentive to subject matter and/or task set but balanced more towards a descriptive rather than a critical, analytical treatment.	Draws on a satisfactory range of sources. Some assessment of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Some use of examples. Treatment of data or literature is basically sound but too narrow in scope and underdeveloped. Understanding of the limits of evidence not fully articulated or understood.
50-54% Pass	Significant learning outcomes have been met satisfactorily. Demonstrates a barely satisfactory understanding of the subject. Some understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards, but falls well short of the standard required for a Merit. Standard of scholarship likely to be undermined by poor linkage of issues/themes, poor use of evidence, unsubstantiated claims etc. Overall conception lacks ambition. A narrow pass in which there is plenty of scope for improvement.	A barely satisfactory standard achieved. Mostly clear, some evidence of logical progression. Some more significant inaccuracies. There may be a number of flaws in structure, some of them of a more fundamental nature. A narrow pass.	Standard of spoken English and vocabulary is adequate for a pass. Use of discipline-specific terminology and language lacks precision and may be flawed. Use of voice projection and eye contact/use of body language are poor - considerable scope for improvement.	Work shows some evidence of engagement in the relevant issues, but may be rather crude in its interpretation and argumentative purpose/focus. Little originality and only occasional insight. Gaps in understanding and knowledge; may not have addressed all aspects of the presentation topic. A narrow pass. Answered most questions but some responses not convincing.	Material fairly disorganised with poor sense of 'mission' or key points the student wished to convey. A narrow pass.	Work is attentive to the subject matter and/or task set but is mostly descriptive rather critical or analytical. It may contain some useful observations, but insights offered are very limited in scope and sophistication. A narrow pass.	Barely satisfactory range of sources. Some assessment of evidence, but the latter may be simplistic and partial. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Some use of examples, but not necessarily well-chosen or employed. Treatment of data or literature is basically sound but too narrow in scope and underdeveloped. Some evidence of the limits of evidence, but these may not always be properly articulated or understood. A narrow pass.

Table 3 - UEA SENATE SCALE (Postgraduate level): ORAL PRESENTATION

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
Marks awarded in the range below indicate that the candidate has failed to achieve the standards required for a pass mark at Masters Level on this occasion. It is recommended that the student receiving marks in this range meet with their adviser (or the marker) to review the factors that may have influenced the mark and ways in which their performance might be enhanced in subsequent assessments. Work representing unsafe practice will be marked as a fail in professional Schools.							
40-49% Fail	Presentation fails to demonstrate achievement of the learning outcomes. Some understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is present but lacks the sophistication required for a Pass. Standard of scholarship undermined by poorly constructed ideas, arguments, use of evidence, partial response to the question etc. There may be some evidence of reflection but it is partial and lacks insight expected at Masters level.	Presentation fails to meet the presentational standard required for a Pass at Masters level. Some errors may be of a more serious nature. Work rushed to completion.	Standard of spoken English and vocabulary falls below the standard required for a pass. Use of discipline-specific terminology and language is inaccurate Voice projection and use of body language are poor. The student should consider seeking additional support in the development of their spoken English. Fails to achieve the standard required of a Pass at Masters level.	Presentation shows some understanding of the topic and some relevant knowledge, but its treatment is basic, unimaginative and superficial and construction of arguments lacks the sophistication required of a Pass at Masters level. Grasp of key concepts is weak. Arguments employed are poorly evidenced and/or contain flaws. Very few convincing answers to questions. Fails to achieve the standard required of a Pass at Masters level.	The presentation is badly prepared. Structurally weak, muddled, lacking incoherence. Little sense of focus or sense of 'mission'. Fails to achieve the standard required of a Pass at Masters level.	Range of data and/or literature employed is very limited and too narrow. Over-reliance on material provided on Blackboard or in lectures/seminars. Fails to achieve the standard required of a Pass at Masters level.	Draws on a limited range of sources. Little attempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided but are poorly chosen or employed. Lacking in sophistication or finesse. The presentation reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence/ability in the use of evidence. Limits of evidence very poorly articulated or understood. Presentation lacks the evidential base required for a Pass at Masters level.
30-39% Fail	Insufficient demonstration of learning outcomes to justify a pass grade. Understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is not sufficient for a Pass. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in several areas. Limited evidence of reflection.	Poor standard, lacking sufficient clarity, and a logical progression, with serious errors/inaccuracies.	Standard of spoken English and vocabulary falls below the standard required for a pass. Use of discipline-specific terminology and language is inaccurate. Voice projection and use of body language are poor. The student should seek additional support in the development of their spoken English.	The presentation contains some material of merit, but it is only a partial attempt to address the key issues, with a lack of robustness and with few (and mostly unsuccessful) attempts to construct argument(s). Poor understanding of key issues or concepts. Almost no convincing answers to questions.	Mostly disorganised and incoherent. No obvious or apparent focus or sense of 'mission'.	The treatment is mostly descriptive. Whilst the work contains some evidence of criticality or analysis, it is too limited or partial or lacking in depth to justify a pass at Masters level.	Draws on a very limited range of sources. No real attempt to assess evidence. Examples are occasionally provided but are poorly chosen and employed. The presentation reflects a very limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence/ability in the choice and use of evidence.

