

Master of Theology in Theological & Pastoral Studies

Programme Specification



1. Programme title	Master of Theology in Theological & Pastoral Studies
2. Awarding institution	Middlesex University
3. Teaching institution	Oak Hill Theological College
4. Programme accredited by	N/A
5. Final qualification	Master of Theology (integrated)
6. Academic year	2010-11 – updated 05/09/2011
7. Language of study	English
8. Mode of study	Full-time

9. Criteria for admission to the programme

The MTh is a four year full time integrated Masters Degree. Entrance requirements for those entering in Year 1 are the same as for the DipHE and CertHE (see those programme specifications for details).

To progress to the third year of the MTh, the student must obtain an average of a 2.1 (B+ on the DipHE scale; 6 or better on the Middlesex scale) in the first two years of study. Permission to progress to the third year of the MTh will take place during the third term of the second year. This will involve consultation with the personal tutor, the Postgraduate Course Leader and the Admissions Officer. To continue on to the fourth year of study of the MTh, students will need to obtain an overall grade of 8 or better for each module/dissertation in the third year.

Entry Points

Direct entrance on to the MTh is permitted into the third year of the course. Applicants will normally be required to have a 2.1 in the equivalent of a DipHE or BA(Hons) in Theology. The applicant's previous study will also need to meet the specific subject area prerequisites for the third year of the MTh in the three areas of Biblical Studies, Theology & Church History, and Church & World.

10. Aims of the programme

The programme aims to:

- develop students as lifelong theological learners and equip them to harness and apply the fruits of such theological study in their diverse ministries;
- provide students with a rounded, four-year theological programme, covering a full range of biblical, theological and pastoral studies up to postgraduate level, which are at, or informed by, the forefront of those fields of study;
- provide an opportunity for sustained reflection on and engagement with a theological or ministerial topic through a research-based dissertation and/or project;
- strengthen and sharpen students' intellectual and practical skills and to develop in them the graces of the Christian theologian in order that they should be more effective in Christian ministry;
- provide opportunity for students to reflect upon and integrate their prior theological studies and their experience of Christian ministry in the process of engaging critically with new learnings and to model this in the way in which teaching and learning are provided;
- enable students to understand something of the demands and opportunities of theological research and equip them to begin such research if they would so choose.

11. Programme outcomes

Note: While the MTh is an integrated four year programme, there is a direct entrance point into the third year, and all students entering their fourth year will have achieved an average grade of 2.1 or better in the first two years of study and an overall grade of 8 or better for each module/dissertation in the third year. For this reason, what follows builds upon rather than repeats focal (2:1 standard), not threshold, Learning Outcomes of the DipHE in TPS and the BA(Hons) in TPS.

The learning outcomes below are at the **threshold** level

A. Knowledge and understanding

On completion of this programme the successful student will have

1. an advanced and thorough understanding of parts of Scripture and their relationship to the whole and how to interpret them;
2. a systematic and advanced understanding of selected doctrines of the Christian faith and/or periods of church history and historical theology, and their significance for the contemporary church;
3. an advanced understanding of how the Christian faith engages with various leading contemporary ethical and pastoral issues;
4. an advanced understanding of the interconnectedness of the various elements within the study of theology;

Teaching/learning methods

Students gain knowledge and understanding through

- lectures – giving overall perspective, exemplary discussions of a topic, models for considering and assessing different views of a subject and explanations of complicated material;
- accompanying handouts;
- interaction in the form of questions, discussion, dialogue and argument;
- guided independent reading some of which is subsequently discussed in class;
- student-led seminars with questions and discussion;
- dissertation supervisions;
- practical exercises and simulations;
- problem analysis;
- translation in class;

