

BMPF7109	
Prior Learning Assessment and Recognition (30 credits)	
Marks	Marking Criteria
80%+	Original work of publishable quality which displays mastery of the subject. A wide range of approaches applied, with logical arguments covering all significant aspects of the subject. Exceptional work and at a very high level in every respect. All aspects of language and communication faultless, including referencing.
70 - 79%	The articulation of learning outcomes and learning from the professional role is excellent. The portfolio of evidence to support learning experiences is extensive. Thorough and comprehensive knowledge of substantive content with some originality of thought. 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.
60 – 69%	The articulation of learning outcomes and learning from the professional role is robust. The portfolio of evidence to support learning experiences is sound. 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. Reading cited is 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 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 articulation of learning outcomes and learning from the professional role is satisfactory. The portfolio of evidence to support learning experiences is acceptable. The content generally is relevant, showing evidence of acceptable knowledge and understanding of issues. Lines 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 links between sections. The presentation and expression are appropriate. Referencing is not always correct. 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.

0 – 49% (Fail)	Reflection/discussion is generally at a very low level, being essentially descriptive rather than evaluative or yields neither substantive conclusions nor recommendations. Very insubstantial with serious deficiencies, for example, some components have been omitted or treated cursorily. No understanding of different approaches related to a wider context or within a work-based setting. No focus on relevant aspects and little or no coherence. 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 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. No work submitted.
---------------------------	---