

MSc Educational Leadership
Course 1: Developing as a Leader

Course Code: EDUA11263

Course Start Date: September 2011

Candidate Name:

Student Number:

Assessment Criteria	Comment
Demonstrate a critical understanding of the principles underpinning leadership and management in schools drawing on relevant literature	
Demonstrate a critical understanding of key implications for the development of leadership practice in an educational context drawing on relevant practice and experience	
Plan, gather, select and justify appropriate evidence including feedback from significant colleagues to support self evaluation of own leadership skills	
Conduct a rigorous self-evaluation of own leadership skills drawing on relevant literature	
From the review of self-evaluation, identify and justify targets for own development in leadership	
Present work with a clear, coherent and accessible structure with conventions fully adhered.	

General comment/advice:

Mark %:

Grade:

First Marker:

Date:

Signed:

Second marker:

Date:

Signed:

Postgraduate Common Marking Scheme

Mark %	Grade A-F	Description
90-100	A1	An excellent performance
80-89	A2	
70-79	A3	
60-69	B	A very good performance
50-59	C	A good performance satisfactory for a masters degree
40-49	D	A satisfactory performance for the diploma, but inadequate for a masters degree
30-39	E	Marginal fail
20-29	F	Clear fail
10-19	G	Bad fail
0-9	H	Bad fail

Criteria for assessing work as A, B, C, D, or E

The criteria relate to general requirements for work at Masters level, and therefore relate to the overarching standards which govern the interpretation of the performance criteria for specific courses. This means that the specific criteria for each course will be interpreted against the general criteria which are listed below.

There are six general categories:

- knowledge and understanding of concepts
- knowledge and use of the literature
- critical reflection on theory and practice
- application to theory to practice
- planning and implementation of research/investigation (to be applied as appropriate)
- constructing academic discourse.

The criteria for each category are as follows:

Knowledge and understanding of concepts

- A The assignment shows that the student has understood the main concepts and theories dealt with in the course, without any misunderstanding, and has been able to integrate this understanding into a coherent framework.
- B The assignment shows that the student understands the main concepts and theories dealt with in the course, without any misunderstanding.
- C The theories and concepts dealt with in the assignment reflect a major part of the content of the course, and are handled in a way that demonstrates that the student understands these concepts, although there is some misunderstanding.
- D There is evidence of a degree of understanding at the conceptual and theoretical level in what is assessed in the assignment but there are some omissions or misunderstandings in the student's handling of the theories and concepts dealt with in the course.
- E There is little or no evidence of understanding of the theories and concepts dealt with in the course, or the theories and concepts are handled in a way that shows considerable misunderstanding or omission.

Knowledge and Use of the Literature

* See postgraduate common marking scheme for details about general masters criteria and marking

- A The student has used most of the key references in the reading list for this course, without necessarily referring to every item on the list, and has in addition drawn on other sources, and has integrated the ideas from all this material into a coherent and analytical framework.
- B The student has drawn on a wide range of appropriate sources, recommended for this course, and has integrated the key ideas from these sources into a coherent and analytical framework.
- C The assignment shows that the student is familiar with a sufficient range of key sources recommended for this course, and has been able to use these sources relevantly and with a degree of critical understanding.
- D The student has drawn on a limited range of sources recommended for this course and these texts have been used for the most part relevantly but with superficial understanding.
- E There is little or no evidence of familiarity with any of the sources recommended for this course, and/or those sources which are used are largely used irrelevantly or with misunderstanding.

Critical Reflection on Theory and Practice

- A There is extended critical discussion of most of the issues dealt with in the course; these issues are brought together into an overall and coherent framework; the issues are examined from several relevant perspectives; there is generalisation beyond the immediate topic.
- B There is extended critical discussion of most of the issues dealt with in the course; the issues are brought together into an overall and coherent framework; the discussion examines issues from more than one perspective.
- C There is extended critical discussion of most of the issues dealt with in the course, without there being an overall integration of the issues, and/or the discussion is largely conducted from one perspective.
- D There is some critical discussion of some of the issues dealt with in the course, but this discussion is not very extensive, or is not pursued to any depth, or shows evidence of inconsistency.
- E The assignment largely consists of anecdotal or descriptive content, or of unsupported assertions or unquestioned assumptions.

Application of Theory to Practice

- A The implications of theory for policy and/or practice are thoroughly discussed and their limitations fully specified.
- B The main implications of theory for policy and/or practice are outlined and their limitations specified.
- C The main implications of theory for policy and/or practice are outlined.
- D Superficial awareness of the implications of theory for policy and practice is demonstrated.
- E The assignment fails to identify any implications of theory for policy and practice.

Planning and Implementation of Research/Investigation

- A The research question(s) is/are clear and operational definitions fully specified; data collection methods are justified with detailed evaluation of alternatives; both reliability and validity are evaluated; presentations of findings are clear and thorough; conclusions are drawn and evaluated.
- B Research question(s) is/are clear and there is some discussion of operational definitions; data collection method is justified with some reference to alternatives; some awareness of validity and reliability; clear presentation and findings; a range of conclusions are drawn.

- C Research question(s) is/are clear; data collection method is justified but with little evaluation of alternatives; some awareness of data limitations; adequate presentation of findings; some conclusions are drawn.
- D Research question(s) is/are only sketchily outlined; some justification for data collection method; lack of critical evaluation of data; unclear presentation of findings; conclusions are unclear.
- E Research question(s) is/are not specified; no rationale for data collection method; no evaluation of data; confused or incomplete presentation of findings; no attempt to draw conclusions.

Constructing Academic Discourse

- A The quality of the writing, expression of ideas and conformity to conventions of referencing are consistent with the quality required for publication in an academic/professional journal.
- B Consistent understanding is demonstrated in a well-structured, clear and appropriate manner which conforms to conventions of academic writing.
- C The assignment demonstrates understanding and expression/application of ideas in a style which is mostly logical, coherent, fluent and appropriate to the conventions of academic writing.
- D For the most part the assignment demonstrates a logical and coherent understanding of the subject matter but sections of the argument become confused or undeveloped, or stylistically inappropriate, and do not conform to the conventions of academic writing.
- E The assignment lacks a logical and coherent framework or the expression of the ideas is confused or underdeveloped, or stylistically inappropriate, or does not conform in any way to the conventions of academic writing.