



ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES

Marking Scheme and Criteria

Module: Sports Law

Assessment: Assessment 2 Position Paper. (50%)

Assessment Criteria	Weighting	Mark breakdown						
		100-80%	79-70%	69-60%	59-50%	49-40%	39-30%	29-0%
<p>Knowledge and Understanding (50%)</p> <p>The Position Paper takes a strong, well defined position, uses at least three appropriate reasons with at least two supporting details for each reason. Counter arguments are effectively addressed, without undercutting the student's position.</p>	50%	Excellent understanding of concepts/theories (some of them abstract) and/or current practice, and several of their applications and implications.	Thorough understanding of concepts and theories (some of them abstract) and/or current practice, and some of their implications and applications.	Clear understanding of concepts and theories (some of them abstract) and/or practice and some of their implications and applications.	Satisfactory understanding of the relevant concepts, theories and/or practice;	Adequate understanding of the main concepts, theories and/or practice;	Occasional errors in understanding of main concepts, theories and/or practice;	Substantial errors in understanding of concepts, theories and/or practice, or none;
<p>Cognitive Skills (30%)</p> <p>The structure of the Position Paper is clear and easy to follow. Moreover, the Position Paper follows the guidance provided by the module leader for these assignments. Paragraph transitions are logical and maintain the flow of thought throughout the paper. The conclusion is logical and flows from the body of the paper.</p>	30%	<p>Exceptional breadth and depth for work at this level. Exemplary in many instances showing capacity and initiative beyond expectations for this level.</p> <p>Exceptional and evidenced conclusions/practical solutions. Conclusion makes final evaluative comments on all the ideas presented in the paper. The conclusion is linked to the paper question.</p>	<p>Accurate and coherent in breadth, with depth in many areas. Excellent and shows capacity beyond expectations for this level in several instances.</p> <p>Accurate, coherent and well-founded conclusions/practical solutions. Final evaluative comments on majority of the ideas presented in the paper are made. The conclusion is directly linked to the paper question. Conclusion does not</p>	<p>Accurate in breadth, with depth in several areas. Sometimes shows the capacity beyond expectations for this level.</p> <p>Research generates well-founded conclusions/practical solutions. Final evaluative comments on some of the ideas presented in the paper are made. The conclusion is directly linked to the paper question. Conclusion does not contain new ideas or examples.</p>	<p>Generally accurate, with depth in some aspects for this level;</p> <p>Conclusion mostly consistent/accurate. Some comments on the ideas presented in the paper are made. The conclusion is relevant to the paper question. Conclusion does not contain new ideas or examples.</p>	<p>Largely accurate across most areas, with limited depth for this level;</p> <p>Adequate evaluative comments on the ideas presented in the paper made. The conclusion is linked to some extend to the paper question. Conclusion mostly does not contain new ideas or examples.</p>	<p>Inaccuracies/omissions in some areas, depth limited and is marginally inadequate for this level;</p> <p>Occasional errors in the final evaluative comments on the ideas presented in the paper made. The conclusion is not directly linked to the paper question. Occasionally conclusion contains new ideas or examples.</p>	<p>Substantial inaccuracies/omissions/irrelevancies for this level;</p> <p>No evaluative comments on the ideas presented in the paper made. The conclusion is not linked to the paper question. Conclusion contains new ideas or examples.</p>



ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES

		Conclusion does not contain new ideas or examples.	contain new ideas or examples.					
<p>Practical and Professional Skills (10%)</p> <p>The Position Paper accurately recounts a wide range of sources of factual and relevant information, with many indications of greater breadth and depth of knowledge.</p>	10%	Explores and evaluates information/ideas from a wide range of sources (may include primary sources). Range of information is of extreme relevance.	Explores and deploys information from a wide range of mostly secondary sources. Range of information is of great relevance.	Locates a wide range of information/evidence. Range of information is of wide relevance.	Locates a satisfactory range of information/evidence, some of it beyond the given/familiar. Range of information is of satisfactory relevance.	Locates an acceptable range of information/evidence mostly from given/familiar secondary sources. Range of information is of acceptable relevance.	Range of information limited to the familiar/given sources. Range of information is of limited relevance.	Range of information is inadequate. Range of information is irrelevant.
<p>Transferable and Key Skills (10%)</p> <p>The Position Paper follows all the designated guidelines. The rules of grammar, usage and punctuation are followed. Spelling is correct. Language is clear and precise. Sentences display consistently strong, varied structure.</p>	10%	<p>Sentence structure and fluency outstanding and demonstrates sophisticated command of lexis, syntax and register, written in idiomatic language. Tone corresponds to original text. Consistent and accurate referencing and citations. Harvard referencing style accurately and consistently followed with no errors.</p> <p>Excellent presentation of work and lucid communication in all contexts. Excellent identification of the topic, the argued position and the main supporting statements.</p>	<p>Overall impression is of accuracy and complex sentences used regularly and successfully. Fluency very good and broad range of vocabulary used to very good effect. Tone corresponds to original text. Consistent and accurate referencing and citations. Harvard referencing style accurately and consistently followed.</p> <p>Excellent presentation of work and lucid communication in most contexts; Thorough identification of the topic, the argued position and the main supporting statements.</p>	<p>Overall impression is of accuracy. Sentence structure and fluency good and generally able to use appropriate vocabulary, though there may be a few gaps in knowledge or in understanding of usage. Consistent and accurate referencing and citations. Harvard referencing style accurately and consistently followed.</p> <p>Presentation of work appropriate to context and purpose, communication clear;</p> <p>Clear identification of the topic, the argued position and the main supporting statements.</p>	<p>Sentence structure and fluency reasonable and adequate to convey the sense. Some errors but rarely interfering with communication: not very successful attempts to use complex structures and appropriate connectors and/or predominant use of simple structures. Evidence of consistent and largely accurate referencing and citations. Harvard referencing style followed with some errors. Satisfactory presentation of work, communications mostly appropriate to the context/purpose. Satisfactory identification of the topic, the argued position and the main supporting statements.</p>	<p>Sentence structure and fluency poor and clumsy on occasions. The literal sense of the original passage is conveyed to some degree, but lexical and syntactical problems impede fluency to a noticeable extent. Evidence of referencing and citations. Harvard referencing style not consistently followed.</p> <p>Presentation of work and communications adequate in most contexts, with some mistakes/irrelevancies; Adequate identification of the topic, the argued position and the main supporting statements.</p>	<p>Inappropriate syntax, lexis or register may turn reading into a very difficult task. Some relevant vocabulary is present but shows inability to handle relatively common structures and vocabulary. Some citation evident but referencing style inaccurate and inconsistent.</p> <p>Elements of poor presentation/ poor or inappropriate communication or expression; Errors in the identification of the topic, the argued position and the main supporting statements.</p>	<p>Incomprehensible or significantly incomplete. Demonstrates inability to produce basic grammatical structures and vocabulary in context. No evidence of referencing.</p> <p>Work is poorly presented with poor/inappropriate communication and expression;</p> <p>The topic is not identified. The argued position and the main reasons for that position are not identified.</p>



ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES

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