<p>5. a thorough understanding of the methodologies and techniques used in the study of theology.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • class discussion of primary texts; • role play; • fieldwork; • organising an event and reflecting on it; • individual written (and at times oral) feedback on written work; • the formative dimension of assessment. <p>Assessment Method Students' knowledge and understanding are assessed by a combination of unseen written exams; assessed coursework in the form of essays, assignments and student-led seminars; book reviews; applied research projects; dissertations.</p>
<p>B. Cognitive (thinking) skills On completion of this programme the successful student will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. critically and reflectively evaluate advanced scholarship in the theological disciplines, applying a variety of critical methods, assessing views and theories and, where appropriate, proposing alternatives; 2. evaluate methodologies employed in the theological disciplines and develop critiques of them; 3. construct and articulate an integrative, coherent, well-informed, critically engaged and sustained argument and develop original application of the knowledge and understanding it contains; 4. demonstrate competence in postgraduate research skills through a substantial research dissertation and/or project. 	<p>Teaching/learning methods Students learn cognitive skills through the teaching and learning methods outlined above. Each module, whatever the format of the teaching, involves discussion of key issues in order to develop the intellectual skills described.</p> <p>Additional methods of particular importance in the development of these intellectual skills are the deliberate modelling of these skills in lectures and classes; the individual feedback given on class contributions and assessed work; provision of special sessions on research skills and methodologies; and individual dissertation supervisions. Moreover, a number of the teaching and learning methods mentioned above are employed with the intention that they should especially contribute to the development of these skills. These include guided independent reading; student-led seminars with questions and discussion; practical exercises and simulations; problem analysis; class reading and discussion of primary texts; role play.</p> <p>Assessment Method The various assessment methods employed (see 'Knowledge and Understanding' – Assessment) all place great emphasis, as shown in the assessment criteria, on the learner's ability to demonstrate these skills. Both written pieces – essays, written examinations, dissertations – and oral presentations</p>

	(e.g., student-led seminars) provide a vehicle for the demonstration of these skills.
<p>C. Practical skills</p> <p>On completion of the programme the successful student will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. articulate systematic and creative responses to typical issues arising in Christian theology and ministry; 2. communicate those responses clearly to specialist and non-specialist audiences; 3. plan and execute a substantial research dissertation or dissertation and project. 	<p>Teaching/learning methods</p> <p>Students learn practical skills across the teaching programme. With regard to project work, students receive research skills training and one-on-one tutorial supervision.</p> <p>Growing originality in the application of knowledge is modelled by faculty, forms a key dimension in class discussions and debates, is cultivated in simulations, practical exercises and problem analysis, and constitutes a major component of the formative objectives of assessment.</p> <p>Assessment Method</p> <p>Students' practical skills are assessed by essay, exam and dissertation and, in particular, by student-led seminars and assessed applied research projects.</p>

<p>12. Programme structure</p>
<p>12.1 Overall structure of the programme</p> <p>The MTh is a four-year (full-time) integrated Masters degree building from a broad foundation of theological and pastoral studies in the first three years to an area of in-depth specialisation of the student's choice in the fourth year.</p> <p>The first two years are in effect the DipHE in Theological & Pastoral Studies, and aim to cover in outline the principal areas of theological and pastoral studies. Study is introductory in the first year, then progresses to a more sophisticated analytical level in the second year.</p> <p>The latter two years (third and fourth) bring the student to degree level and then on to Masters level study. The third year builds on work in the first two years and involves high level learning and greater specialisation within the three subject areas. In-depth engagement with a topic and sustained reflective writing are required by means of the compulsory short dissertation. In the fourth year, the student is given a choice of topics to study from a selection of masters-level modules and can therefore specialise to a greater depth. The fourth year dissertation brings the student to a mature engagement with issues which have relevance for his or her own ministry, and requires independence in pursuing relevant lines of enquiry. Across the third and fourth years, students participate in the postgraduate research seminars, which expose them to a broad range of ideas and help inculcate critical thinking skills.</p>

12.2 Levels and modules

Levels 4 & 5 (Years 1 & 2)

Please see DipHE programme structure details.

Students must obtain an average of a 2.1 (B+) in the first two years of study in order to progress onto the MTh programme. A lower average might allow them to continue with the BA(Hons) programme instead (see the BA(Hons) in TPS Programme Specification).

