

**Wales Institute for Work-based Learning
Level 7 - Academic Skills**

Generic criteria is used to inform marking decisions made against specific module criteria. Higher education learners are expected to demonstrate academic skills in the presentation of their work, and this is implicit in the marks awarded for the modules they complete. The criteria given below sets out the standards of academic skills expected against each of the mark ranges as they apply to specific module criteria.

Note: The mark ranges refer to specific module criteria mark ranges, and the corresponding academic skills illustrate what is expected for marks to be awarded against the mark ranges. Clear feedback will be given to learners in relation to academic skills.

Level 7 is characterised by an expectation of learners' expertise in their chosen area of research. They are expected to demonstrate independence and the ability to evaluate, challenge, modify and develop theory and practice. Learners are expected to demonstrate an ability to identify the significant features of problems and to offer reliable solutions, with some producing original or innovative work in their specialism that is worthy of publication or public performance or display.

At Level 7 learners are expected to apply skills and competencies which are practical and transferable and to a very high level. They are expected to adhere to standard practice in terms of style and presentation and the accurate use of sources and referencing. The required assessment needs to be sequenced and structured correctly and addressing specific guidance e.g. word counts.

A wide range of reading should be undertaken at this level and the vocabulary employed must address content and be at postgraduate level. The scope of the research methods must respond to the negotiated and agreed study.

Specific module mark range	
80%+	Original work of publishable quality which displays mastery of the subject. A wide range of methods applied, with an argument covering all significant aspects of the subject; logically argued. Exceptional work and at a very high level in every respect. Presentation faultless, using correct referencing and subject and level appropriate vocabulary. The range of research methods used respond wholly to the agreed study.
70 - 79%	Thorough and comprehensive knowledge of substantive content with some originality. Shows a sound ability to inter-relate concepts and ideas and to evaluate theory critically at the appropriate level. Makes points clearly and precisely, always uses a wide range of source materials which are appropriately referenced to substantiate points. Coherent argument which is methodically analysed supports a reliable conclusion based on discussion and examination. Evidence of independent thought. The reading cited is extensive and very relevant. Written work is very well planned and presented, is wholly relevant, clearly expressed and coherent in organisation, with evidence of reading and correct referencing and citation. Excellent use of language relevant to the study. The range of research methods selected are wholly appropriate for the study.

60 – 69%	Sound knowledge of the topics and issues is evidenced through critical treatment of the material, inter-relating concepts, ideas and practical examples. Discussion is at an appropriate level. Points are substantiated with appropriate evidence. Content is relevant and links are made between all paragraphs and sections. Reading cited is very good and the conclusion relevant to the discussion. A very good standard of writing and presentation, coherent and relevant, based on a range of reading. Relevant points made are justified and referenced appropriately. Referencing is on correct and citations follow the appropriate system. Use of language is very good with some minor errors. The range of research methods selected is appropriate for the study.
50 – 59%	The content generally is relevant, showing evidence of acceptable knowledge and understanding of issues, but limited ability to apply theory and concepts critically. Line of reasoning not always clear and there is sometimes a lack of coherence. Work can be inappropriately descriptive for this level. There is some evidence of points made which are unsubstantiated and some examples of work not cited. Work is planned but there are weaknesses in the relationship between some sections. The presentation and expression are appropriate. Referencing is more often than not correct and citations follow the standard required, but not all are included in the bibliography. Use of language is good but there are some weaknesses which need to be addressed, for example errors on syntax, spelling and sentence structure needs reviewing. The research methods selected are in the main pertinent for the study.
0 – 49% (Fail)	Very insubstantial with inadequate evidence of knowledge and understanding of the topic. Much of the work is not level appropriate. No evidence of appropriate reading and investigation; descriptive only, Outcomes not achieved to the standard required. No work submitted No evidence of planning. Background reading is very weak Inadequate bibliography and references are insufficient/unavailable. Use of language is very weak. The presentation is untidy and lacks any coherence.