

REVISED UNIVERSITY GRADE DESCRIPTORS FOR 2026/27

Appendix 1: Scaling of Expectations across Levels 3-7 and

Appendix 2: University Grade Descriptors (Levels 3-7)

CONTEXT

The review of Grade Descriptors was designed to support the effective and equitable assessment of student performance in the context of evolving assessment practices, including the introduction of process-based assessment as part of the University's AI in Education Framework.

Terminology used in this guidance:

Descriptor: An individual statement of standards/performance for a given domain and at a given level of performance.

Domain: A defined category of standards/performance, e.g., knowledge, professional skills.

UGDs: A set of individual descriptors which together specifies performance at all grade bands and in all domains.

Superlative stacking: Piling up multiple words like *excellent*, *outstanding*, *exceptional*, or *highly effective* in the same descriptor without clearly explaining what actually needs to be done and implying that all need to be present to achieve that standard.

Vertical alignment: A clear connection and consistent step-by-step progression in quality across different grade bands.

Under-specification: A domain that is described too vaguely to guide consistent marking or help students understand expectations.

REVISION PROCESS

GDs were revised in spring 2026 by starting with making recommended changes to the FHEQ 6 descriptors, as this enables the closest alignment with the QAA FHEQ. Adjustments to Levels 3-5 and 7 followed, using scaling principles from the SEEC descriptors (see Appendix 3). Changes are described in detail below and summarised in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Summary of changes to GDs

Structural Changes	Linguistic Changes	Calibration Changes
70+ band collapsed from three bands (70-79; 80-89; 90-100) to two bands (70-79; 80-100).	Removed superlative stacking.	Increased level of specification in 'Transferable Skills' domain and introduced scaling of expectations across grade bands.
Fail band collapsed from four bands to two (0-29; 30-39 for Levels 4-6); (0-29; 30-49 for Levels 3 and 7).	Initial review of UGD language against neuro-inclusion recommendations. Replaced generic descriptors (e.g. excellent, good, adequate) with more detailed	Realigned expectations of originality and breadth of reading to align with QAA FHEQ.

<p>Number of descriptor domains collapsed from five to four, removing categories not present in descriptors from QAA or other HEIs, and aligning with KCTP categories.</p> <p>Introduced a descriptor reflecting process assessment and a descriptor reflecting use of AI.</p>	<p>descriptions of performance using active verbs.</p> <p>Removed conflation of quantity and quality.</p>	<p>Improved vertical alignment in all domains.</p>
--	---	--

STRUCTURAL CHANGES

- Surrey's GDs now have 7 performance bands at Levels 3-6 (0-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60-69, 70-79, and 80-100), and 6 performance bands at Level 7 (0-29, 30-49, 50-59, 60-69, 70-79, and 80-100), rather than 10. This has reduced redundancy in descriptors, has better aligned Surrey's UGDs with those from other HEIs, and reduced the likelihood of grade compression, particularly at the upper end of the scale.
- The domain categories in Surrey's GDs did not clearly align with either the QAA descriptor or UGDs from other HEIs (see Appendix 2). The domains of 'Independent study' and 'Development of argument' have been removed as independent domains, with the domain names being aligned both with the QAA and other HEIs, as well as with the KCPT categories we use in module descriptors to categorise learning outcomes (see Box 1). All legacy elements from the five old categories have been redistributed coherently.

Box 1. Descriptor domains

Domains in the QAA FHEQ Outcome Classification Descriptors

- **Knowledge and Understanding** encompass understanding of key aspects of the field of study, including knowledge of the subject and critical understanding of theories and concepts.
- **Cognitive skills** encompass development of arguments/positions, the capacity to solve problems, and critical approaches to selection and evaluation of sources.
- **Transferable skills** encompass personal and enabling skills appropriate to the discipline, including the ability to communicate information, work collaboratively, work autonomously, and the ability to reflect critically on and improve their work.
- **Practical and professional skills** encompass the ability to deploy techniques and processes within a discipline, to act in accordance with disciplinary or professional standards, and ethical awareness.

Domains in Surrey module descriptors used to classify learning outcomes:

- **K** – Subject knowledge
- **C** – Cognitive/analytical
- **T** – Transferable skills
- **P** – Professional/Practical skills

- There is a new descriptor under ‘Cognitive and analytical skills’ that can be used to differentiate the processes used to generate work, where this is relevant to an assessment.
- There is a new descriptor under ‘Professional and Practical Skills’ that can be used to differentiate use of AI, where this is relevant to an assessment.

LINGUISTIC CHANGES

- Language in the revised UGDs has been initially reviewed against recommendations from Dr Jo Moss and the School of Psychology Inclusive Education Working Group. More detailed review is currently taking place.
- Diverse disciplinary representation on the TFG has enabled us to review language in the UGDs to represent as wide a range of types of assessment as possible.
- Superlative stacking, particularly at the upper end of the scale, has been removed. Where several attributes are listed in a single descriptor, the word ‘and’ has been replaced with ‘or’.
- General descriptors (Excellent, Very good, Good, etc.) have been replaced with descriptions of what this level of performance looks like, using active verbs, to reduce marker interpretation.

CALIBRATION CHANGES

- Vertical alignment has been improved throughout, and SEEC descriptors have been used to create consistent escalation of expectations across Levels 3-7 (see Appendix 3).
- Misaligned expectations for originality and breadth of reading have been replaced by language more closely aligned with the QAA descriptor.
- The ‘Transferable Skills’ domain now includes the full range of competences as represented in the QAA descriptor: Communication, Collaboration, Self-regulation, Reflection and Development.

Important interpretation notes:

- As with the previous UGDs, these are *generic* descriptors, intended to be used as a benchmark for the creation of discipline and/or assignment specific mark schemes/rubrics.
- Not all statements in each domain will be relevant to every assignment. Markers should make a holistic judgement across relevant elements of the domain rather than requiring all elements to be demonstrated
- Incorporation of process (if relevant), can be further specified
- Incorporation of AI (if relevant), can be further specified

RE-INTEGRATION

- Following approval of the draft revised GDs, the GDs will be tested against sample work, and the development of implementation guidance, including worked example for translation of GDs into assignment-specific mark schemes/rubrics and student-facing explainers. These resources will be available prior to the start of the 2026/27 Academic Year.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Scaling of Expectations across Levels 3-7

Appendix 2: University Grade Descriptors (Levels 3-7)

Appendix 1: Scaling of Expectations across Levels 3-7

Scaling of Expectations (aligned with SEEC Descriptors)

FHEQ3	FHEQ4	FHEQ5	FHEQ6	FHEQ7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and understanding of core, pre-defined areas of the discipline • Use pre-defined sources, tools, processes, etc. • Evaluate using given frameworks • Work in/apply understanding to familiar contexts • Use simple tools, practices, processes, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and understanding of foundational areas of the discipline • Use established sources, tools, processes, etc. • Evaluate using established frameworks • Work in/apply understanding to familiar or unfamiliar contexts • Use foundational tools, practices, processes, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and understanding of key areas of the discipline • Use discipline's main sources, tools, processes, etc. • Evaluate using range of frameworks • Work in contexts of varying familiarity • Use discipline's main tools, practices, processes, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and understanding across breadth of the discipline • Selects and uses sources, tools, processes, etc. • Evaluate using range of self-selected frameworks • Work in/apply understanding to contexts of varying familiarity • Critically selects and applies discipline's tools, practices, processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systematic understanding of discipline and understanding of its interrelationships • Critically selects and uses advanced sources, tools, processes, etc. • Evaluate using range of critically selected, advanced frameworks • Work in/apply understanding to unfamiliar or novel contexts • Use discipline's advanced tools, practices, processes, etc.