Level 6 (Year 3)

COMPULSORY	OPTIONAL	PROGRESSION REQUIREMENTS
<p>Students must take all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SD4.1 (6,000-word BA-level dissertation)• 5 taught modules• Postgraduate Research Skills sessions (non-credit-bearing)	<p>Students must also choose for their 5 taught modules at least:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2 modules at 'Level 6B' with code 4.x• 1 module from each area of study (Biblical Studies, Theology & Church History, Church & World)	<p>Level 6 MTh students must obtain a grade of at least 8 on the 15-point scale for each module/dissertation in order to continue to Level 7. Lower grades (9–12) at Level 6 are still pass marks and might enable students to be awarded a BA(Hons) instead of proceeding to Level 7 of the MTh.</p>

Level 7 (Year 4)

COMPULSORY	OPTIONAL	PROGRESSION REQUIREMENTS
<p>Students must take all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Either RP6.4 (15,000-word Masters-level dissertation) or RP6.2 (7,500-word Masters-level dissertation) and RP6.3 (7,500-word Masters-level project).• 2 taught modules• Postgraduate Research Skills sessions (non-credit-bearing)	<p>Students must also choose at least:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The 2 taught modules must be at 'Specialist Masters-level' (code 6.x)	<p>At Level 7 of the MTh, the pass mark is 12. Lower grades are fail grades; however, it might be possible for the student to be awarded a BA(Hons).</p>

12.3 Non-compensatable modules

All modules for the MTh are non-compensatable.

13. Curriculum map

See attached.

14. Information about assessment regulations

See the current 'Information, Regulations & Procedures' handbook, and the 'Progression Requirements' noted above'.

15. Placement opportunities, requirements and support (if applicable)

N/A (Church of England ordinands registered on the MTh complete placements as part of the Certificate in Ministry programme, which runs alongside the MTh and other TPS programmes.)

16. Future careers (if applicable)

Christian ministry of various sorts (pastoral ministry, missions, academic teaching and research, counselling, youth work)

17. Particular support for learning (if applicable)

- Extensive theological library (24-hour access to over 50,000 volumes)
- IT resources: email, virtual learning environment, CD-Rom resources, Internet
- Monthly postgraduate research seminar
- Tuition sessions on postgraduate research skills
- One-to-one dissertation supervisions
- Special provision for students with special needs (e.g., English not first language, specific learning disabilities) (see Information & Regulations handbook for details)

18. JACS code (or other relevant coding system)

19. Relevant QAA subject benchmark group(s)

Theology & Religious Studies

20. Reference points

- Bloom's taxonomy of education objectives – cognitive domains
- Framework for Higher Education Qualifications
- Theology & Religious Studies Subject Benchmark Statements
- Quality in Formation Panel of the Archbishops' Council of the Church of England
- Middlesex University Learning & Quality Enhancement Handbook
- QAA – Guidelines for preparing programme specifications
- Oak Hill – Learning, Teaching & Assessment Strategy
- Student, Staff, External Examiner and Graduates' feedback and comments (particularly through Assessment Board, Academic Board and the Courses Evaluation Committee)

21. Other information

The College's programmes are also validated by the Quality in Formation Panel of the Archbishops' Council of the Church of England.

Exit Points

Students registered for the MTh whose circumstances (e.g., personal, financial) change during their course may decide to leave College before the end of the fourth year. After one year, given the appropriate range of modules studied and credit total, a student could exit and be awarded a CertHE. After two years, a student with the appropriate modules and credit total could be awarded the DipHE. (In both cases, though, the student would not have technically registered yet for the MTh, as this takes place upon progression to the third year.)

MTh students who proceeded to the third year having completed the Oak Hill DipHE, or who were admitted directly to the third year with a DipHE equivalent, may exit at the end of the third year and be awarded a BA(Hons), on the basis of 360 accumulated credits (in such cases, the normal BA(Hons) pass mark of 12 or better [16 on the Middlesex scale] applies to each module rather than the 8 required to advance to the MTh fourth year).

