



# University Assessment Marking Criteria for LFFLM Portfolio

July 2020 check [www.fflm.ac.uk](http://www.fflm.ac.uk) for latest updates

The medico-legal guidelines and recommendations published by the Faculty are for general information only. Appropriate specific advice should be sought from your medical defence organisation or professional association. The Faculty has one or more senior representatives of the MDOs on its Board, but for the avoidance of doubt, endorsement of the medico-legal guidelines or recommendations published by the Faculty has not been sought from any of the medical defence organisations.

The University Assessment Marking Criteria for Level 7 (Masters Level) will apply to LFFLM Portfolio as stated below:

	Generic Criteria
<b>90-100%</b>	An excellent critical and complete demonstration of understanding in all key areas of knowledge relevant to the work and demonstrating an innovative and creative approach. Evidence throughout the work of a sustained ability to synthesise and interpret complex concepts, to make inferences and to provide an original and/or compelling argument and discussion. Excellent structure and immaculate presentation, with cogent use of academic language and grounded in a pertinent and substantial selection of source materials. Excellent use of appropriate analytical and research methods and addresses ethical considerations in an informed and perceptive manner. Exceptional ability to link and critically analyse theory and practice where appropriate.
<b>80-89%</b>	An excellent, critical and systematic demonstration of understanding in all key areas of knowledge relevant to the work. Evidence throughout of the ability to synthesise and interpret complex concepts to provide a compelling argument and discussion. Very good structure and presentation, with confident use of academic language and grounded in a relevant and extensive selection of source materials. Excellent use of appropriate analytical and research methods and fully addresses ethical considerations. Excellent ability to link and critically analyse theory and practice where appropriate.
<b>70-79%</b>	An excellent, critical and organised demonstration of understanding in all key areas of knowledge relevant to the work. Evidence throughout of the ability to synthesise and interpret diverse concepts to provide a sound argument and discussion. Good structure and presentation, with fluent use of academic language and grounded in an appropriate and comprehensive selection of source materials. Very effective use of appropriate analytical and research methods and consideration of ethical implications. Very good ability to link and critically analyse theory and practice where appropriate.
<b>60-69%</b>	A proficient, clearly stated and analytical demonstration of understanding in all key areas of knowledge relevant to the work. Evidence of the ability to integrate and analyse diverse concepts in a rational and logical argument and discussion. Well-structured and clearly presented work, with fluent use of academic language and utilising a relevant and extensive range of source materials. Effective use of appropriate analytical and research methods and consideration of ethical issues. Good ability to link and critically analyse theory and practice where appropriate.
<b>50-59%</b>	An acceptable and substantiated demonstration of understanding in all key areas of knowledge relevant to the work. Evidence of the ability to integrate and analyse diverse concepts in a reasoned and valid argument and discussion. Adequately structured and presented work, with clear use of academic language and reference to a sufficient range of relevant source materials. Adequate use of appropriate analytical and research methods and does address ethical considerations. Effective linking of theory and practice where appropriate.
<b>40-49%</b>	A limited, insufficient and/or inaccurate understanding in key areas of knowledge relevant to the work. Insufficient evidence of ability to integrate and analyse concepts to provide a valid discussion. Unacceptably structured and presented work, with insufficient use of academic language and conventions. A limited range of source materials is used. Limited or ineffective use of analytical and research methods and limited coverage of ethical considerations. Inadequate linking of theory and practice where applicable.
<b>30-39%</b>	A descriptive and/or narrative account, with little critical and/or flawed understanding of key areas of knowledge relevant to the work. Insufficient evidence of ability to discuss fundamental concepts. Unclear and and/or unevidenced argument and discussion. Poorly structured and presented work, with little use of academic language and conventions. A narrow and/or inappropriate range of source materials and analytical and research methods is used. Failure to identify ethical considerations and to link theory and practice where applicable.
<b>0-29%</b>	A weakly descriptive and/or narrative account, with no analytical content and/or significant inaccuracies in understanding of key areas of knowledge relevant to the work. Little or no evidence of research and the ability to discuss fundamental concepts. No awareness of ethical issues. Unclear and unsourced arguments and discussion. Flawed structure and presentation, with negligible attention to academic language or conventions. Some or all source materials are unreferenced and/or irrelevant. Failure to link theory and practice where applicable.