

mmu Institute of Education



Manchester
Metropolitan
University

Multi-Professional Education

Professional Development Programme

8

**Guidance on
Assessment & the
Assessment
Matrices**

September 2009 onwards

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
ANONYMOUS ASSESSMENT OF COURSEWORK	3
ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	4
Postgraduate Marks	5
UNDERGRADUATE MARKS	6
PLAIGIARISM	6
FORMAL SUBMISSION OF WORK	7
SUBMISSION DEADLINES	8
FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS	10
SUBMISSION EXTENSIONS	10
PENALTIES FOR LATE SUBMISSION OF WORK FOR ASSESSMENT	10
TUTOR COMMENTS ON WORK IN PROGRESS (DRAFTS)	
APPENDIX 1: ASSESSMENT MATRICES (LEVEL M - 7)	
APPENDIX 2: ASSESSMENT MATRICES (LEVEL U - 6)	
APPENDIX 3: SUBMISSION COVERSHEET	
APPENDIX 2: TIME LOG	
APPENDIX 3: EVIDENCE LOG	
APPENDIX 4: UNIT EVALUATIONS AND IMPACT DOCUMENT	

ASSESSMENT GUIDANCE

Introduction

The purpose of this guidance is to make available authoritative information on the submission of course assessments. Further advice and support can be obtained from unit tutors and course leaders. This guidance is subject to the Undergraduate and Postgraduate Regulations for the Academic Awards of the University.

The terms ‘assessed coursework’ and ‘other assessments’ encompass all those forms of summative assessments (other than written examinations) which contribute to a student’s unit and/or stage assessments, including: written assignments, studio work, performance, presentations, practicals, projects and dissertation.

The purpose of assessment is to enable students to demonstrate that they have fulfilled the objectives of the programme of study and achieved the required learning outcomes to the standard required for the award they seek.

Assessment is a matter of judgement, not simply of computation. Marks grades and percentages are not absolute values but indicators of an examiner’s judgements about different aspects of a student’s work. They provide information on which the final decision on a student’s fulfilment of course objectives may be based. In determining the final recommendation to be made in respect of a student, the Board of Examiners will take into account such matters as in its judgement are relevant.

Activities generating marks that contribute to the assessment of a student’s performance in a unit are referred to as summative assessments. They are marked to inform students about their progress and level of performance. **All** credit bearing units are subject to summative assessment. All assessment outcomes are determined with respect to learning outcomes and unit aims and objectives.

The nature, frequency and form of assessed coursework will of necessity vary between programmes. The time taken for it to be marked or otherwise assessed, returned to students and feedback provided will also vary and these factors will determine the submission dates and absolute deadlines referred to below.

Anonymous Assessment of Coursework

The Professional Development Programme subscribes to the University’s policy on anonymous marking of coursework including anonymous second marking and moderation. This measure will protect staff from the potential suspicion of bias, but more significantly it eliminates the influence of a tutors preconceptions about gender, race or personal knowledge of students.

Anonymous assessment will have the positive effect of ensuring that all assignments are marked on same basis. Knowledge of Personal Learning Plans (PLPs) or extenuating circumstances will not influence the marking decision or process. These are circumstances which will be dealt with during the moderation process.

There are however exceptions and exemptions from the anonymous assessment of coursework. Within the PDP the following are likely exemptions:

- transient assessments such as oral presentations,
- assessments in which candidates can be identified during the assessment, e.g. observation of professional practice or performance,
- assessments in which the production of the work has been closely supervised by the marker e.g. fine art work and dissertations.

Assessment Criteria

Assessment criteria provide a consistent, coherent framework embracing the work of all units, stages and courses in the Professional Development Programme (PDP). The assessment criteria refer to the expected outcomes of all PDP work. They include:

(1) Knowledge and Understanding (acknowledging many sources of knowledge-base): Knowledge and understanding of key concepts and critical awareness of issues at or informed by, or at the forefront of an academic discipline, field of study, or area of knowledge

(2) Thinking Skills

The ability to critically evaluate:

- current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline;
- methodologies and develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, propose new hypotheses;
- complex issues systematically and with originality and make sound judgements in the absence of complete data

(3) Practical Skills

Practical skills involve the ability to:

- apply knowledge to the solution of problems;
- use research techniques to answer questions;
- solve complex practical problems;
- demonstrate implications for improving professional practice. (In some courses to undertake assessment and teaching to meet specific outcomes.)