Appendix 2: University Grade Descriptors (Levels 3-7)

FHEQ 3	Knowledge & Understanding	Cognitive & Analytical Skills	Transferable Skills	Professional / Practical Skills
<p>80–100 Excellent</p>	<p>Demonstrates impressive and authentic knowledge and understanding of core pre-defined areas of the discipline, including its key concepts or principles.</p> <p>Demonstrates critical use of theories, evidence, or approaches using given principles or frameworks.</p> <p>Demonstrates a critical awareness of common areas of debate or complexity in the discipline, appropriate to the level of study.</p>	<p>Demonstrates effective and relevant evaluation of pre-defined sources, tools, or methods, using given frameworks or principles for analysis.</p> <p>Develops fully justified positions, solutions, or conclusions.</p> <p>Applies techniques with competence to given problems in familiar contexts.</p> <p>Demonstrates clear and consistently competent processes of investigation, analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study using defined guidelines.</p>	<p>Communicates information, ideas or solutions with a high level of clarity, showing adaptation to audience, in familiar contexts.</p> <p>Contributes with consistent effectiveness to collaborative activity in specified contexts or using defined guidelines.</p> <p>Demonstrates clear initiative when participating in guided activities.</p> <p>Demonstrates clear and insightful reflection on performance using given criteria, and acts upon feedback and guidance to make meaningful improvements.</p>	<p>Applies theories, concepts, or methods with insight in familiar contexts.</p> <p>Demonstrates consistently effective use of simple tools, practices, or processes in pre-defined contexts.</p> <p>Demonstrates a clear awareness of key ethical concerns within the discipline.</p> <p>Demonstrates transparent, responsible, and ethical use of AI.</p>
<p>70–79 Very Good</p>	<p>Demonstrates strong and accurate knowledge and understanding of core pre-defined areas of the</p>	<p>Demonstrates competent and relevant evaluation of pre-defined sources, tools, or methods, using given</p>	<p>Communicates information, ideas or solutions clearly in familiar contexts, adapting to</p>	<p>Applies pre-defined theories, concepts, or methods effectively in familiar contexts.</p>

	<p>discipline, including its key concepts or principles.</p> <p>Demonstrates some critical use of theories, evidence, or approaches using given principles or frameworks.</p> <p>Demonstrates an emerging critical awareness of common areas of debate or complexity in the discipline, appropriate to the level of study.</p>	<p>frameworks or principles for analysis.</p> <p>Develops well-reasoned positions, solutions, or conclusions with clear justification.</p> <p>Applies pre-defined techniques with competence to problems in familiar contexts.</p> <p>Demonstrates clear processes of analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study using defined guidelines.</p>	<p>audience using pre-defined guidelines.</p> <p>Makes some effective contributions to collaborative activity in specified contexts or using defined guidelines.</p> <p>Demonstrates some initiative when participating in guided activities.</p> <p>Reflects clearly on performance using given criteria and responds to feedback to improve.</p>	<p>Demonstrates competent use of simple tools, practices, or processes in pre-defined contexts.</p> <p>Demonstrates some awareness of key ethical concerns within the discipline.</p> <p>Demonstrates transparent and responsible use of AI, with some awareness of the ethical implications.</p>
<p>60–69 Good</p>	<p>Demonstrates coherent knowledge and understanding of core pre-defined areas of the discipline, including some key concepts or principles.</p> <p>Demonstrates accurate, but largely descriptive, use of relevant theories, evidence, or approaches.</p> <p>Demonstrates the ability to describe common areas of debate or complexity in the discipline, appropriate to the</p>	<p>Demonstrates some evaluation of pre-defined sources, tools, or methods, using given frameworks or principles for analysis.</p> <p>Develops simple positions, solutions, or conclusions with some justification.</p> <p>Applies pre-defined techniques to problems in familiar contexts with some effectiveness.</p>	<p>Communicates information, ideas or solutions with some clarity in familiar contexts, showing some ability to adapt to audience using pre-defined guidelines.</p> <p>Makes simple contributions to collaborative activity in specified contexts or using defined guidelines.</p> <p>Effectively follows given guidelines, with some</p>	<p>Applies pre-defined theories, concepts, or methods in familiar contexts, with some inconsistencies.</p> <p>Demonstrates largely effective use of simple tools, practices, or processes in pre-defined contexts, with some errors or inconsistencies.</p> <p>Demonstrates simple or inconsistent awareness of key ethical concerns within the discipline.</p>

	level of study, but with limited critical awareness.	Demonstrates largely effective processes of analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study using defined guidelines.	emerging evidence of initiative. Reflects with some effectiveness on performance using given criteria and can identify some limited areas for improvement on the basis of feedback.	Demonstrates transparent and responsible use of AI, with limited awareness of the ethical implications.
50–59 Adequate	<p>Demonstrates adequate knowledge and understanding of core pre-defined areas of the discipline and its key concepts or principles.</p> <p>Demonstrates adequate use of relevant theories, evidence, or approaches, though with some gaps or inaccuracies.</p> <p>Shows limited awareness of common areas of debate or complexity in the discipline.</p>	<p>Attempts evaluation of pre-defined sources, tools, or methods.</p> <p>Attempts the development of conclusions, but without sufficient support or justification.</p> <p>Attempts the application of pre-defined techniques to problems in familiar contexts, but with some gaps or inaccuracies.</p> <p>Demonstrates adequate, though incomplete, processes of analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study.</p>	<p>Communicates information, ideas or solutions with limited clarity in familiar contexts, and with limited ability to adapt to audience using pre-defined guidelines.</p> <p>Makes limited contributions to collaborative activity in specified contexts or using defined guidelines.</p> <p>Demonstrates the ability to follow given guidelines, but with limited evidence of initiative.</p> <p>Demonstrates basic reflection on performance using given criteria, but does not translate feedback into the identification of areas for improvement.</p>	<p>Attempts the application of pre-defined theories, concepts, or methods in familiar contexts, with some errors or inconsistencies.</p> <p>Demonstrates adequate use of simple tools, practices, or processes in pre-defined contexts, with errors, omissions, or inconsistencies.</p> <p>Demonstrates limited awareness of key ethical concerns within the discipline.</p> <p>Demonstrates limited transparency in the use of AI, with limited awareness of the ethical implications.</p>

<p>30-49 Not yet meeting expectations</p>	<p>Demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the discipline and its key concepts or principles, with misunderstandings or inconsistencies.</p> <p>Demonstrates inadequate use of relevant theories, evidence, or approaches.</p> <p>Shows little to no awareness of common areas of debate or complexity in the discipline, or limited awareness with several misunderstandings or omissions.</p>	<p>Demonstrates misunderstandings or errors in describing pre-defined sources, tools, or methods, with little or no attempt at evaluation.</p> <p>Conclusions are weak, confused, or lacking in relevance, with no support or justification.</p> <p>Shows limited ability to apply pre-defined techniques to problems in familiar contexts.</p> <p>Shows limited evidence of processes of analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study, with errors or omissions.</p>	<p>Shows a limited ability to communicate information, ideas or solutions, and does not use pre-defined guidelines to adapt to audience.</p> <p>Makes limited contribution to collaborative activity in specified contexts or using defined guidelines.</p> <p>Demonstrates some errors or inconsistencies in the ability to follow given guidelines, with no evidence of initiative.</p> <p>Demonstrates little to no relevant reflection on performance using given criteria, and does not translate feedback into the identification of areas for improvement.</p>	<p>Shows limited ability to apply pre-defined theories, concepts, or methods in familiar contexts, with some errors or inconsistencies.</p> <p>Demonstrates limited use of simple tools, practices, or processes in pre-defined contexts, with some errors or inconsistencies.</p> <p>Demonstrates insufficient awareness of key ethical concerns within the discipline.</p> <p>Demonstrates insufficient evidence of responsible, ethical, or transparent use of AI.</p>
<p>0-29 Significantly below expectations</p>	<p>Demonstrates inadequate knowledge and understanding of the discipline and its key concepts or principles, with major gaps, serious inaccuracies, or confusion.</p> <p>Shows very limited or no awareness of relevant</p>	<p>Shows very limited or no awareness of pre-defined sources, tools or methods.</p> <p>Shows very limited or no attempt to draw conclusions.</p> <p>Shows very limited or no ability to apply pre-defined</p>	<p>Shows very limited or no attempt to communicate information, ideas or solutions with clarity, and shows no awareness of pre-defined guidelines for adapting to audience.</p>	<p>Shows very limited or no attempt to apply theory, concepts, or methods in familiar contexts.</p> <p>Shows very limited or no attempt to use simple tools, practices, or processes.</p>