A 'third year Direct Entry' student who was admitted to the MTh with a BA(Hons) or equivalent does not have this option of exiting with an Oak Hill BA(Hons). In this case, however, credits gained in the third year may be used towards any future course under the national Credit Accumulation & Transfer (CAT) scheme.

Please note: Programme specifications provide a concise summary of the main features of the programme and the learning outcomes that a typical student might reasonably be expected to achieve if s/he takes full advantage of the learning opportunities that are provided. More detailed information about the programme can be found in the relevant student programme handbook and the University Regulations.

Appendix 1: MTh List of modules by subject area and level¹

Listed below are all of the modules for Level 6 (codes 3.x, 4.x) and Level 7 (code 6.x) which comprise the third and fourth years of the MTh programme, respectively.

There are four main subject areas for Level 7 modules, along with hybrid codes for modules which encompass two subject areas.² Level 6 modules retain a more diverse array of abbreviations.³

Subject Areas

BS – Biblical Studies

DH – Theology & Church History⁴

CW – Church & World

RP – Research & Projects

¹Please see DipHE in TPS information for modules available at Levels 4 and 5.

²Such modules may count in *either* subject area but not *both*.

³Certain Level 6 modules may also count in one of two subject areas, although their module codes do not clearly identify this. They are DN4.1 (Biblical Studies or Theology & Church History); DW3.1 (Theology & Church History or Church & World); SH3.2 (Theology & Church History or Church & World); and HM4.1 (Theology & Church History or Church and World). They are listed only once here for the sake of simplicity.

⁴The D in the module codes stands for Doctrine.

BD – Biblical Studies and Theology & Church History
BW – Biblical Studies and Church & World
DW – Theology & Church History and Church & World

Biblical Studies

BH3.2	Reading Biblical Hebrew
NT3.1	The Fourth Gospel
NT3.4	1 Corinthians
OT3.7	The Psalms
BS4.1	Deuteronomy
BS4.2	Advanced Biblical Hebrew Reading
DN4.1	Justification in the Bible & in Christian Doctrine
NT4.7	General Epistles
OT4.7 ⁵	Hebrew Psalms & Poetry
OT4.8	Wisdom Literature
OT4.10	Studying Prophetic Literature
BS6.1	Theology in the Old Testament & Today
BS6.5	The Old Testament in Scripture
BS6.9	The Theology of the Book of Acts

Theology & Church History

CD4.3	Doctrine of Salvation
CH4.7	Reading Primary Historical Texts
DH4.1	Doctrine of God
HM4.1	Puritan Perspectives on Ministry

Church & World

PC3.3	Pastoral Ministry
SH3.2	Christian Spirituality – Past & Present
YM3.1	Perspectives on Children, Young People & the Church in Britain
AP4.1	Apologetics for Mission
CM4.6	Advanced Christian Leadership
TM4.2	Establishing Churches across Cultures
TM4.3	Christian Theology in the Non-Western World
CW6.1	Christian Theology of World Religions

Research & Projects

SD4.1	Short Dissertation
RP6.2	Short Dissertation
RP6.3	Short Project
RP6.4	Long Dissertation

Biblical Studies and Theology & Church History

BD6.1	Christology in the Bible & in Christian Doctrine
-------	--

⁵ OT4.7 may only be taken if module OT3.7 has not previously been credited.

Biblical Studies and Church & World

BW6.1 Pauline Spirituality

Theology & Church History and Church & World

DW3.1 Evangelical Public Theology

DW6.2 Doctrine of Grace

Reading Module (Study area dependent on topic chosen by student)

RP6.7 Guided Reading

Progressive Marking Scheme for Written Coursework and Examinations at Levels 4-6

The structure of the mark scheme:

The criteria within each classification band are given under the following categories which are taken to represent the ten key criteria for assessing a piece of written work at these levels: organisation; method; relevance; coverage of data; coverage of concepts; coverage of views; argumentation; independent judgement; writing style; presentation and apparatus.