Table 3 - UEA SENATE SCALE (Postgraduate level): ORAL PRESENTATION							
Classification	**Learning outcomes & scholarship**	**Presentation**	**Argument & understanding**	**Criticality & analysis**	**Use of sources and evidence**	**Academic referencing**	**Written communication**
20-29% **Fail**	One or two learning outcomes have been met in a limited way. Understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is considerably below that required for a pass. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in many areas. Very limited evidence of reflection.	Very poor standard of presentation, lacking sufficient clarity, and a sufficiently logical progression, with many serious inaccuracies.	Standard of spoken English and vocabulary is very poor. Use of discipline-specific terminology and language is inaccurate. No awareness of voice projection and body language. The student should seek additional support in the development of their spoken English.	Little material of merit or relevance, revealing a paucity of understanding of key issues or concepts. Fails to address most aspects of the task set or the topic of the presentation. Presentation lacks any focused or sustained argument(s). Answers to questions mostly superficial.	Very disorganised and mostly incoherent. No obvious or apparent focus or sense of 'mission'. Very little evidence of planning in advance.	The treatment is almost wholly descriptive. Contains little evidence of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic.	Draws on minimal range of sources. Rarely goes beyond paraphrasing bits of lecture notes or easily accessible web sources. No attempt to assess evidence. Examples are very rarely provided and those that are very poorly employed. Presentation reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.
10-19% **Fail**	The work submitted will have very limited relevance to any of the stated learning outcomes. Understanding of link between theory and practice is very weak. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in all areas. Reflection almost entirely lacking.	Little evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation. Many serious errors/ inaccuracies.	Spoken English and vocabulary cause for major concern: may require remedial intervention. Use of discipline-specific terms and language suggests major deficiencies in reading/ knowledge. The student should seek additional support in the development of their spoken English.	No material of merit or relevance, revealing a complete lack of understanding of key issues or concepts associated with the topic. Fails to address all aspects of the task or the topic. No attempt to construct argument(s). Answers to questions wholly superficial.	No real evidence of any planning in advance. Organisation or structure almost entirely lacking.	The treatment is wholly descriptive. Very little evidence of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic.	Almost complete absence of evidence. Presentation reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.
0-9% **Fail**	Lacks any understanding of learning outcomes. No understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Standard of scholarship very poor throughout. No evidence of reflection.	No evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation.	Standard of spoken English totally inadequate for an oral exercise at Masters level. Hardly any knowledge demonstrated. The student should seek additional support in the development of their spoken English.	No understanding is demonstrated. Arguments notable for their complete absence. No real attempt to answer questions at all.	No organisation or structure. No evidence of any advance planning at all.	The treatment is wholly descriptive. No evidence of any kind of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic.	Evidence wholly absent. Presentation reflects a non-existent or wholly ineffective engagement in study on a more general level.