(4) Transferable Skills

Transferable Skills involve the ability to:

- locate and use a range of resources for study
- communicate arguments effectively
- act and work autonomously and collaboratively as appropriate
- collect and use critically evidence to demonstrate arguments and professional development
- engage in peer scrutiny/ access and use peer support.

Detailed **Marking Criteria** are provided for each award level on the appended matrices at the end of this guidance. Normally, all unit outcomes are assessed against these criteria. However, where more specific assessment criteria for a unit are needed they are provided for students in the specific handbook.

All elements of summative assessment shall be marked out of 100 in accordance with the marking schemes below.

There will be explicit reference to assessment matrix descriptors to indicate achievements within the mark grading bands.

Taught postgraduate units which are at level 7 (QAA's Framework for Higher Education Qualifications [FHEQ] Level M).

Marks

The level 7 (postgraduate) unit pass mark is 50%. The mark will take into account the individual weightings of each element of assessment included within it to ensure that a student who achieves a threshold pass has demonstrated all unit learning outcomes. Students who fail taught units shall have an opportunity to redeem the initial unit failure(s). The mark for any unit in which a student is re-assessed will be **capped at 50%**.

Postgraduate Certificates, Postgraduate Diplomas and Master's Degrees may be awarded at pass level, with Credit, or with Distinction.
At FHEQ level H [5 and6] the following applies.

Mark	Outcome	Descriptor
<45	Fail	Learning outcomes not achieved
45 to 49	Marginal fail	Some learning outcomes achieved at a threshold level
50 to 59	Pass	All learning outcomes achieved at a threshold level
60 to 69	Pass	All learning outcomes achieved at a good level
>70	Pass	All learning outcomes achieved at an excellent/outstanding level

At FHEQ level H (undergraduate) [levels 5 and 6] the pass mark is 40%. Students will be required to undertake reassessment in units in which they have not achieved a mark of at least 40%. The mark for any unit in which a student is reassessed shall be **capped at 40%.**

Summative assessment marks determining progression in undergraduate and postgraduate programmes from one stage to another and/or contributing to the determination of the final award of a student on either an undergraduate or taught postgraduate programme are subject to internal and where appropriate external moderation before final confirmation by the Board of Examiners.

Mark	Outcome	Descriptor
<35	Fail	Learning outcomes not achieved
35 to 39	Marginal fail	Some learning outcomes achieved at a threshold level
40 to 49	Pass	All learning outcomes achieved at a threshold level
50 to 59	Pass	All learning outcomes achieved at a good level
60 to 69	Pass	All learning outcomes achieved at a very good level
>70	Pass	All learning outcomes achieved at an excellent/outstanding level

Plagiarism (academic dishonesty)

Plagiarism is to take another person's work and use it as if it were one's own in a manner which misleads the reader. Whole pieces of work can be plagiarised (e.g. where a student puts his/her name to the work of another author), or extracts of from various sources can be plagiarised, (e.g. where chapters or extracts are taken from other unacknowledged sources). Occasionally plagiarism may be unintentional, where a student fails to read the instructions about, or to understand the rules governing the acknowledgement sources in the presentation of work. **Premeditated attempts to deceive the examiners are regarded as cheating and are treated very severely by the Programme Examination Boards.** The university provides a valuable resource which answers the most common questions about plagiarism and suggests ways it can be discouraged and detected. The resource can be found at: <http://www.ltu.mmu.ac.uk/plagiarism/index.php>.

Formal Submission of Work

The formal submission of work for assessment must be made to the appropriate Student Life Office at either of the following campuses.

Student Life Office
Institute of Education
Manchester Metropolitan University
799 Wilmslow Road
Didsbury
MANCHESTER
M20 2RR

Tel: 0161 247 2011/2012
cpd.didsbury@mmu.ac.uk

Student Life Office
Institute of Education
Manchester Metropolitan University
Crewe Green Road
CREWE
Cheshire
CW1 5DU

Tel: 0160 247 5582
cpd.crewe@mmu.ac.uk

If you would like to discuss the submission of your work please contact the appropriate address.

WORK MUST NOT BE SUBMITTED DIRECTLY TO TUTORS – IT MUST BE SUBMITTED WITH FULL DOCUMENTATION TO THE APPROPRIATE STUDENT LIFE OFFICE EITHER DIRECTLY, VIA A SUBMISSION BIN OR BY POST.