In each table the grades not specified are borderline grades, which represent work that is better than the criteria for the band below but not entirely sufficient by the criteria for the band above, perhaps by being clearly in one band on some criteria and another on other criteria of similar importance. A 16 counts as a pass.

The criteria develop in differing ways between the levels. Some of the criteria simply shift one to the left so that what they expect of a 2:1 in Level 4 they expect of a 2:2 in Level 5 (e.g. the coverage criteria). This is the case for criteria where real and clear progress is expected between each level.

With some of the criteria slower progression is expected between some levels, e.g. on independent judgement, so that the descriptions move more gradually. This is the case for the more demanding criteria.

Some of the criteria reach a peak and level off, e.g. already by Level 5 they expect very few mistakes in presentation and apparatus and do not subsequently raise this expectation to an impossible standard of flawlessness.

The use of the mark scheme:

- This scheme will be used in marking both written coursework and written examinations in all 1.x, 2.x, 3.x and 4.x modules, except modules or part-modules which consist of language work. For dissertations it is used in conjunction with the dissertation mark sheet. Obviously not all of the criteria will be applicable to both the coursework and examination elements of assessment. Apparatus, for example, is not assessed in examinations.
- The mark scheme is to serve as an agreed guide for markers, and will be applied at the discretion of markers in the light of judgements made about suitable expectations for a particular piece of work. In some coursework, for example, there may be much less taught material or reading available than in others, and the scheme is intended to allow markers the flexibility to recognize such differing expectations. It is intended to guide marking, not to hold it to ransom. In particular, a marker will exercise his/her discretion in determining the weighting between the criteria evident in a particular piece of work for determining the final mark.

CRITERIA FOR LEVEL 4 (CD1.x, OT1.x, &c.)

	A Excellent	B+ Very good	B- Good	C Satisfactory	F Fail
Organisation	a. Thoroughly structured	k. Clear structure	u. Structure evident	ee. Minimal	oo. Absent
Method	b. Very fitting	l. Fitting	v. Broadly appropriate	ff. Barely appropriate	pp. Inappropriate
Relevance	c. Nearly all relevant	m. Very largely relevant	w. Some irrelevant	gg. Much irrelevant	qq. None
Coverage of data	d. Broad	n. Key data covered	x. Significant gaps	hh. Very narrow	rr. Lacking
Coverage of concepts	e. Broad	o. Key concepts covered	y. Some covered	ii. Very narrow	ss. Lacking
Coverage of views	f. Broad	p. Key views covered	z. Some covered	jj. Almost none	tt. Solipsistic
Argumentation	g. Incisive, hints of originality	q. Coherent, derivative	aa. Essentially coherent	kk. Minimal shape evident	uu. Incoherent
Independent judgement	h. Independent elements	r. Independent elements	bb. Very largely second-hand	ll. Entirely second-hand	vv. None or random
Writing style	i. Well written	s. Very readable	cc. Good to read	mm. Uneven	ww. Bad English
Presentation and apparatus	j. Few mistakes	t. Broadly accurate	dd. Much accurate	nn. Persistent errors	xx. Deeply flawed

CRITERIA FOR LEVEL 5 (OT2.x, NT2.x, &c.)

	A Excellent	B+ Very good	B- Good	C Satisfactory	F Fail
Organisation	a. Everything in its place	k. Thoroughly structured	u. Clear structure	ee. Structure evident	oo. Minimal
Method	b. Excellent, hints of creativity	l. Fitting	v. Largely appropriate	ff. Basic but appropriate	pp. Inappropriate
Relevance	c. Entirely focused	m. Nearly all relevant	w. Mostly relevant	gg. Some relevant	qq. Largely relevant
Coverage of data	d. Broad and deep	n. Broad or deep	x. Key data covered	hh. Some real gaps	rr. Major gaps
Coverage of concepts	e. Broad and deep	o. Broad or deep	y. Key concepts covered	ii. Some real gaps	ss. Major gaps
Coverage of views	f. Broad and deep	p. Broad or deep	z. Key views covered	jj. Some mentioned	tt. Almost no awareness
Argumentation	g. Incisive, original aspects	q. Incisive, derivative	aa. Coherent, derivative	kk. Some shape evident	uu. Incoherent
Independent judgement	h. Clear independence	r. Independent elements	bb. Very largely second-hand	ll. Entirely derivative	vv. None or random
Writing style	i. Well written	s. Very readable	cc. Good to read	mm. Uneven	ww. Bad English
Presentation and apparatus	j. Very few mistakes	t. Few mistakes	dd. Broadly accurate	nn. Numerous errors	xx. Deeply flawed