Table 4 - UEA SENATE SCALE (Postgraduate level): POSTER AND ORAL PRESENTATION

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Oral Presentation	Poster	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources & evidence	Academic referencing
90-100% Distinction (Upper Range)	Significant learning outcomes are met at an exemplary standard showing creativity, inventiveness, independence of judgement and consistent evidence of originality of thought and expression. Demonstrates an exemplary understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains the highest standards of scholarship that can be expected of a Masters level submission.	Exemplary oral presentation: exceptionally clear, logical, imaginative, creative and original. Almost flawless in delivery. Conveys even the most difficult/complex issues clearly and concisely. Exemplary in terms of audience engagement. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level presentation.	Exemplary presentation conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level submission: An imaginative title that reflects the content and chosen topic. Exemplary organisation, layout and presentation of written and graphic material, presenting a very coherent perspective on chosen topic. Exemplary standard of spelling and grammar. Exemplary use of illustrations and graphics to supplement and aid understanding of the issue. Graphics are clearly labelled and clearly linked to any text.	Highly effective and sustained arguments, demonstrating exemplary level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Addresses all aspects of the assignment to exemplary standard. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level submission.	Work demonstrates exemplary standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Exemplary in its use of ideas, concepts and theory. Exemplary analysis of data. Exemplary level of self-reflection. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level submission.	Exemplary use of sources/case studies and/or evidence. Demonstrates deeply impressive command of data or literature, drawing on an exemplary range of material/evidence and/or examining the topic in considerable detail. Demonstrates an exemplary sensitivity to the limitations of evidence. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level submission.	Exemplary in all respects. Outstanding bibliography with academic referencing conventions employed accurately, consistently and according to established practice within the discipline. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level submission.
80-89% Distinction (Middle Range)	Significant learning outcomes have been fully met to a very high standard. The submission shows clear signs of perceptiveness and some originality of thought and expression. Demonstrates a strong understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a very high level of scholarship, though small potential improvements can be readily identified.	A very high standard of presentation: clear, logical and few errors. The delivery, whilst not exemplary, is lively, and some evidence of practice and choreography. Encouraged group participation and discussion.	A very high standard of presentation: clear title that reflects the content and chosen topic. Very high visual impact poster with very good standard of organisation, layout and presentation of written and graphic material, presenting a very coherent perspective on chosen topic. Very clear and easy to read with correct spelling and grammar. Very good use of illustrations and graphics to supplement and aid understanding of the issue. Graphics are clearly labelled and clearly linked to any text.	Coherent, articulate and resourcefully constructed arguments, demonstrating a very high level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment to a very high standard.	Work demonstrates a very high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts and theory to good effect. Very high level of self-reflection.	Work demonstrates a very strong command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail. Also demonstrates a very high level of awareness of, and sensitivity to, the limits of evidence.	A very high standard of referencing throughout. Bibliography conforms to a very high standard. Errors very few and mostly very minor.