	<p>theories, evidence, or approaches.</p> <p>Shows very limited or no awareness of common areas of debate or complexity in the discipline.</p>	<p>techniques to problems in familiar contexts.</p> <p>Shows very limited or no evidence of processes of investigation, analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study.</p>	<p>Makes very limited or no effective contribution to collaborative activity.</p> <p>Makes very limited or no attempt to follow given guidelines.</p> <p>Demonstrates very limited or no awareness of the evaluation of their own work, and no engagement with feedback.</p>	<p>Demonstrates very limited or no awareness of key ethical concerns within the discipline.</p> <p>Demonstrates a disregard for transparency, responsibility, or ethical practice in the use of AI.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

FHEQ 4	Knowledge & Understanding	Cognitive & Analytical Skills	Transferable Skills	Professional / Practical Skills
80–100 High First	<p>Demonstrates highly detailed and authentic knowledge and understanding of introductory material in the discipline, including its key concepts or principles.</p> <p>Demonstrates highly critical use of relevant theories, evidence, or approaches appropriate to the level of study.</p> <p>Demonstrates an advanced critical awareness of common areas of debate or complexity in the discipline, appropriate to the level of study.</p>	<p>Demonstrates consistently competent and relevant evaluation of the discipline’s foundational sources, tools, or methods using established frameworks for analysis.</p> <p>Develops fully justified and convincing positions, solutions, or conclusions.</p> <p>Applies established techniques with strong competence to given problems in familiar or unfamiliar contexts.</p> <p>Demonstrates very clear and competent processes of investigation, analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study.</p>	<p>Communicates information, ideas or solutions with a high level of clarity, showing adaptation to audience, in familiar or unfamiliar contexts.</p> <p>Contributes with consistent effectiveness to collaborative activity in familiar or unfamiliar contexts using defined guidelines.</p> <p>Demonstrates clear initiative when participating in guided activities, with emerging evidence of autonomy.</p> <p>Demonstrates confident and insightful reflection on performance using given criteria, and acts upon feedback and guidance to make meaningful improvements.</p>	<p>Applies theories, concepts or methods with competence in familiar or unfamiliar contexts.</p> <p>Demonstrates highly competent use of the discipline’s foundational tools, practices, or processes in familiar or unfamiliar contexts.</p> <p>Demonstrates a clear and coherent awareness of key ethical concerns within the discipline.</p> <p>Demonstrates highly transparent and responsible, use of AI, with clear awareness of the ethical implications.</p>
70–79 First	<p>Demonstrates detailed and authentic knowledge and understanding of introductory material in the discipline, including its key concepts or principles.</p>	<p>Demonstrates clear and relevant evaluation of the discipline’s foundational sources, tools, or methods using established frameworks for analysis.</p> <p>Develops fully justified</p>	<p>Communicates information, ideas or solutions with clarity, showing adaptation to audience, in familiar or unfamiliar contexts.</p> <p>Contributes with effectiveness</p>	<p>Applies theories, concepts, or methods effectively in familiar or unfamiliar contexts.</p> <p>Demonstrates consistently competent use of the discipline’s foundational</p>

	<p>Demonstrates consistently effective critical use of theories, evidence, or approaches appropriate to this level of study.</p> <p>Demonstrates strong critical awareness of common areas of debate or complexity in the discipline, appropriate to the level of study.</p>	<p>positions, solutions, or conclusions.</p> <p>Applies established techniques with strong competence to given problems in familiar or unfamiliar contexts.</p> <p>Demonstrates very clear processes of investigation, analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study.</p>	<p>to collaborative activity in familiar or unfamiliar contexts using defined guidelines.</p> <p>Demonstrates clear initiative when participating in guided activities.</p> <p>Demonstrates confident reflection on performance using given criteria, and acts upon feedback and guidance to make meaningful improvements.</p>	<p>tools, practices, or processes in familiar or unfamiliar contexts.</p> <p>Demonstrates a clear awareness of key ethical concerns within the discipline.</p> <p>Demonstrates transparent and responsible use of AI, with clear awareness of the ethical implications.</p>
<p>60–69 2:1</p>	<p>Demonstrates clear and consistent knowledge and understanding of introductory material in the discipline, including its key concepts or principles.</p> <p>Demonstrates some effective critical use of theories, evidence, or approaches appropriate to this level of study. Some evaluation may be underdeveloped.</p> <p>Demonstrates some critical awareness of common areas of debate or complexity in the discipline, appropriate to the level of study.</p>	<p>Demonstrates some clear and relevant evaluation of the discipline’s foundational sources, tools, or methods using established frameworks for analysis. Some evaluation may be underdeveloped.</p> <p>Develops partially justified positions, solutions, or conclusions.</p> <p>Applies established techniques with competence to given problems in familiar or unfamiliar contexts.</p> <p>Demonstrates largely effective processes of analysis,</p>	<p>Communicates information, ideas or solutions with clarity, showing some basic adaptation to audience, in familiar or unfamiliar contexts.</p> <p>Contributes with some effectiveness to collaborative activity in familiar or unfamiliar contexts using defined guidelines.</p> <p>Demonstrates some initiative when participating in guided activities.</p> <p>Reflects with some effectiveness on performance using given criteria and can</p>	<p>Applies theories, concepts, or methods in familiar or unfamiliar contexts, with some inconsistencies.</p> <p>Demonstrates largely effective use of the discipline’s foundational tools, practices, or processes in familiar or unfamiliar contexts.</p> <p>Demonstrates a basic awareness of key ethical concerns within the discipline.</p> <p>Demonstrates transparent and responsible use of AI, with some awareness of the ethical implications.</p>

		research, enquiry, and/or study.	identify some limited areas for improvement on the basis of feedback.	
50–59 2:2	<p>Demonstrates adequate knowledge and understanding of introductory material in the discipline, including its key concepts or principles.</p> <p>Demonstrates limited critical use of theories, evidence, or approaches appropriate to this level of study. Evaluation, where present, is underdeveloped.</p> <p>Demonstrates limited critical awareness of common areas of debate or complexity in the discipline, appropriate to the level of study.</p>	<p>Demonstrates limited evaluation of the discipline’s foundational sources, tools, or methods using established frameworks for analysis. Evaluation is largely underdeveloped.</p> <p>Attempts the development of conclusions, but with limited support or justification.</p> <p>Attempts the application of established techniques to problems in familiar or unfamiliar contexts, but with some gaps or inaccuracies.</p> <p>Demonstrates adequate, though incomplete, processes of analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study.</p>	<p>Communicates information, ideas or solutions with limited clarity, and with limited ability to adapt to audience in familiar and unfamiliar contexts.</p> <p>Makes limited contributions to collaborative activity in familiar or unfamiliar contexts using defined guidelines.</p> <p>Demonstrates the ability to follow given guidelines, but with no evidence of initiative.</p> <p>Demonstrates basic reflection on performance using given criteria, but does not translate feedback into the identification of areas for improvement.</p>	<p>Attempts the application of pre-defined theories, concepts, or methods in familiar or unfamiliar contexts, with some errors or inconsistencies.</p> <p>Demonstrates adequate use of the discipline’s foundational tools, practices, or processes in familiar or unfamiliar contexts, with errors, omissions, or inconsistencies.</p> <p>Demonstrates limited awareness of key ethical concerns within the discipline.</p> <p>Demonstrates some transparency in the use of AI, with no awareness of the ethical implications.</p>
40–49 3rd	Demonstrates adequate knowledge and understanding of introductory material in the discipline, including its key concepts or principles, with	Describes the discipline’s foundational sources, tools, or methods with little to no evaluation or use of	Shows a limited ability to communicate information, ideas or solutions in familiar or unfamiliar contexts, and does	Shows limited ability to apply pre-defined theories, concepts, or methods in familiar or unfamiliar contexts,

