|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ID4001 - MARKING SHEET FOR THE REFLECTIVE REPORTID Number of author:**Brief** title **of report**: | | Yes | No / Absent | Unacceptable (0-6) | Satisfactory (7-10) | Good (11-13) | Very Good (14-16) | Excellent (17-20) |
| Structure and presentation (30%) | | Y | A | U | S | G | VG | E |
| Includes the project title, word count, etc. in the cover sheet? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Special project clearly described on cover sheet? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Correct length, (2000 ± 200 words)? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Instructions about layout followed? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| References presented according to specifications? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Introduction clearly prepares the ground & sets out a plan for the report? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aims of placement for the student clearly set out? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Examples are well chosen, well described, and relevant? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conclusion effectively links the main points? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Writing readily understood? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of grammar, syntax, and spelling | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *If diagrams or pictures were used*, were they relevant and helpful? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *If diagrams or pictures were used,* did they have appropriate captions? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| If diagrams or pictures were used, were the sources acknowledged? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Please see mark descriptors for this section* | Mark (/20) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Understanding, evaluating, and communicating key educational items from the placement (35%) | |  | A | U | S | G | VG | E |
| Educational topic(s) covered in depth and breadth? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All factual information relevant? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Good knowledge of literature evident, including some up-to-date sources? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clear indication of literature and other sources informing your decisions? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Appropriate use of material from seminars and/or mentor teacher? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A strong understanding of concepts and critical evaluation of issues? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shows understanding of planning to meet the needs of all the learners? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical reflection on own observations and experiences contributing strongly to the material'? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Please see mark descriptors for this section* | Mark (/20) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reflection on the placement; communicating your ideas (35%) | |  | A | U | S | G | G | E |
| Evidenced reflection on attainment of aims, or otherwise | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deep reflection on experiences in the placement | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recognition of your learning from the placement | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clear & logical development of material, (not just description of events)? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Evidence accurately presented? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Effective explanations? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Good use of examples, evidence, references, and information? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Are conclusions and judgements reached and justified? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Is evaluation/independent thought about the evidence and its strengths/weaknesses/limitations evident in the report? | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Please see mark descriptors for this section* | Mark (/20) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Overall mark (/20) | | | | |

## Mark Descriptors

The tick boxes give guidance to candidates and assessors various aspects of the report. Where many tick boxes in a section are towards the right hand side of the table, it is likely that the overall mark for that section will be higher. However, the mark that the assessors give to each section will be determined using the mark descriptors below.

## Structure and Presentation

19 - 20: The structure and presentation of the report is of the highest standard with few flaws or oversights. Exceptional quality of report that a marker will (on average) see only very occasionally. This report will be at a level that is essentially ready for publication in a high quality journal; language will be of notable clarity, and the structure will be particularly clear and useful. Referencing will be flawless.

17 - 18: The report structure and presentation follows all the requirements well and makes good use of them. The report is logically structured, and that structure is clear for the reader to see.  The report is typeset to a very high standard and is written using clear language with appropriate use of scientific and educational terms. The reader is never distracted by poor grammar, ill-chosen punctuation, or incorrect spellings.  The aims of the placement for the student are well specified. The references are all presented in the text in the required manner, and the reference list is formatted in the required style. The author’s choice of any diagrams, mathematics, and examples will be appropriate in all cases.

14 - 16: The criteria noted for the 17 to 18 range will in the most part be there, but with one or two lapses. The structure may be slightly confusing, the balance of sections slightly inappropriate, or the language too colloquial. There may be some errors in presentation. There may be minor flaws in some of the grammar. Spelling, and punctuation may occasionally be wrong, or there may be minor deficiencies in sectionalisation. A few figures may be missing where they would have been desirable, or a superfluous figure may have been used, one or two examples may be absent or poorly chosen, or their inclusion is not fully justified. The reference list may be less well formatted, such as missing page numbers or mis-spelling author names.

11 - 13: The criteria noted for the 14 to 16 range will be there in most cases, but with several lapses or a major problem in one or two categories. The references may not all be in the required style.