CRITERIA FOR LEVEL 6 (OT3.x, CD4.x, &c.)

	1-3 Excellent	5-7 Very good	9-11 Good	13-15 Satisfactory	17-20 Fail
Organisation	a. Everything in its place	j. Everything in its place	u. Careful structure	ee. Structure evident	oo. Minimal
Method	b. Fitting, creative	l. Fitting, hints of creativity	v. Appropriate	ff. Basic but appropriate	pp. Inappropriate
Relevance	c. Ruthlessly focused	m. Nearly all relevant	w. Mostly relevant	gg. Mostly relevant	qq. Some relevant
Coverage of data	d. Exhaustive within scope	n. Broad and deep	x. Good coverage	hh. Basic data covered	rr. Very narrow
Coverage of concepts	e. Exhaustive within scope	o. Broad and deep	y. Good coverage	ii. Basic concepts covered	ss. Very narrow
Coverage of views	f. Exhaustive within scope	p. Broad and deep	z. Key views covered	jj. Some covered	tt. Almost no awareness
Argumentation	g. Ruthlessly prosecuted	q. Coherent and incisive	aa. Largely coherent	kk. Some shape evident	uu. Very confused
Independent judgement	h. Clear independence	r. Evidence of independence	bb. Largely second-hand	ll. Entirely derivative	vv. None or random
Writing style	i. Sophisticated writing	s. Well written	cc. Very readable	mm. Uneven	ww. Very rough
Presentation and apparatus	j. Very few mistakes	t. Few mistakes	dd. Broadly accurate	nn. Numerous errors	xx. Deeply flawed

Progressive Marking Scheme for ‘non-standard/placement-based coursework’ at Levels 4-5

CRITERIA FOR LEVEL 4 (TR1.x, &c.)

	A Excellent	B+ Very good	B- Good	C Satisfactory	F Fail
Methodology	a. Very fitting	k. Fitting	u. Broadly appropriate	ee. Barely appropriate	oo. Inappropriate
Theological competence	b. Incisively evident	l. Considerable	v. Some clearly evident	ff. Limited competence	pp. Little evident
Content in light of task	c. Relevant; broad or deep	m. Key content covered	w. Some content covered	gg. Major gaps	qq. Minimal content
Pastoral discernment	d. Insightful	n. Considerable	x. Some evident	hh. Limited	rr. None evident
Mission orientation	e. Thorough	o. Clearly evident	y. Some evident	ii. Limited	ss. None evident
Application	f. Insightful	p. Well applied	z. Some application	jj. Minimal application	tt. Lacking application
Integration of class- and work-based learning	g. Very well integrated	q. Well integrated	aa. Some integration	kk. Limited integration	uu. Lacking integration
Logical coherence	h. Thoroughly coherent	r. Mostly coherent	bb. Broadly coherent	ll. Limited coherence	vv. Barely coherent
Organisation	i. Thoroughly structured	s. Clear structure	cc. Some structure evident	mm. Minimal structure	ww. Lacking structure
Presentation / delivery	j. Very few mistakes	t. Well expressed	dd. Good to read / hear	nn. Uneven	xx. Poorly expressed

CRITERIA FOR LEVEL 5 (TR2.x, &c.)