	<p>some misunderstandings or inconsistencies.</p> <p>Demonstrates limited use of relevant theories, evidence, or approaches appropriate to this level of study, with several gaps or inaccuracies.</p> <p>Demonstrates little to no critical awareness of common areas of debate or complexity in the discipline, appropriate to the level of study.</p>	<p>established frameworks for analysis.</p> <p>Conclusions are simplistic or inconsistent, without support or justification.</p> <p>Shows limited ability to apply established techniques to problems in familiar or unfamiliar contexts, with several gaps or inaccuracies.</p> <p>Demonstrates limited evidence of processes of analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study, with errors or omissions.</p>	<p>not demonstrate the capacity to adapt to audience.</p> <p>Makes little to no contribution to collaborative activity in familiar or unfamiliar contexts using defined guidelines.</p> <p>Demonstrates some errors or inconsistencies in the ability to follow given guidelines, with no evidence of initiative.</p> <p>Demonstrates little to no relevant reflection on performance using given criteria, and does not translate feedback into the identification of areas for improvement.</p>	<p>with some errors or inconsistencies.</p> <p>Demonstrates limited use of the discipline’s foundational tools, practices, or processes in familiar or unfamiliar contexts, with errors, omissions, or inconsistencies.</p> <p>Demonstrates little to no awareness of key ethical concerns within the discipline.</p> <p>Demonstrates some, though limited, transparency in the use of AI, with no awareness of the ethical implications.</p>
<p>30–39 Fail</p>	<p>Demonstrates partial or inconsistent knowledge and understanding of introductory material in the discipline, including its key concepts or principles, with many misunderstandings or inconsistencies.</p> <p>Uses theories, evidence of approaches inaccurately or inappropriately, leading to flawed interpretations.</p>	<p>Demonstrates misunderstandings of the discipline’s foundational sources, tools, or methods, with no attempt at evaluation.</p> <p>Conclusions are weak, confused, or lacking in relevance, with no support or justification.</p> <p>Applies established techniques unsuccessfully or</p>	<p>Shows significant flaws in the communication of information, ideas or solutions in familiar or unfamiliar contexts, with no attempt to adapt to audience.</p> <p>Makes no contribution to collaborative activity in familiar or unfamiliar contexts using defined guidelines.</p> <p>Demonstrates significant error</p>	<p>Shows major errors or omissions in the application of pre-defined theories, concepts, or methods in familiar or unfamiliar contexts.</p> <p>Uses the discipline’s foundational tools, practices, or processes unsuccessfully or inconsistently in familiar or unfamiliar contexts.</p>

	<p>Demonstrates no critical awareness of common areas of debate or complexity in the discipline, appropriate to the level of study, with several errors or omissions.</p>	<p>inconsistently to problems in familiar or unfamiliar contexts, with several gaps or inaccuracies.</p> <p>Shows limited or no evidence of processes of analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study, with errors or omissions.</p>	<p>or inconsistencies in the ability to follow given guidelines, with no evidence of initiative.</p> <p>Demonstrates no relevant reflection on performance using given criteria, and does not translate feedback into the identification of areas for improvement.</p>	<p>Demonstrates insufficient awareness of key ethical concerns within the discipline.</p> <p>Demonstrates insufficient evidence of responsible, ethical, or transparent use of AI.</p>
<p>0-29 Low Fail</p>	<p>Demonstrates an inadequate range of knowledge and understanding of introductory material in the discipline, including its key concepts or principles, with major gaps, serious inaccuracies, or confusion.</p> <p>Shows no awareness of relevant theories, evidence, or approaches appropriate to this level of study.</p> <p>Shows no awareness of common areas of debate or complexity in the discipline, appropriate to the level of study.</p>	<p>Shows no awareness of the discipline's foundational sources, tools, or methods.</p> <p>Shows no attempt to draw conclusions.</p> <p>Applies established methods or techniques to problems with major flaws, even in familiar contexts.</p> <p>Shows no evidence of processes of investigation, analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study.</p>	<p>Shows no attempt to communicate information, ideas or solutions with clarity even in familiar contexts, with no attempt to adapt to audience.</p> <p>Makes no attempt to contribute to collaborative activity, even in familiar contexts and using defined guidelines.</p> <p>Makes no attempt to follow given guidelines.</p> <p>Demonstrates no awareness of the evaluation of their own work, and no engagement with feedback.</p>	<p>Shows no attempt to apply pre-defined theories, concepts, or methods in familiar or unfamiliar contexts.</p> <p>Shows no attempt to use the discipline's foundational tools, practices, or processes, even in familiar contexts.</p> <p>Demonstrates no awareness of key ethical concerns within the discipline.</p> <p>Demonstrates a disregard for transparency, responsibility, or ethical practice in the use of AI.</p>

FHEQ 5	Knowledge & Understanding	Cognitive & Analytical Skills	Transferable Skills	Professional / Practical Skills
80–100 High First	<p>Demonstrates highly detailed and authentic knowledge and understanding of the discipline, its key concepts, principles or interrelationships appropriate to this level of study.</p> <p>Demonstrates highly critical use of relevant theories, evidence, or approaches appropriate to the level of study.</p> <p>Demonstrates an advanced critical awareness of common areas of debate or complexity in the discipline, appropriate to the level of study.</p>	<p>Demonstrates consistently competent and relevant evaluation of the discipline’s main sources, tools, or methods using a range of frameworks for analysis.</p> <p>Develops fully justified and convincing positions, solutions, or conclusions.</p> <p>Applies a range of techniques with strong competence to given problems in contexts of varying complexity and predictability.</p> <p>Demonstrates very clear and competent processes of investigation, analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study.</p>	<p>Communicates information, ideas or solutions with a high level of clarity, showing adaptation to audience, in contexts of varying familiarity.</p> <p>Contributes with consistent and self-directed effectiveness to collaborative activity in contexts of varying familiarity.</p> <p>Demonstrates clear initiative when participating in activities, with growing evidence of autonomy.</p> <p>Generates criteria to support confident and insightful reflection on performance, and acts upon feedback and guidance to make meaningful improvements.</p>	<p>Applies theories, concepts or methods with competence in contexts of varying familiarity.</p> <p>Demonstrates highly competent use of the discipline’s main tools, practices, or processes in contexts of varying familiarity.</p> <p>Demonstrates a clear and coherent critical awareness of key ethical concerns within the discipline.</p> <p>Demonstrates highly transparent and responsible, use of AI, with clear awareness of the ethical implications.</p>
70–79 First	<p>Demonstrates detailed and authentic knowledge and understanding of the discipline, including its key concepts or principles appropriate to this level of study.</p>	<p>Demonstrates clear and relevant evaluation of the discipline’s main sources, tools, or methods using a range of frameworks for analysis.</p>	<p>Communicates information, ideas or solutions with clarity, showing adaptation to audience, in contexts of varying familiarity.</p> <p>Contributes with self-directed</p>	<p>Applies theories, concepts, or methods effectively in contexts of varying familiarity.</p> <p>Demonstrates consistently competent use of the discipline’s main tools,</p>