7 - 10: While the report can be read and followed, and has at least some way of referring to relevant literature, this range of marks corresponds to a poorly presented report and/or gross errors in format, writing style, spelling and grammar. There may be very sparse or ill-chosen use of examples. It may be clear that the literature was not sufficiently scoured in the writing of the report. There may be citations that are irrelevant to the points made.

6 marks or fewer: The structure and presentation is sufficiently poor that a passing mark cannot be justified.

## Understanding, evaluating, and communicating key educational items from the placement

19 – 20: The depth of understanding, the use of literature, the illustrations from the placement experience, the critical analysis, and the communication of the key educational ideas are of an exceptional standard, the originality is high, and the material is essentially ready for publication in a high quality journal.

17 - 18 : The report gives an outstanding coverage of an appropriate educational topic. The writing is clearly informed by an appropriately selected range of literature and ID4001 teaching sessions. There is crystal-clear and appropriate use of the author’s own experience on the placement in the explanation and illustration of the topic. Exceptionally strong critical evaluation and reflection is shown. The analysis will critically identify, define, conceptualise, and analyse a relevant educational topic, give clear insights and interpretations of the matter, and show exceptional originality and creativity.

14 - 16: The criteria noted for the 17 to 18 range will in the most part be there, but with one or two lapses. It may not always be clear how the literature or inputs from a mentor teacher informed the work, or the evidence from the placement experience may not be presented and interpreted as well as it should be.

11 - 13: The criteria noted for the 14 to 16 range will be there in most cases, but with several lapses or a major problem in one or two categories

7 - 10: While the report shows evidence of some understanding of the educational topic chosen, this range of marks corresponds to work that does a poor job of explaining the topic, lack of significant critical judgement, and limited use of examples of experience from the placement to illustrate the arguments. There will be limited use of the literature and it may be apparent that supporting the report with suitable literature examples was an afterthought.

6 marks or fewer: The communication of the topic, and the evaluation of the placement experience in this topic, is sufficiently poor that a passing mark cannot be justified.

## Reflection on the placement, communicating your ideas

19 – 20: Appropriate goals are described excellently, the reflective writing about the attainment or otherwise of these goals could be used as an exemplar in a course on reflective writing in education, and the ideas are communicated in a manner that cannot be significantly improved.

17 - 18: The report clearly states appropriate and well-defined goals of the author for the placement, and explains well what inputs they worked to achieve those goals. The report will also clearly justify the successes of the aims and critically evaluate any short-comings or adaptions to these aims, and to what extent. This analysis will clearly and fully engage in the full reflective cycle. There is an excellent reflective account of the development path towards those goals, including how hurdles were overcome, and what the key learning outcomes were for the author. Strong evidence is produced to show how well the goals were achieved, and at what level. Throughout, critical analysis is excellent. Examples from the placement are well chosen, and support the discussion well. The explanations are at an appropriate level and include good use of relevant literature.

14 - 16: The criteria noted for the 17 to 18 range will in the most part be there, but with one or two lapses. It may not always be clear how the literature or inputs from a mentor teacher informed the work, or the evidence from the placement experience may not be presented and interpreted as well as it should be.

11 - 13: The criteria noted for the 14 to 16 range will be there in most cases, but with several lapses or a major problem in one or two categories. Either the communication of the ideas or the reflection on the placement may need significant improvement.

7 - 10: While the report gives some indication of goals and progress towards those goals, this range of marks corresponds to writing that shows limited reflection, limited communication of the ideas, limited evidence of attaining goals, and/or inappropriate choice of goals. The report may read more like a diary of events rather than a critical evaluation of the student’s journey and progress through the placement.

6 marks or fewer: The communication of the ideas, and the quality of reflection, are sufficiently poor that a passing mark cannot be justified.

----------------------------

Some feedback comes from where the tick boxes are in the table above. Further comments here please from the assessor, including at least two comments on aspects that were done well, and at least two suggestions of how the report might be improved.