

COMMON GRADING SCHEME (Critiqued Scientific Review)

The Common Grading Scheme (CGS) applies to all courses, except where published Assessment & Award Regulations incorporate the 10-point scheme.

This is the marking scheme for individual pieces of work and not the degree classification scheme. The latter is calculated through the aggregation of marks from the full range of assessments undertaken by a candidate.

Each mark has a short descriptor and a full definition of what is to be expected of an answer that is assigned that mark. For the more commonly used grades, there is a core descriptor of the essential grade (e.g. upper second) and enhancer/detractor points which would place the mark in the 'high' or 'low' range of the 'class'. Only those percentages that appear with descriptors in the marking scheme are to be used; percentages that fall between these **must not** be used.

Application of the Scheme

The descriptors indicate how marks should be allocated according to the standard of a piece of work in three different categories; "selection and coverage of material", "understanding of concepts and critical ability" and "structure, clarity and presentation". Where an answer comprises entirely or almost entirely incorrect information, no credit will be given for Structure, Clarity and Presentation.

Descriptor	Critiqued Scientific Review	Mark	BSc Class	BVM/VN/MSc/ CertAVP Grade
No Answer	<p>Selection & Coverage of Material Nothing presented or containing nothing at all of relevance and/or completely incorrect description of PICO (patient/population, intervention/exposure, comparison and outcomes) model / methodology.</p> <p>and / or</p> <p>Understanding of Concepts & Critical Ability None evident. No evidence of wider reading of an appropriate nature.</p> <p>and / or</p> <p>Structure, Clarity & Presentation None or extremely poor.</p>	0	Fail	Fail
Extremely Poor Answer	<p>Selection & Coverage of Material Virtually no information provided or information that is almost entirely incorrect and/or irrelevant. Flawed approach to PICO (patient/population, intervention/exposure, comparison and outcomes) model / methodology.</p> <p>and / or</p> <p>Understanding of Concepts & Critical Ability No or almost no understanding evident. No, or almost no, evidence of wider reading of an appropriate nature.</p> <p>and / or</p> <p>Structure, Clarity & Presentation None or very poor.</p>	15	Fail	Fail
Very Poor Answer	<p>Selection & Coverage of Material Very limited amount of information that is correct and relevant. Flawed approach to PICO (patient/population, intervention/exposure, comparison and outcomes) model / methodology.</p> <p>and / or</p> <p>Understanding of Concepts & Critical Ability If any, extremely limited evidence of understanding. No, or almost no, evidence of wider reading of an appropriate nature.</p> <p>and / or</p> <p>Structure, Clarity & Presentation Very poor.</p>	27	Fail	Fail

Descriptor	Critiqued Scientific Review	Mark	BSc Class	BVM/VN/MSc/ CertAVP Grade
Poor Answer	<p>Selection & Coverage of Material Incomplete and/or inaccurate account of task with inadequate description of hypothesis and inadequate description of PICO (patient/population, intervention/exposure, comparison and outcomes) methodologies used. Presence of significant, and/or many errors in selection of literature.</p> <p>and / or</p> <p>Understanding of Concepts & Critical Ability If any, very limited evidence of understanding of the PICO process to critique scientific literature and address hypothesis. Little or no evidence of critical ability and/or powers of argument and original/innovative thought expressed through appropriate refinement of inclusion and exclusion criteria and correct classification of 'Level of Evidence' of selected papers.</p> <p>and / or</p> <p>Structure, Clarity & Presentation Poor/inadequate application of the PICO process and templates provided for the task. Poor/inadequate ordering of appendices in line with guidelines. Poor presentation of discussion section with inadequate clarity of expression.</p>	35	Fail	Fail
Clearly Deficient Answer	<p><i>As for 45 but with a greater number, and/or more significant, omissions/inaccuracies/errors, flaws in understanding, interpretation, presentation and/or communication of information.</i></p>	42	Third	Fail
Deficient Answer	<p>Selection & Coverage of Material Superficial account of task with imprecise statement of hypothesis / PICO (patient/population, intervention/exposure, comparison and outcomes) question and relevance of both to subject area. Limited description of PICO methodologies used but with only minor errors, omissions or inaccuracies.</p> <p>and / or</p> <p>Understanding of Concepts & Critical Ability Below expectations for understanding the PICO process to critique scientific literature and address hypothesis. Insufficient evidence of critical ability and/or powers of argument and original/innovative thought expressed through appropriate refinement of inclusion and exclusion criteria and correct classification of 'Level of Evidence' of selected papers. Inadequate interpretation of the evidence collected outlined by appropriate conclusions.</p> <p>and / or</p> <p>Structure, Clarity & Presentation Below expectations for application of the PICO process and templates provided for the task. Appropriate ordering of appendices in line with guidelines. Limitations in organisation and logical presentation of discussion section and/or some deficiencies in clarity of expression.</p>	45	Third	Fail
Marginally Deficient Answer	<p><i>As for 45 but with fewer, and/or less significant, omissions/inaccuracies/errors, flaws in understanding, interpretation, presentation and/or communication of information.</i></p>	48	Third	Fail