	<p>Demonstrates consistently effective critical use of theories, evidence, or approaches appropriate to this level of study.</p> <p>Demonstrates strong critical awareness of common areas of debate or complexity in the discipline, appropriate to the level of study.</p>	<p>Develops fully justified positions, solutions, or conclusions.</p> <p>Applies a range of techniques with strong competence to given problems in contexts of varying complexity and predictability.</p> <p>Demonstrates very clear processes of investigation, analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study.</p>	<p>effectiveness to collaborative activity in contexts of varying familiarity.</p> <p>Demonstrates clear initiative when participating in guided activities.</p> <p>Generates criteria to support confident reflection on performance, and acts upon feedback and guidance to make meaningful improvements.</p>	<p>practices, or processes in contexts of varying familiarity.</p> <p>Demonstrates a clear critical awareness of key ethical concerns within the discipline.</p> <p>Demonstrates transparent and responsible use of AI, with clear awareness of the ethical implications.</p>
<p>60–69 2:1</p>	<p>Demonstrates clear and consistent knowledge and understanding of the discipline, including its key concepts or principles appropriate to this level of study.</p> <p>Demonstrates some effective critical use of theories, evidence, or approaches appropriate to this level of study. Some evaluation may be underdeveloped.</p> <p>Demonstrates some critical awareness of common areas of debate or complexity in the</p>	<p>Demonstrates some clear and relevant evaluation of the discipline’s main sources, tools, or methods using a range of frameworks for analysis. Some evaluation may be underdeveloped.</p> <p>Develops partially justified positions, solutions, or conclusions.</p> <p>Applies a range of techniques with competence to given problems in contexts of varying complexity and predictability.</p>	<p>Communicates information, ideas or solutions with clarity, showing some basic adaptation to audience, in contexts of varying familiarity.</p> <p>Contributes with effectiveness to collaborative activity using defined guidelines in contexts of varying familiarity.</p> <p>Demonstrates some initiative when participating in guided activities.</p> <p>Reflects with effectiveness on performance using given criteria and can identify areas</p>	<p>Applies theories, concepts, or methods contexts of varying familiarity, with some inconsistencies.</p> <p>Demonstrates largely effective use of the discipline’s main tools, practices, or processes in contexts of varying familiarity.</p> <p>Demonstrates a basic critical awareness of key ethical concerns within the discipline.</p> <p>Demonstrates transparent and responsible use of AI, with</p>

	discipline, appropriate to the level of study.	Demonstrates largely effective processes of analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study.	for improvement on the basis of feedback.	some awareness of the ethical implications.
50–59 2:2	<p>Demonstrates adequate knowledge and understanding of the discipline, including its key concepts or principles appropriate to this level of study.</p> <p>Demonstrates limited critical use of theories, evidence, or approaches appropriate to this level of study. Evaluation, where present, is underdeveloped.</p> <p>Demonstrates limited critical awareness of common areas of debate or complexity in the discipline, appropriate to the level of study.</p>	<p>Demonstrates limited evaluation of the discipline’s main sources, tools, or methods using a limited range of frameworks for analysis. Evaluation is largely underdeveloped.</p> <p>Attempts the development of conclusions, but with limited support or justification.</p> <p>Attempts the application of a range of techniques to problems in contexts of varying complexity and predictability, but with some gaps or inaccuracies.</p> <p>Demonstrates adequate, though incomplete, processes of analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study.</p>	<p>Communicates information, ideas or solutions with limited clarity, and with limited ability to adapt to audience in contexts of varying familiarity.</p> <p>Makes limited contributions to collaborative activity using defined guidelines in contexts of varying familiarity.</p> <p>Demonstrates the ability to follow given guidelines, but with limited evidence of initiative.</p> <p>Demonstrates basic reflection on performance using given criteria, but shows limited ability to translate feedback into the identification of areas for improvement.</p>	<p>Attempts the application of theories, concepts, or methods contexts of varying familiarity, with some errors or inconsistencies.</p> <p>Demonstrates adequate use of the discipline’s main tools, practices, or processes in contexts of varying familiarity, with errors, omissions, or inconsistencies.</p> <p>Demonstrates limited critical awareness of key ethical concerns within the discipline.</p> <p>Demonstrates some transparency in the use of AI, with no awareness of the ethical implications.</p>
40–49 3rd	Demonstrates adequate knowledge and understanding of the discipline, including its	Describes the discipline’s main sources, tools, or methods with little to no	Shows a limited ability to communicate information, ideas or solutions in contexts	Shows limited ability to apply theories, concepts, or methods in contexts of varying

	<p>key concepts or principles appropriate to this level of study, with some misunderstandings or inconsistencies.</p> <p>Demonstrates limited use of relevant theories, evidence, or approaches appropriate to this level of study, with several gaps or inaccuracies.</p> <p>Demonstrates little to no critical awareness of common areas of debate or complexity in the discipline, appropriate to the level of study.</p>	<p>evaluation or use of relevant frameworks for analysis.</p> <p>Conclusions are simplistic or inconsistent, without support or justification.</p> <p>Shows limited ability to apply a range of techniques to problems in contexts of varying familiarity and predictability, with several gaps or inaccuracies.</p> <p>Demonstrates limited evidence of processes of analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study, with errors or omissions.</p>	<p>of varying familiarity, and does not demonstrate the capacity to adapt to audience.</p> <p>Makes little to no contribution to collaborative activity using defined guidelines in contexts of varying familiarity.</p> <p>Demonstrates some errors or inconsistencies in the ability to follow given guidelines, with no evidence of initiative.</p> <p>Demonstrates little to no relevant reflection on performance using given criteria, and does not translate feedback into the identification of areas for improvement.</p>	<p>familiarity, with some errors or inconsistencies.</p> <p>Demonstrates limited use of the discipline’s main tools, practices, or processes in contexts of varying familiarity, with errors, omissions, or inconsistencies.</p> <p>Demonstrates little to no critical awareness of key ethical concerns within the discipline.</p> <p>Demonstrates some, though limited, transparency in the use of AI, with no awareness of the ethical implications.</p>
<p>30–39 Fail</p>	<p>Demonstrates partial or inconsistent knowledge and understanding of the discipline, including its key concepts or principles appropriate to this level of study, with many misunderstandings or inconsistencies.</p> <p>Uses theories, evidence, or approaches inaccurately or</p>	<p>Demonstrates misunderstandings of the discipline’s main sources, tools, or methods, with no attempt at evaluation.</p> <p>Conclusions are weak, confused, or lacking in relevance, with no support or justification.</p>	<p>Shows significant flaws in the communication of information, ideas or solutions in contexts of varying familiarity, with no attempt to adapt to audience.</p> <p>Makes no contribution to collaborative activity using defined guidelines in contexts of varying familiarity.</p>	<p>Shows major errors or omissions in the application of theories, concepts, or methods in contexts of varying familiarity.</p> <p>Uses the discipline’s main tools, practices, or processes unsuccessfully or inconsistently in contexts of varying familiarity.</p>