Table 4 - UEA SENATE SCALE (Postgraduate level): POSTER AND ORAL PRESENTATION

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Oral Presentation	Poster	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources & evidence	Academic referencing
70-79% Distinction	Significant learning outcomes have been fully met to a high standard. Demonstrates a strong understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and / or standards. Attains an impressive level of scholarship, though there may be scope for improvement in a number of areas.	A high standard of presentation: clear, logical and few errors.	A high standard of presentation: clear title that reflects the content and chosen topic. Good standard of organisation, layout and presentation of written and graphic material, presenting a very coherent perspective on chosen topic. Very clear and easy to read with correct spelling and grammar. Good use of illustrations and graphics to supplement and aid understanding of the issue. Graphics are clearly labelled and clearly linked to any text.	Coherent and articulate arguments, demonstrating a high level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment to a high standard.	Work demonstrates a high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts and theory to good effect. High level of self-reflection.	Work demonstrates a strong command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail. The submission shows awareness of, the limits/limitations of evidence.	A high standard of referencing throughout. Bibliography conforms to a high standard, though there may be a number of small errors which can be easily corrected in future submissions.
65-69% High Merit	Significant learning outcomes have been met to a good standard. Demonstrates a good understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a good level of scholarship, but lacks sophistication of distinction.	A good standard of presentation: clear, mostly logical, and errors are mostly very minor.	A good standard of presentation: title that reflects the content and chosen theme. Good organisation, layout and presentation of written and graphic material, presenting a coherent perspective on the topic, Clear and easy to read, with only very minor spelling errors. Good use of illustrations and graphics to supplement and aid understanding of the issue. Poster graphics are labelled and linked to any text.	The submission shows a thorough grasp of the subject and contains evidence of insight. Though it may lack finesse, it is thorough, clear and shows an understanding of the subject/topic. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment. Lacks intellectual independence required for a distinction.	The work contains some good examples of critical analysis but limited originality and creativity in use of ideas, concepts, case studies etc. Good level of self-reflection though some scope for development.	The student draws on a good range of material but lacks breadth of engagement with the secondary literature required for a distinction. Judicious use of sources and evidence appropriate to the discipline. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Partial awareness of the limits of evidence.	A good standard of referencing, though a number of errors or inconsistencies may be present. Good bibliography but possibly containing technical errors, some minor, some more serious.

Table 4 - UEA SENATE SCALE (Postgraduate level): POSTER AND ORAL PRESENTATION							
Classification	**Learning outcomes & scholarship**	**Oral Presentation**	**Poster**	**Argument & understanding**	**Criticality & analysis**	**Use of sources & evidence**	**Academic referencing**
60-64% Merit	Significant learning outcomes have been met, mostly to a good standard. Demonstrates understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a good level of scholarship and demonstrates clear evidence of engagement in the discipline that lifts it above the merely 'competent'. Exceeds the requirements of a Pass.	A good standard of presentation: clear, mostly logical, and errors are mostly very minor. There may be occasional and relatively minor flaws in structure.	A good standard of presentation: clear title, mostly logical layout and presentation of written and graphic material, presenting a perspective on the topic, Errors are mostly very minor.	The student has submitted work which contains evidence of insight. Though it may lack finesse, it is thorough, clear and shows an understanding of the subject context. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment.	The work contains some good examples of critical analysis but limited originality and creativity in use of ideas, concepts, case studies etc. Good level of self-reflection, but plenty of scope for development.	The student draws on a good range of material but lacks breadth of engagement with the secondary literature required for a distinction. Good use of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Partial awareness of the limits of evidence.	A good standard of referencing, though a number of errors or inconsistencies may be present. Good bibliography but possibly containing technical errors, some minor, some more serious.
55-59% Pass	Significant learning outcomes have been met satisfactorily. Some may have been met to a good standard. Demonstrates a satisfactory understanding of the subject and some understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Standard of scholarship likely to be undermined by poor linkage of issues/themes, poor use of evidence, unsubstantiated claims etc.	A competent standard achieved: mostly clear, some evidence of logical progression. Some minor inaccuracies. There may be a number of flaws in structure, some of them serious.	A satisfactory standard achieved: mostly clear, some evidence of logical layout and presentation of written and graphic material. Some minor inaccuracies. There may be a number of weaknesses in the organisation, layout and presentation of written and graphic material, some of them serious.	Competent work, with evidence of engagement in the relevant issues, but little originality and only occasional insight. Gaps in understanding and knowledge; may not have addressed all aspects of the assignment.	Conscientious work and attentive to subject matter and/or task set, but balanced more towards a descriptive rather than a critical, analytical treatment.	Draws on a satisfactory but relatively limited range of sources. Some assessment of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Some use of examples. Treatment of data or literature is basically sound but too narrow in scope and underdeveloped. Understanding of the limits of evidence not fully articulated or understood.	Referencing satisfactory on the whole, though some inconsistencies or instances of poor/limited citation may be present. Satisfactory bibliography but likely to reveal some weaknesses in composition and use of referencing conventions.

