

## **Assessment criteria**

In marking the assignments we will be looking for evidence of your understanding and abilities in relation to two broad areas:

1. Content i.e. knowledge and understanding of the material covered in the module;
2. Form i.e. ability to present a clear and logical argument using this knowledge.

In addition, we will be considering some basic issues about how you addressed the question.

**Given the assignment tasks we will assess these areas of understanding and ability using the following criteria sets (together accounting for around 75 out of 100 marks with items 2, 3 and 4 counting most).**

### **Assignment task Part 1**

*a) Provides an initial brief and basic description of policy experience of focus*

<i>Poor answer</i>	<i>Adequate answer</i>	<i>Good answer</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poorly structured: no sense of chronology, repetition, some points not necessary, contradictions</li> <li>• No sense of context of experience</li> <li>• Too long in relation to rest of assignment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offers generally clear structure and chronology of events, using enough and appropriate information, little or no unnecessary information</li> <li>• Contextualises problem and experience</li> <li>• Appropriate length relative to rest of assignment</li> </ul>	<p>Moves beyond adequate answer by e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offering better structured presentation of greater clarity, whilst being succinct</li> <li>• Using policy analysis ideas and approaches appropriately in way structures and presents description</li> </ul>

*b) Presents a reasoned and justified argument about whether it was a success or failure (or had elements of both), explaining this judgement through a careful assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the experience*

<i>Poor answer</i>	<i>Adequate answer</i>	<i>Good answer</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not make clear judgement OR</li> <li>• Judgement not based on evidence or analysis of strengths and weaknesses as presented in assignment AND/OR</li> <li>• Judgement based on poor review of evidence available (ignoring some important elements of experience that contradict judgement)</li> </ul>	<p>Clear judgement made which is generally based on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• evidence from experience</li> <li>• the analysis of strengths and weaknesses as presented in assignment</li> <li>• the range of evidence available</li> </ul>	<p>Moves beyond adequate answer by e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• more clear/stronger use of evidence</li> <li>• stronger link from judgement to analysis of strengths and weaknesses presented in assignment</li> <li>• including critical reflection on judgement and strength of evidence base used in making it (author provides own views on these issues, appropriately justified)</li> </ul>

*c) uses a policy analysis approach to describe and explain this experience in an integrated way.*

<i>Poor answer</i>	<i>Adequate answer</i>	<i>Good answer</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No analysis – only outlines features of experience in limited detail, without use of policy analysis concepts or frameworks OR</li> <li>• Only limited use of relevant analytic framework, e.g. only categorises issues using elements of the policy analysis triangle, does not consider interactions between elements, uses policy analysis concepts incorrectly and without explanation</li> <li>• Colloquialism: style of language and use of description couched in common sense evaluation (could have written without doing module)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly works coherently with the policy analysis triangle as an integrated analytic framework, e.g. appropriately categorises issues, analysis structured in way that draws out and discusses some of the interactions between issues in different categories</li> <li>• Uses policy analysis concepts appropriately and with adequate explanation</li> </ul>	<p>Moves beyond adequate answer by e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• offering more comprehensive use of policy analysis concepts and approaches, perhaps drawing on additional concepts or frameworks</li> <li>• critically reflecting on the policy analysis approach as applied in assignment, developing or adapting frameworks used in relation to the problem of focus or critiquing the approach (author provides own ideas or views, appropriately justified)</li> </ul>

## Assignment task Part 2

### *a) Perspective*

Poor performance = actor perspective being adopted not made clear and/or does not make clear which option addressing in response and/or tries to address both options of Part 2.

Ad/Good performance = actor perspective and option addressing clearly stated and only one option considered.

### *b) Proposals*

<i>Poor answer</i>	<i>Adequate answer</i>	<i>Good answer</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• inappropriate to stated perspective</li> <li>• based on everyday knowledge rather than conclusions or ideas that are drawn from the analysis presented in the assignment</li> <li>• addresses only small part of experience as presented in part 1</li> <li>• focusses on a few individual problems as presented and so does not take comprehensive approach to addressing problems outlined</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• appropriate to stated perspective</li> <li>• derived from analysis presented in essay</li> <li>• addresses main issues in experience raised in part 1</li> <li>• attempts to address problems as a whole</li> <li>• demonstrates an awareness of range of strategic interventions</li> </ul>	<p>Moves beyond adequate answer by e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• using policy analysis ideas or concepts to generate ideas about strategic interventions</li> <li>• taking into account contextual opportunities &amp; constraints for proposals</li> <li>• critically reflecting on interventions proposed (e.g. author presents own ideas that clarify the purpose of using them, the potential for unintended consequences, the need to link up strategies)</li> </ul>

## Both parts of assignment

### a) Use of concepts

<i>Poor</i>	<i>Adequate</i>	<i>Good</i>
Little or not use of concepts OR largely confusing and inappropriate use of concepts	Largely tacit use of concepts, where concepts not spelt out, explained or critiqued, but underlie analysis and largely used appropriately	Moves beyond adequate answer by e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally explaining concepts clearly when used, and uses them appropriately in analysing experience</li> <li>• Justifying and explaining meaning and/or concepts used in relation to experience of focus</li> <li>• Critically reflecting on or critiques concepts and their significance for the analysis (author provides own ideas or views, appropriately justified)</li> </ul>

Given normal expectations of post-graduate work, we will also apply the following additional sets of criteria in assessing your essay (together accounting for around 25 out of 100 marks).

### Evidence of reading and research around the problem

<i>Poor</i>	<i>Adequate</i>	<i>Good</i>
Course material not used OR little used	Course material used within analysis	Course material and perhaps other relevant texts used in assignment in ways that illuminate experience

### Structure and argument

- Poor: language and argument unclear: difficult for reader to grasp issues at stake; assignment consists of description and/or discrete points that are not linked to other points through logical connectors (e.g. I judge/think xx because yy)
- Adequate: has a clear structure – introduction, body and conclusion with generally clear arguments within sections
- Good: not only carefully structured but also clear and logical interconnections between points and sections