	<p>inappropriately, leading to flawed interpretations.</p> <p>Demonstrates no critical awareness of common areas of debate or complexity in the discipline, appropriate to the level of study, with several errors or omissions.</p>	<p>Applies techniques unsuccessfully or inconsistently to problems in contexts of varying familiarity and predictability, with several gaps or inaccuracies.</p> <p>Shows limited or no evidence of processes of analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study, with errors or omissions.</p>	<p>Demonstrates significant error or inconsistencies in the ability to follow given guidelines, with no evidence of initiative.</p> <p>Demonstrates no relevant reflection on performance using given criteria and does not translate feedback into the identification of areas for improvement.</p>	<p>Demonstrates insufficient awareness of key ethical concerns within the discipline.</p> <p>Demonstrates insufficient evidence of responsible, ethical, or transparent use of AI.</p>
<p>0-29 Low Fail</p>	<p>Demonstrates an inadequate range of knowledge and understanding of the discipline, including its key concepts or principles appropriate to this level of study, with major gaps, serious inaccuracies, or confusion.</p> <p>Shows no awareness of relevant theories, evidence, or approaches appropriate to this level of study.</p> <p>Shows no awareness of common areas of debate or complexity in the discipline, appropriate to the level of study.</p>	<p>Shows no awareness of the discipline's main sources, tools, or methods.</p> <p>Shows no attempt to draw conclusions.</p> <p>Applies established techniques to problems with major flaws, even in familiar contexts.</p> <p>Shows no evidence of processes of investigation, analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study.</p>	<p>Shows no attempt to communicate information, ideas or solutions with clarity even in familiar contexts, with no attempt to adapt to audience.</p> <p>Makes no attempt to contribute to collaborative activity, even in familiar contexts and using defined guidelines.</p> <p>Makes no attempt to follow given guidelines.</p> <p>Demonstrates no awareness of the evaluation of their own work, and no engagement with feedback.</p>	<p>Shows no attempt to apply theories, concepts, or methods, even in familiar contexts.</p> <p>Shows no attempt to use the discipline's main tools, practices, or processes, even in familiar contexts.</p> <p>Demonstrates no awareness of key ethical concerns within the discipline.</p> <p>Demonstrates a disregard for transparency, responsibility, or ethical practice in the use of AI.</p>

FHEQ 6	Knowledge & Understanding	Cognitive & Analytical Skills	Transferable Skills	Professional / Practical Skills
80–100 High First	<p>Demonstrates sophisticated and authentic knowledge and understanding across the breadth of the discipline, its key concepts, principles or interrelationships.</p> <p>Demonstrates critical and assured use of relevant theories, evidence, or approaches.</p> <p>Demonstrates sophisticated critical appreciation of current issues, complexity, uncertainty, limitations, or contested knowledge.</p>	<p>Demonstrates discernment and judgement in the selection and evaluation of sources, tools, or methods.</p> <p>Develops nuanced, persuasive and fully justified positions, solutions, or conclusions.</p> <p>Resolves complex problems with sophisticated judgement, insight or creativity.</p> <p>Demonstrates processes of investigation, analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study with consistent integrity, showing creativity, insight or sophistication.</p>	<p>Communicates complex information, ideas or solutions with sophistication and clarity, showing adaptation to audience, in contexts of varying familiarity.</p> <p>Contributes strongly to collaborative activity, including the demonstration of highly effective leadership where appropriate.</p> <p>Works with exceptional autonomy, showing sustained initiative and a consistently high level of responsibility.</p> <p>Demonstrates perceptive reflection and sustained improvement, with an exceptional ability to reflect critically, independently, and insightfully on their work, leading to significant and well-judged development.</p>	<p>Applies theory, concepts or methods with insight in professional or practical contexts, with clear awareness of the broader context in which the discipline is situated.</p> <p>Demonstrates sophisticated and professional use of tools, practices, or processes in the context of disciplinary expectations.</p> <p>Identifies, critically evaluates, and resolves ethical concerns, demonstrating independent judgement and consistently making reasoned choices aligned with professional expectations or codes of conduct.</p> <p>Demonstrates highly transparent, creative, responsible, and ethical use of AI.</p>
70–79 First	<p>Demonstrates comprehensive and authentic knowledge and understanding across the</p>	<p>Demonstrates highly effective judgement in the selection and</p>	<p>Communicates complex information, ideas, or solutions coherently and</p>	<p>Applies theory, concepts or methods effectively in professional or practical</p>

	<p>breadth of the discipline, its key concepts, principles or interrelationships.</p> <p>Demonstrates critical use of relevant theories, evidence, or approaches.</p> <p>Demonstrates clear and thoughtful critical awareness of current issues, complexity, uncertainty, limitations or contested knowledge.</p>	<p>evaluation of sources, tools, or methods.</p> <p>Develops coherent, persuasive and well-justified positions, solutions or conclusions.</p> <p>Resolves complex problems with sound judgement, insight, or confidence.</p> <p>Demonstrates processes of investigation, analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study with high levels of critical insight, coherence, and integrity.</p>	<p>effectively showing adaptation to audience, in contexts of varying familiarity.</p> <p>Contributes very effectively to collaborative activity, showing leadership where appropriate.</p> <p>Works with a high degree of autonomy, showing strong initiative and a reliable sense of responsibility.</p> <p>Demonstrates highly effective reflection and clear improvement, with a strong ability to reflect critically and independently on their work, leading to purposeful and well-judged development.</p>	<p>contexts, showing some awareness of the broader context in which the discipline is situated.</p> <p>Demonstrates highly effective and assured use of tools, practices, or processes in the context of disciplinary expectations.</p> <p>Identifies and critically evaluates ethical concerns, making well-reasoned and largely independent decisions in line with professional expectations or codes of conduct.</p> <p>Demonstrates highly transparent, responsible, and ethical use of AI.</p>
<p>60–69 2:1</p>	<p>Demonstrates coherent and authentic knowledge and understanding across the breadth of the discipline and its key concepts or principles.</p> <p>Demonstrates accurate use of relevant theories, evidence, or approaches.</p>	<p>Demonstrates competence in the selection and evaluation of sources, tools, or methods.</p> <p>Develops coherent and well-supported positions, solutions, or conclusions.</p> <p>Addresses problems with sound judgement or some insight.</p>	<p>Communicates information, ideas or solutions clearly and effectively, showing adaptation to audience, in contexts of varying familiarity.</p> <p>Contributes constructively to collaborative activity and works effectively with others.</p>	<p>Applies theory, concepts or methods clearly in professional or practical contexts.</p> <p>Demonstrates proficient use of tools, practices, or processes in the context of disciplinary expectations.</p>

	<p>Demonstrates clear critical awareness of current issues, complexity, uncertainty, or limitations.</p>	<p>Demonstrates processes of investigation, analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study with clear purpose, sound judgement, and strong integrity.</p>	<p>Works independently with clear initiative and a strong sense of responsibility, requiring only limited guidance.</p> <p>Demonstrates effective reflection and clear improvement, with a well-developed ability to reflect critically on their work and use insight to inform meaningful development.</p>	<p>Identifies ethical concerns and responds appropriately, making sound decisions informed by professional expectations or codes of conduct.</p> <p>Demonstrates clear and appropriate transparency in the responsible and ethical use of AI.</p>
<p>50–59 2:2</p>	<p>Demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding across the breadth of the discipline and its key concepts or principles.</p> <p>Uses relevant theories, evidence, or approaches, though depth or consistency may be limited.</p> <p>Shows some critical awareness of current issues, complexity or differing perspectives.</p>	<p>Demonstrates some effectiveness in the selection and evaluation of sources, tools, or methods.</p> <p>Develops sound positions, solutions, or conclusions, though strength of justification may be inconsistent.</p> <p>Addresses problems with generally sound judgement, although insight may be inconsistent.</p> <p>Demonstrates processes of investigation, analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study with competence, and appropriate integrity.</p>	<p>Communicates information, ideas or solutions with some effectiveness in contexts of varying familiarity, with some attempt to adapt to audience.</p> <p>Contributes appropriately to collaborative activity and works reasonably well with others.</p> <p>Works with reasonable autonomy, showing appropriate initiative and responsibility, though some guidance may be required.</p> <p>Demonstrates sound reflection and some improvement, with an ability</p>	<p>Applies theory, concepts or methods with some effectiveness in practical or professional contexts.</p> <p>Demonstrates appropriate use of tools, practices, or processes in the context of disciplinary expectations.</p> <p>Identifies key ethical concerns and makes generally appropriate decisions based on professional expectations or codes of conduct.</p> <p>Demonstrates some transparency in the responsible and ethical use of AI.</p>