The work must have a fully completed **assignment cover sheet**. This involves entering the

- MMUID Number
- Name
- Course and the unit number and title
- Level of the submitted work
- Term and year of the unit taken and
- **signing the plagiarism declaration**

If the coversheet is not completed, or if it is completed incorrectly the work will be returned to the student for correction; if this means that the work misses an assessment deadline this is the responsibility of the student.

Presentational requirements for the submission of work are in the booklets entitled

- Guidance on References, Quotations and Bibliographies
- Guidance on Submitting Work for Assessment and
- Guidance on submitting a Practitioner Report/Dissertation/Management Study

All work should be presented to a “**professional standard**” and meet the presentation requirements noted below;

- There should be a left margin of 35 mm, a right margin of 20 mm and top/bottom margins of 20mm The document should be 1½ line spaced, with quotations double (left and right) indented (1cm) and single line spaced.
- individual pages **must not** be placed in separate plastic pockets.
- Where there are a number of chapters in an assignment there should be a complete index and where there are appendices, there should be an appendix index.
- All work should be checked for typographical errors.
- There should be a bibliography which meets the guidance set out in Guidance 1: Guidance on References, Quotations and Bibliographies
- Work which fails to meet the above requirements will be deemed “**not in a fit state for assessment**” for example, by virtue of
 - Having poor spelling/grammar
 - Having incorrect citation and/or bibliography technique,
 - not being in the required presentational format
- Work should be presented in an A4 Plastic folder (**not a ring binder**) unless specific alternative instructions are given in the unit booklet or programme handbook.
- The only form of identification on the actual text of work submitted for assessment is the students MMUID Number – student **names must not be on the text.**
- There must be an ‘**assessment submission sheet**’, indicating the students name, MMUID Number, course and the title of the assessment
- The declarations regarding plagiarism **must** be signed
- Work should be word processed using an eleven (11) or twelve (12) point font.
- Only one side of the paper should be used. Pages **must** be numbered.

Such work will be returned to students for correction and resubmission without detriment to their marks.

Students are responsible for ensuring that work is submitted by the appropriate date. Students are required to **keep a back up and hard copy** of submitted work together with any associated documentation pertaining to that work. A **receipt will be sent to the student’s university e-mail address when work has been submitted.**

Submission Deadlines

Students are informed at the beginning of their programme of study or, in the case of undergraduate students at the commencement of each stage of their programme of study, or as soon as is practical thereafter of all deadlines for the submission of each element of summatively assessed course work and other assessments and of the procedure for the submission and receipt of work.

Normally, there is a submission deadline at the beginning of each term. The actual dates are shown on both the students’ and the tutors’ calendars. Work may be submitted at any time prior to a submission date. It will be marked in accordance with the appropriate assessment matrix and submitted to the next examination board. ‘Submission’ in this context means more than just ‘handing in’; it is to be understood

as referring to the completion of and making coursework available for assessment. In order to encourage students to complete unit assessment and gain maximum benefit from the unit the Professional Development Programme, in agreement with the external examiners, assignments **must be submitted** no later than **ONE TERM** after the end of the taught unit as indicated in the table below:

Taught Session		Final Submission Date
Autumn Term	→	After the Easter Break
Spring Term	→	September after the Summer Break
Summer Term	→	January after the Christmas Break

Feed back to Students

Marking is intended to be developmental and formative not just summative. Not only does marking make a holistic judgment on an assignment, it also gives guidance on those aspects that need improvement. Students will be given written comments on the PDP Assessment Sheet which will give some indication the quality of their work. It will include a percentage mark, general comments on the overall qualities of the assignment and specific observations on particular points in the assignment. All marks given are provisional, **subject to confirmation** by the Programme Examinations Board. If an assignment fails, guidance, on how to improve it will be given. An opportunity to resubmit the work, to a new deadline, is available. The process is subject of the university's Regulations for Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate Programmes of Study.

Submission Extensions

Students must normally keep to the agreed deadlines for the handing in of assignments. In **exceptional circumstances** an extension may be requested as soon as the student is aware of circumstances which may prevent the timely submission of work. Student seeking an extension should submit an extension request form. Students submitting work for assessment after the published deadline, without the appropriate authorization, may have their mark reduced to minimum pass or to zero (0%) in serious cases in accordance with the scheme approved by the Academic Board.