	A Excellent	B+ Very good	B- Good	C Satisfactory	F Fail
Methodology	a. Thoroughly appropriate	k. Very fitting	u. Fitting	ee. Broadly appropriate	oo. Barely appropriate
Theological competence	b. Very incisive throughout	l. Incisively evident	v. Considerable	ff. Some clearly evident	pp. Limited competence
Content in light of task	c. Relevant, broad and deep	m. Relevant, broad or deep	w. Key content covered	gg. Some content covered	qq. Major gaps
Pastoral discernment	d. Very insightful	n. Insightful	x. Considerable	hh. Some evident	rr. Very limited
Mission orientation	e. Very thorough	o. Thorough	y. Clearly evident	ii. Some evident	ss. Very limited
Application	f. Very insightful and apposite	p. Insightful	z. Well applied	jj. Some application	tt. Minimal application
Integration of class- and work-based learning	g. Thoroughly and incisively integrated	q. Very well integrated	aa. Well integrated	kk. Some integration	uu. Very limited integration
Logical coherence	h. Incisive throughout	r. Thoroughly coherent	bb. Mostly coherent	ll. Broadly coherent	vv. Limited coherence
Organisation	i. Everything in its place	s. Thoroughly structured	cc. Clear structure	mm. Some structure	ww. Minimal structure
Presentation / delivery	j. Impressively well expressed	t. Very few mistakes	dd. Well expressed	nn. Good to read/hear	xx. Uneven

Marking Scheme for Assignments at Levels 4-6 (Pass/Fail Only)

The structure and use of the mark scheme

This scheme will be used in marking particular assignments where it is felt that the piece of work concerned can only realistically be graded as Pass or Fail (with a Fail grade being applied for a token or non-submission): an example would be a sermon preached to a regular congregation in a genuine local church context. Students will be told in advance to which pieces of assessment this particular scheme will be applied within a given module.

CRITERIA FOR LEVELS 4, 5 and 6 (TR1.x, TR2.x, TM3.x, CM4.x, &c.)

P	Pass	Satisfactory Submission
N	Fail	Token or Non-Submission

Progressive Marking Scheme for Written Coursework and Examinations at Level 7

The structure of the mark scheme:

The scheme covers different aspects of a piece of work, from reading and research, through argumentation to presentational standards. Key criteria include: organisation; method; relevance; coverage of data; coverage of concepts; coverage of views; argumentation; independent judgement; writing style; presentation and apparatus.

The use of the mark scheme:

This scheme will be used in marking both written coursework and written examinations in all 5.x and 6.x modules, except for dissertations and for modules or part-modules which consist of language work. For dissertations it is used in conjunction with the dissertation mark sheet. Obviously not all of the criteria will be applicable to both the coursework and examination elements of assessment. Apparatus, for example, is not assessed in examinations.

The mark scheme is to serve as an agreed guide for markers, and will be applied at the discretion of markers in the light of judgements made about suitable expectations for a particular piece of work. In some coursework, for example, there may be much less taught material or reading available than in others, and the scheme is intended to allow markers the flexibility to recognize such differing expectations. It is intended to guide marking, not to hold it to ransom. In particular, a marker will exercise his/her discretion in determining the weight between the criteria evident in a particular piece of work for determining the final mark.

The criteria will be used cumulatively, so that a Level 7 piece of work will be required to meet the relevant positive criteria for work done at Levels 4, 5 and 6.

Use of grade point 15:

This mark scheme does not include reference to grade point 15, because this is the mark given where work is not submitted.