			to evaluate their work and identify appropriate areas for development, though depth or consistency may be limited.	
40–49 3rd	<p>Demonstrates broadly coherent understanding of the discipline and its key concepts or principles, but with limited depth in some areas.</p> <p>Shows limited but relevant use of theories, evidence, or approaches.</p> <p>Shows some critical awareness of current issues or differing perspectives, though depth and consistency are limited.</p>	<p>Demonstrates some effectiveness in the selection and evaluation of sources, tools, or methods, but with some errors or omissions.</p> <p>Shows basic capacity to form positions, solutions, or conclusions, but with limited justification.</p> <p>Addresses problems with basic judgement but limited insight.</p> <p>Demonstrates processes of investigation, analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study with basic competence and some limited evidence of integrity in process.</p>	<p>Communicates information, ideas or solutions at an adequate level in contexts of varying familiarity, though clarity, structure or coherence may be inconsistent.</p> <p>Contributes at a basic level to collaborative activity.</p> <p>Works with some autonomy and limited initiative, demonstrating sufficient responsibility with regular guidance or support.</p> <p>Demonstrates basic reflection and limited improvement, with some ability to review their work and recognise straightforward areas for development, though evaluation may be descriptive or dependent on guidance.</p>	<p>Applies theory, concepts or methods at a basic but sufficient level in practical or professional contexts.</p> <p>Demonstrates satisfactory but inconsistent use of tools, practices, or processes in the context of disciplinary expectations.</p> <p>Identifies some ethical concerns and makes basic or inconsistent decisions in relation to professional expectations or codes of conduct.</p> <p>Demonstrates basic awareness of responsible and ethical use of AI, though transparency in the use of AI may be limited or inconsistent.</p>
30–39 Fail	Shows partial or inconsistent knowledge and understanding of the discipline and key concepts or principles, with significant omissions,	Evaluates few appropriate sources, tools, or methods effectively.	Communicates information, ideas or solutions without sufficient clarity, and in a way that is unclear, poorly structured, or inconsistent.	Shows limited ability to apply theory, concepts, or methods in practical or professional contexts.

	<p>inaccuracies, or misunderstanding.</p> <p>Uses theories, evidence, or approaches inconsistently, leading to flawed interpretations.</p> <p>Shows no meaningful recognition of current issues, complexity, or differing perspectives, or shows significant omissions, inaccuracies, or misunderstandings.</p>	<p>Shows limited ability to develop positions, solutions or conclusions, with no justification or support.</p> <p>Shows limited ability to resolve problems, with weak judgement and no evidence of insight.</p> <p>Shows limited evidence of adequate processes of investigation, analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study.</p>	<p>Makes limited contribution to collaborative activity.</p> <p>Works with insufficient autonomy or initiative and demonstrates inconsistent responsibility, requiring substantial guidance or supervision.</p> <p>Demonstrates weak or inconsistent reflection, with limited ability to evaluate their work critically or use insight to support improvement.</p>	<p>Demonstrates major errors or inconsistencies in the use of tools, practices, or processes in the context of disciplinary expectations.</p> <p>Demonstrates insufficient awareness of ethical concerns and makes poorly reasoned or inappropriate decisions in relation to professional expectations or codes of conduct.</p> <p>Demonstrates insufficient evidence of responsible, ethical, or transparent use of AI.</p>
<p>0-29 Low Fail</p>	<p>Shows inadequate knowledge and understanding, with major gaps, serious inaccuracies, or confusion.</p> <p>Shows no attempt to use relevant theories, evidence, or approaches.</p> <p>Shows no awareness of current developments, complexity, or differing perspectives.</p>	<p>Shows no effective evaluation of sources, tools or methods.</p> <p>Demonstrates confusion and incoherence in the attempt to develop positions, solutions or conclusions.</p> <p>Shows no ability to resolve problems effectively, with unsound judgement and no evidence of insight.</p> <p>Shows no evidence of processes of investigation,</p>	<p>Communication is poor, ineffective, or incomprehensible.</p> <p>Makes no effective contribution to collaborative activity.</p> <p>Shows little or no autonomy or initiative and fails to demonstrate an acceptable level of responsibility, even with guidance or supervision.</p>	<p>Shows very limited or no ability to apply theory, concepts, or methods in practical or professional contexts.</p> <p>Demonstrate serious errors or flaws in the use of tools, practices, or processes in the context of disciplinary expectations.</p> <p>Demonstrates a lack of awareness of ethical concerns and makes inappropriate decisions that disregard</p>

		analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study.	Demonstrates little or no meaningful reflection, with serious weaknesses in evaluating their work or identifying and acting on opportunities for improvement.	professional expectations or codes of conduct. Demonstrates a disregard for transparency, responsibility, or ethical practice in the use of AI.
--	--	--	---	--

FHEQ 7	Knowledge & Understanding	Cognitive & Analytical Skills	Transferable Skills	Professional / Practical Skills
80–100 High Distinction	<p>Demonstrates sophisticated and authentic mastery of the discipline, its key concepts, principles and interrelationships with other disciplines or fields of study.</p> <p>Demonstrates critical and assured use of relevant theories, evidence, or approaches, including current research or advanced scholarship.</p> <p>Demonstrates authoritative critical appreciation of current issues, complexity, uncertainty, limitations, or contested knowledge.</p>	<p>Demonstrates autonomous discernment and judgement in the selection and evaluation of advanced sources, tools, or methods.</p> <p>Develops nuanced, authoritative and fully justified positions, solutions, or conclusions.</p> <p>Resolves complex problems in abstract or unpredictable contexts with sophisticated judgement, insight or creativity.</p> <p>Demonstrates advanced processes of investigation, analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study with consistent integrity, showing creativity, insight or sophistication.</p>	<p>Communicates complex information, ideas or solutions with sophistication and clarity in unfamiliar contexts, demonstrating adaptation to specialised audiences.</p> <p>Contributes strongly to collaborative activity, including the demonstration of authoritative leadership where appropriate.</p> <p>Works with exceptional autonomy and creativity, showing sustained initiative and a consistently high level of responsibility.</p> <p>Demonstrates perceptive reflection and sustained improvement, with an exceptional ability to reflect critically, independently, and insightfully on their work, leading to significant and well-judged development.</p>	<p>Applies advanced theory, concepts or methods with insight in professional or practical contexts, with sophisticated awareness of the broader context in which the discipline is situated.</p> <p>Demonstrates sophisticated and professional use of specialised or advanced tools, practices, or processes in the context of disciplinary expectations.</p> <p>Identifies, critically evaluates, and resolves ethical concerns, demonstrating independent judgement and advocacy, and consistently making reasoned choices aligned with professional expectations or codes of conduct.</p> <p>Demonstrates highly transparent, creative, responsible, and ethical use of AI.</p>
70–79 Distinction	Demonstrates comprehensive and authentic mastery of the	Demonstrates highly effective autonomous judgement in the	Communicates complex information, ideas, or	Applies advanced theory, concepts or methods