Table 4 - UEA SENATE SCALE (Postgraduate level): POSTER AND ORAL PRESENTATION

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Oral Presentation	Poster	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources & evidence	Academic referencing
50-54% Pass	Significant learning outcomes have been met satisfactorily. Demonstrates a barely satisfactory understanding of the subject. Some understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards, but falls well short of the standard required for a Merit. Standard of scholarship likely to be undermined by poor linkage of issues/themes, poor use of evidence, unsubstantiated claims etc. Overall conception lacks ambition. A narrow pass in which there is plenty of scope for improvement.	A barely satisfactory standard achieved. Mostly clear, some evidence of logical progression. Some more significant inaccuracies. There may be a number of flaws in structure, some of them of a more fundamental nature. A narrow pass.	A barely satisfactory standard achieved: mostly clear, some evidence of logical layout and presentation of written and graphic material. Some more significant inaccuracies. There may be a number of weaknesses in the organisation, layout and presentation of written and graphic material, some of them of a more fundamental nature. A narrow pass.	Work shows some evidence of engagement in the relevant issues, but may be rather crude in its interpretation and argumentative purpose/focus. Little originality and only occasional insight. Gaps in understanding and knowledge; may not have addressed all aspects of the assignment. A narrow pass.	Work is attentive to the subject matter and/or task set, but mostly descriptive rather than critical or analytical in its approach. It may contain some useful observations, but insights offered are very limited in scope and sophistication. A narrow pass.	Barely satisfactory range of sources. Some assessment of evidence, but the latter may be simplistic and partial. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Some use of examples, but not necessarily well-chosen or employed. Treatment of data or literature is basically sound but too narrow in scope and underdeveloped. Some evidence of the limits of evidence, but these may not always be properly articulated or understood. A narrow pass.	Referencing barely satisfactory. A number of inconsistencies in citation may be present. Satisfactory bibliography but likely to reveal some serious weaknesses in composition and use of referencing conventions. A narrow pass.
Marks awarded in the range below indicate that the candidate has failed to achieve the standards required for a pass mark at Masters Level on this occasion. It is recommended that the student receiving marks in this range meet with their adviser (or the marker) to review the factors that may have influenced the mark and ways in which their performance might be enhanced in subsequent assessments. Work representing unsafe practice will be marked as a fail in professional Schools.							
40-49% Fail	Submission fails to demonstrate achievement of the learning outcomes. Some understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is present but lacks the sophistication required for a Pass. Standard of scholarship undermined by poorly constructed ideas, arguments, use of evidence, partial response to the question etc. There may be some evidence of reflection but it is partial and lacks insight expected at Masters level.	Submission fails to meet the presentational standard required for a Pass at Masters level. Some errors may be of a more serious nature. Work rushed to completion.	Poster fails to meet the presentational standard required for a Pass at Masters level. Some errors may be of a more serious nature. Work rushed to completion.	Work shows some understanding of the topic and some relevant knowledge, but its treatment is basic, unimaginative, and superficial. Construction of arguments lacks the sophistication required of a Pass at Masters level. Grasp of key concepts is weak. Arguments employed are poorly evidenced and/or contain flaws.	Range of data and/or literature employed is very limited and too narrow to justify a Pass at Masters level. Over-reliance on material provided on Blackboard or in lectures/seminars.	Draws on a limited range of sources. Little attempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided but are poorly chosen or employed. Lacking in sophistication or finesse. The submission reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence/ability in the use of evidence. Limits of evidence very poorly articulated or understood. Submission lacks the evidential base required for a Pass at Masters level.	Citations may be present, but referencing is poor, suggesting that little effort has been made to follow guidance. Work is vulnerable to unwitting plagiarism. Bibliography inadequate. Many errors, some serious, revealing an insufficient awareness of mechanics of scholarship.