1-3 – Excellent	4-6 – Very Good	7-9 – Good	10-12 – Satisfactory	13-14 – Fail
<p>Work submitted is excellent, demonstrating high levels of competence across a range of criteria and leaving very little or no room for improvement</p> <p>a. an entirely relevant answer to the question in which each of the component parts makes an integrated and clear contribution to the whole</p> <p>b. thorough knowledge of the obviously relevant sources and initiative in seeking out additional sources</p> <p>c. well-directed application of knowledge from, or informed by, the forefront of the relevant discipline with no relevant ground omitted</p> <p>d. advanced, sophisticated and integrated conceptual understanding</p> <p>e. outstanding analytical, synthetic management of sources</p> <p>f. the generation and clear articulation of independent critical insights</p> <p>g. originality or creativity in developing new perspectives, insights or arguments</p> <p>h. deployment of a wide and relevant range of disciplinary perspectives and methods</p> <p>i. clear, coherent, well-structured, logically well-formed, and sustained argument lucidly and elegantly expressed</p> <p>j. virtually flawless presentation and citation</p>	<p>Work submitted is very good but lacks characteristics of excellent work or across a range of criteria still leaves room for improvement</p> <p>k. a relevant and focussed answer to the question in which the component parts make a clear contribution to the whole</p> <p>l. thorough knowledge of the obviously relevant sources</p> <p>m. well-directed application of knowledge from, or informed by, the forefront of the relevant discipline</p> <p>n. advanced conceptual understanding</p> <p>o. very good analytical and synthetic management of sources</p> <p>p. some independent critical insight and/or the judicious application of sophisticated critical insight of others</p> <p>q. some originality or creativity in developing new perspectives, insights or arguments</p> <p>r. deployment of a relevant range of disciplinary perspectives and methods</p> <p>s. clear, coherent, well-structured, logically well-formed, and sustained argument which is very well-written</p> <p>t. very good presentation and citation</p>	<p>Work submitted is good but there is significant room for improvement across a range of criteria</p> <p>u. an answer to the question as set but with some relevant material missing and / or some irrelevant material included</p> <p>v. a good knowledge of the obviously relevant sources</p> <p>w. generally accurate application of knowledge informed by the forefront of the relevant discipline although acquired mostly in class or from set reading</p> <p>x. good conceptual understanding</p> <p>y. good analytical and synthetic management of sources</p> <p>z. little or no independent critical insight but good application of the critical insight of others though with a tendency to general argument</p> <p>aa. some originality or creativity in developing new perspectives, insights or arguments</p> <p>bb. deployment of the essential disciplinary perspectives and methods</p> <p>cc. an organised, coherent and well-written argument with a recognisable conclusion and supporting reasons</p> <p>dd. generally accurate presentation and good citation of sources</p>	<p>Work submitted is acceptable (it attains threshold standard) but it is either seriously defective in one or two respects or minimally acceptable across a range of criteria</p> <p>ee. an answer to the question is recognisable but with noticeable omissions and irrelevancies</p> <p>ff. an adequate knowledge of a reasonable proportion of the obviously relevant sources</p> <p>gg. unfocussed application of knowledge acquired only in class or from set reading</p> <p>hh. adequate understanding of key concepts</p> <p>ii. some endeavour to inhabit and integrate a variety of sources</p> <p>jj. little or no independent critical insight along with adequate - and not always pertinent - application of the critical insight of others though with a tendency to general argument</p> <p>kk. little or no independence or creativity shown</p> <p>ll. limited but adequate deployment of the essential disciplinary perspectives and methods</p> <p>mm. a recognisable argument, adequately organised but marked by logical errors and/or satisfactory rather than pleasing expression</p> <p>nn. adequate accurate presentation and good citation of sources</p>	<p>Work is submitted but is characterised by unacceptably low standards</p> <p>oo. the demands of the task have been barely addressed</p> <p>pp. insufficient knowledge of the relevant material</p> <p>qq. such knowledge as is shown is not used to answer the question</p> <p>rr. inadequate grasp of key concepts</p> <p>ss. use of sources is uncritical and not integrated</p> <p>tt. little or no critical engagement</p> <p>uu. entirely or almost entirely dependent and derivative</p> <p>vv. inadequate understanding and deployment of relevant methods</p> <p>ww. argument is either absent or incoherent and unstructured and is poorly expressed</p> <p>xx. many mistakes in presentation and failure to observe accepted norms of academic presentation in matters of citation of sources and bibliography</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>yy. Token or no submission</p>