	<p>discipline, its key concepts, principles or interrelationships with other disciplines or fields of study.</p> <p>Demonstrates critical and coherent use of relevant theories, evidence, or approaches including current research or advanced scholarship.</p> <p>Demonstrates clear and thoughtful critical awareness of current issues, complexity, uncertainty, limitations or contested knowledge.</p>	<p>selection and evaluation of advanced sources, tools, or methods.</p> <p>Develops systematic, highly persuasive and well-justified positions, solutions or conclusions.</p> <p>Resolves complex problems in abstract or unpredictable contexts with sound judgement, insight, or confidence.</p> <p>Demonstrates advanced processes of investigation, analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study with high levels of critical insight, coherence, and integrity.</p>	<p>solutions coherently and effectively in unfamiliar contexts, demonstrating adaptation to specialised audiences.</p> <p>Contributes very effectively to collaborative activity, showing some authoritative leadership where appropriate.</p> <p>Works with a high degree of autonomy and creativity, showing strong initiative and a reliable sense of responsibility.</p> <p>Demonstrates highly effective reflection and clear improvement, with a strong ability to reflect critically and independently on their work, leading to purposeful and well-judged development.</p>	<p>effectively in professional or practical contexts, showing strong awareness of the broader context in which the discipline is situated.</p> <p>Demonstrates highly effective and professional use of advanced tools, practices, or processes in the context of disciplinary expectations.</p> <p>Identifies and critically evaluates ethical concerns, making well-reasoned and independent decisions in line with professional expectations or codes of conduct.</p> <p>Demonstrates highly transparent, responsible, and ethical use of AI.</p>
<p>60–69 Merit</p>	<p>Demonstrates coherent and authentic mastery of the discipline and its key concepts, principles or, interrelationships with other disciplines or fields of study.</p>	<p>Demonstrates competence and autonomy in the selection and evaluation of advanced sources, tools, or methods.</p>	<p>Communicates complex information, ideas or solutions clearly and effectively in familiar and unfamiliar contexts, demonstrating</p>	<p>Applies advanced theory, concepts or methods clearly in professional or practical contexts, showing clear awareness of the broader</p>

	<p>Demonstrates critical use of relevant theories, evidence, or approaches including current research or advanced scholarship.</p> <p>Demonstrates clear critical awareness of current issues, complexity, uncertainty, limitations or contested knowledge.</p>	<p>Develops coherent, persuasive and well-supported positions, solutions, or conclusions.</p> <p>Resolves complex problems in abstract or unpredictable contexts with sound judgement or some insight.</p> <p>Demonstrates advanced processes of investigation, analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study with clear purpose, sound judgement, and strong integrity.</p>	<p>adaptation to specialised audiences.</p> <p>Contributes constructively to collaborative activity and works effectively with others, showing leadership where appropriate.</p> <p>Works independently and creatively with clear initiative and a strong sense of responsibility.</p> <p>Demonstrates effective reflection and clear improvement, with a well-developed ability to reflect critically on their work and use insight to inform meaningful development.</p>	<p>context in which the discipline is situated.</p> <p>Demonstrates proficient and professional use of advanced tools, practices, or processes in the context of disciplinary expectations.</p> <p>Identifies and critically evaluates ethical concerns and responds appropriately, making sound decisions informed by professional expectations or codes of conduct.</p> <p>Demonstrates clear and appropriate transparency in the responsible and ethical use of AI.</p>
<p>50–59 Pass</p>	<p>Demonstrates coherent and authentic knowledge and understanding of the discipline and its key concepts, principles or, with some, though limited awareness of interrelationships with other disciplines or fields of study.</p>	<p>Demonstrates competence but limited autonomy in the selection and evaluation of advanced sources, tools, or methods.</p> <p>Develops clear positions, solutions, or conclusions, although strength of justification may be inconsistent.</p>	<p>Communicates complex information, ideas or solutions at an adequate level in familiar and unfamiliar contexts, though clarity, structure or coherence may be inconsistent.</p> <p>Contributes appropriately to collaborative activity and works reasonably well with</p>	<p>Applies advanced theory, concepts or methods at a basic but sufficient level in professional or practical contexts, showing some awareness of the broader context in which the discipline is situated.</p> <p>Demonstrates satisfactory use of advanced tools, practices,</p>

	<p>Demonstrates critical use of relevant theories, evidence, or approaches including basic awareness of current research or advanced scholarship.</p> <p>Demonstrates some critical awareness of current issues, complexity, uncertainty, limitations or contested knowledge, with some omissions or inconsistencies.</p>	<p>Resolves complex problems in abstract or unpredictable contexts with basic judgement or insight.</p> <p>Demonstrates advanced processes of investigation, analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study with competence and appropriate integrity.</p>	<p>others, with limited evidence of leadership where appropriate.</p> <p>Works with some autonomy, showing adequate initiative and responsibility.</p> <p>Demonstrates basic reflection and improvement, with some ability to review their work and recognise straightforward areas for development, though evaluation may be descriptive.</p>	<p>or processes in the context of disciplinary expectations, with some minor inconsistencies.</p> <p>Identifies and describes ethical concerns and responds appropriately, making generally appropriate decisions informed by professional expectations or codes of conduct.</p> <p>Demonstrates clear and appropriate transparency in the responsible and ethical use of AI.</p>
<p>30–49 Fail</p>	<p>Shows partial or inconsistent knowledge and understanding of relevant concepts or principles, with significant omissions, inaccuracies, or misunderstanding.</p> <p>Shows limited critical use of relevant theories, evidence, or approaches, with no awareness of current research or advanced scholarship.</p> <p>Shows no meaningful recognition of current issues, complexity, or differing perspectives, or shows</p>	<p>Shows limited evaluation of advanced sources, tools, or methods effectively, with no evidence of autonomy.</p> <p>Shows limited ability to develop positions, solutions or conclusions, with no justification or support.</p> <p>Shows limited ability to resolve complex problems, with weak judgement and no evidence of insight.</p> <p>Shows limited evidence of adequacy in advanced</p>	<p>Communicates information, ideas or solutions without sufficient clarity, and in a way that is unclear, poorly structured, or inconsistent with no effective adaptation to audience.</p> <p>Makes limited contribution to collaborative activity.</p> <p>Works with insufficient autonomy or initiative and demonstrates inconsistent responsibility, requiring substantial guidance or supervision.</p>	<p>Shows significant errors or misunderstandings when applying advanced theory, concepts, or methods in practical or professional contexts, with no awareness of the broader context in which the discipline is situated.</p> <p>Demonstrates significant errors or inconsistencies in the use of advanced tools, practices, or processes in the context of disciplinary expectations.</p>

	significant omissions, inaccuracies, or misunderstandings.	processes of investigation, analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study.	Demonstrates weak or inconsistent reflection, with limited ability to evaluate their work critically or use insight to support improvement.	Demonstrates insufficient awareness of ethical concerns and makes poorly reasoned or inappropriate decisions in relation to professional expectations or codes of conduct. Demonstrates insufficient evidence of responsible, ethical, or transparent use of AI.
0–29 Low Fail	Shows inadequate knowledge and understanding of relevant concepts or principles, with major gaps, serious inaccuracies, or confusion. Shows inadequate use of relevant theories, evidence, or approaches, with no awareness of current research or advanced scholarship. Shows no awareness of current developments, complexity, or differing perspectives.	Shows no effective evaluation of advanced sources, tools or methods. Demonstrates confusion and incoherence in the attempt to develop positions, solutions or conclusions. Shows no ability to resolve complex problems effectively, with unsound judgement and no evidence of insight. Shows no evidence of processes of investigation, analysis, research, enquiry, and/or study.	Communication is poor, ineffective, or incomprehensible with no awareness of adaptation to audience. Makes no effective contribution to collaborative activity. Shows little or no autonomy or initiative and fails to demonstrate an acceptable level of responsibility, even with guidance or supervision. Demonstrates little or no meaningful reflection, with serious weaknesses in evaluating their work or identifying and acting on	Shows very limited or no ability to apply advanced theory, concepts, or methods in practical or professional contexts, with no awareness of the broader context in which the discipline is situated. Demonstrate serious errors or flaws in the use of advanced tools, practices, or processes in the context of disciplinary expectations. Demonstrates a lack of awareness of ethical concerns and makes inappropriate decisions that disregard professional expectations or codes of conduct.

			opportunities for improvement.	Demonstrates a disregard for transparency, responsibility, or ethical practice in the use of AI.
--	--	--	--------------------------------	--