Descriptor	Critiqued Scientific Review	Mark	BSc Class	BVM/VN/MSc/ CertAVP Grade
Adequate Answer	<i>As for 55 but with more numerous, and/or more significant, omissions/inaccuracies/errors, flaws in understanding, interpretation, presentation and/or communication of information.</i>	52	2:ii	Pass
Sound Answer	<p>Selection & Coverage of Material Systematic account of task with clear statement of hypothesis and PICO (patient/population, intervention/exposure, comparison and outcomes) question and relevance of both to subject area. Adequate description of PICO methodologies used with minimal errors, omissions or inaccuracies. Description should include key words, eligibility criteria and information sources employed for the search, and search strategy used.</p> <p>Understanding of Concepts & Critical Ability Adequate evidence of understanding of the PICO process to critique scientific literature and address hypothesis. Adequate evidence of critical ability and/or powers of argument and original/innovative thought expressed through appropriate refinement of inclusion and exclusion criteria and correct classification of 'Level of Evidence' of selected papers. Adequate interpretation of the evidence collected outlined by appropriate conclusions.</p> <p>Structure, Clarity & Presentation Appropriate application of the PICO process and templates provided for the task. Appropriate ordering of appendices in line with guidelines. Reasonably well-organised and logical presentation of discussion section with adequate clarity of expression.</p>	55	2:ii	Pass
Very Sound Answer	<i>As for 55 but with fewer, and/or less significant, omissions/inaccuracies/errors in the PICO process and more evidence of critical ability and/or powers of argument and clarity of expression.</i>	58	2:ii	Pass
Quite Good Answer	<i>As for 65 but with less evidence of critical judgement and more, or more important, omissions/ inaccuracies/errors. There is likely to be less evidence of wider reading through reference to published work from authoritative sources.</i>	62	2:i	Pass

Descriptor	Critiqued Scientific Review	Mark	BSc Class	BVM/VN/MSc/ CertAVP Grade
Good Answer	<p>Selection & Coverage of Material Systematic account of task with clear statement of hypothesis and PICO (patient/population, intervention/exposure, comparison and outcomes) question and relevance of both to subject area. Clear description of PICO methodologies used with no significant errors, omissions or inaccuracies. Description should include key words, eligibility criteria and information sources employed for the search, and search strategy used.</p> <p>Understanding of Concepts & Critical Ability Good evidence of understanding of the PICO process to critique scientific literature and address hypothesis. Good evidence of critical ability and/or powers of argument and original/innovative thought expressed through appropriate refinement of inclusion and exclusion criteria and correct classification of 'Level of Evidence' of selected papers. Well-reasoned interpretation of the evidence collected outlined by appropriate conclusions.</p> <p>Structure, Clarity & Presentation Competent application of the PICO process and templates provided for the task. Appropriate ordering of appendices in line with guidelines. Good organisation and logical presentation of discussion section with good clarity of expression.</p>	65	2:i	Merit
Very Good Answer	<i>As for 65 but with more evidence of critical judgement and fewer and/or less significant omissions/inaccuracies/errors. There is likely to be more evidence of wider reading through reference to published work from authoritative sources.</i>	68	2:i	Merit
Extremely Good Answer	<p>Selection & Coverage of Material Systematic account of task with clear statement of hypothesis and PICO (patient/population, intervention/exposure, comparison and outcomes) question and relevance of both to subject area. Extremely good description of PICO methodologies used with no errors, omissions or inaccuracies. Description should include key words, eligibility criteria and information sources employed for the search, and search strategy used.</p> <p>Understanding Thorough understanding of the PICO process to critique scientific literature and address hypothesis. Clear evidence of critical ability and/or powers of argument and original/innovative thought expressed through appropriate refinement of inclusion and exclusion criteria and correct classification of 'Level of Evidence' of selected papers. Extremely good interpretation of the evidence collected outlined by appropriate conclusions.</p> <p>Structure, Clarity & Presentation Exemplary application of the PICO process and templates provided for the task. Appropriate ordering of appendices in line with guidelines. Excellent organisation and logical presentation of discussion section with clarity of expression throughout.</p>	75	First	Distinction
Excellent Answer	<i>As for 75 but demonstrating an authoritative grasp of concepts with sustained powers of argument, frequent insights and much evidence of original/innovative thinking. Virtually no errors or omissions and none of significance.</i>	82	First	Distinction
Outstanding Answer	<i>As for 82 but with strong evidence of original/innovative thinking throughout and no omissions or factual errors. Would be of publishable standard with only minor modifications to content.</i>	90	First	Distinction
Exceptional Answer	<p>Selection & Coverage of Material Exceptional depth of coverage with no identifiable errors or omissions.</p>	100	First	Distinction

Descriptor	Critiqued Scientific Review	Mark	BSc Class	BVM/VN/MSc/ CertAVP Grade
	Understanding Exceptional powers of analysis, argument, synthesis and insight. Structure, Clarity & Presentation Flawless. Of publishable standard with only amendments in style/formatting required.			