Table 4 - UEA SENATE SCALE (Postgraduate level): POSTER AND ORAL PRESENTATION

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Oral Presentation	Poster	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources & evidence	Academic referencing
30-39% Fail	Insufficient demonstration of learning outcomes to justify a pass grade. Understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is not sufficient for a Pass. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in several areas. Limited evidence of reflection.	Poor standard, lacking sufficient clarity, and a logical progression, with serious errors/ inaccuracies.	Poor standard, lacking sufficient clarity, and logic in presentation of written and graphic material. Contains serious errors/ inaccuracies.	The submission contains some material of merit, but it is only a partial attempt to address the question and fails to answer the question fully or in a robust manner, with few (and mostly unsuccessful) attempts to construct argument(s). Poor understanding of key issues or concepts.	The treatment is mostly descriptive. Whilst the work contains some evidence of criticality or analysis, it is too limited or partial or lacking in depth to justify a pass.	Draws on a very limited range of sources. No real attempt to assess evidence. Examples are occasionally provided but are poorly chosen and employed. Entirely lacking in sophistication or finesse. The submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence/ability in the choice and use of evidence.	Citations present but very limited. Referencing is very poor. Bibliography is omitted, partial or poorly structured. Guidance not followed. Poor referencing means work is highly vulnerable to unwitting plagiarism. Many serious errors, revealing very limited awareness of mechanics of scholarship.
20-29% Fail	One or two learning outcomes have been met in a limited way. Understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is considerably below that required for a pass. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in many areas. Very limited evidence of reflection.	Very poor standard of presentation, lacking sufficient clarity, and a sufficiently logical progression, with many serious inaccuracies.	Very poor standard of presentation, lacking sufficient clarity, and a sufficiently logical progression, with many serious inaccuracies.	Little material of merit or relevance, revealing a paucity of understanding of key issues or concepts. Fails to address most aspects of the task or question set. Work lacks any sustained argument(s).	The treatment is almost wholly descriptive. Contains little evidence of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic.	Draws on minimal range of sources. Rarely goes beyond paraphrasing bits of lecture notes or easily accessible web sources. No attempt to assess evidence. Examples are very rarely provided and those that are are very poorly employed. Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citation almost or entirely absent. Guidance largely ignored. Bibliography omitted or very poorly assembled. Poor referencing means work is highly vulnerable to unwitting plagiarism. Awareness of mechanics of scholarship very weak.
10-19% Fail	The work submitted will have very limited relevance to any of the stated learning outcomes. Understanding of link between theory and practice is very weak. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in all areas. Reflection almost entirely lacking.	Little evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation. Many serious errors / inaccuracies.	Little evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation. Many serious errors / inaccuracies.	No material of merit or relevance, revealing a complete lack of understanding of key issues or concepts. Fails to address all aspects of the task or question set. No attempt to construct argument(s).	The treatment is wholly descriptive. No evidence of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic.	Almost complete absence of evidence. Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citations absent. Guidance entirely ignored. No bibliography that could merit description as such. Very poor referencing Highly vulnerable to unwitting plagiarism. Work shows no real attempt to apply the mechanics of scholarship.

Table 4 - UEA SENATE SCALE (Postgraduate level): POSTER AND ORAL PRESENTATION							
Classification	**Learning outcomes & scholarship**	**Oral Presentation**	**Poster**	**Argument & understanding**	**Criticality & analysis**	**Use of sources & evidence**	**Academic referencing**
0-9% Fail	Lacks any understanding of learning outcomes. No understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Standard of scholarship very poor throughout. No evidence of reflection.	No evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation.	No evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation.	No understanding is demonstrated. Arguments notable for their complete absence.	The treatment is wholly descriptive.	Evidence absent Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citation entirely absent. Bibliography omitted. Highly vulnerable to unwitting plagiarism. Application of the mechanics of scholarship entirely absent.