Penalties for Late Submission of Work for assessment

In the case of a late submission, beyond the maximum permitted deadline, students may submit evidence of exceptional circumstances which they consider to have caused them to submit assessments late and for which they do not wish to attract any penalty; this would normally be the Programme or Year Leader/Tutor (or equivalent) or the Chairperson (or nominee) of the Board of Examiners. In cases where the student's reasons for late or non-submission are accepted then the late work shall be assessed without penalty or the student may be given an opportunity to make good the missed assessment.

Where a student's progression, stage result or final award is at issue and the student wishes to submit evidence of exceptional factors having affected his/her performance then that should be done under the Regulations for Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate Programmes of Study which deal specifically with factors affecting performance..

Feedback on assignments in progress (DRAFTS)

Students to bear the following points in mind,

- **Normally, only a draft of the first assignment for a course undertaken by a student will be looked at by tutors.** This usually means the first unit taken when studying in the Professional Development Programme (PDP)
- Assessment is the responsibility of the student, tutors can only offer advice.
- Sufficient time in the academic year must be allowed for the consideration of work in progress (holidays do not constitute teaching weeks; for precise dates please look at the Student Calendar) – generally two weeks is a minimum, but this must be agreed with the tutor in advance.
- The tutor agreeing to look at a draft will offer to respond in one of the following ways:
 - Comments will be discussed with student(s)
 - Written comments may be sent in the post.
- Work in progress must be submitted in hard copy, it must not be sent electronically directly to a tutor
- Work in progress must be submitted in the same way that assessed work is submitted, via the Student Life Office on the relevant campus, and an e-mail receipt obtained.
- Work in Progress must have a completed WORK IN PROGRESS front sheet clearly visible; if it does not have this the work will be returned. A copy of the WORK IN PROGRESS front sheet will be found at the back of this booklet; further copies may be downloaded from www.ioe.mmu.ac.uk/cpd/
- Students must keep a full copy of any work in progress and any associated documents in case the work is mislaid or lost.
- Comments will be general in nature and will relate to the assessment criteria for the work.
- It is not possible to indicate what mark work will get or whether it is passworthy, that is the role of assessment.
- ***Special rules apply to dissertations in progress and this is made clear to students being tutored for dissertations.***

APPENDICES

1. ASSESSMENT MATRIX (LEVEL 7 POSTGRADUATE)
2. ASSESSMENT MATRIX (LEVEL 6 UNDERGRADUATE)
3. SUBMISSION COVERSHEET
4. TIME LOG
5. EVIDENCE LOG
6. UNIT EVALUATION AND IMPACT DOCUMENT
7. WORK IN PROGRESS FRONTSHEET

Level 7 POSTGRADUATE Assessment Criteria Matrix

1st/2nd Marker:

Student ID:

Assignment Title:

Date of submission:

Outcomes	Over 70 Excellent All learning outcomes achieved at an excellent/outstanding level	69–60 Good All learning outcomes achieved at a good level	59-50 Pass All learning outcomes achieved at Threshold level	49-45 Marginal Fail Some learning outcomes achieved at Threshold Level	Below 45 Fail Learning outcomes not achieved	
Key Differentiating Features	strong, confident; has depth, insight and complexity, personalisation and creativity or originality	Some depth and is overall of good quality	Adequate and generally sound	Weak, limited	Generally poor, limited in scope and depth and fails to address criteria at the appropriate level	
Knowledge and Understanding	Evidence of deep knowledge and insightful understanding of key concepts and problems/issues at the forefront of the area in terms of academic and professional knowledge and understanding. Fluency and confidence in using the literature and current thinking/research/professional literature. Presents counter arguments; identifies key issues/problems and justifies conclusion.	Evidence of a good level of critical understanding of the main concepts. Evidence of a good understanding of relevant critical issues. The writing is contextualised within recent research/professional literature.	Evidence of knowledge and understanding of key concepts is sufficiently sound. Awareness of relevant critical issues is sound. Literature base is sufficient, current and appropriate. The literature base is used to inform awareness of relevant issues.	Evidence of knowledge and understanding of key concepts is limited and weak. Evidence of awareness of relevant critical issues is limited. Literature base is inadequate and lacks currency.	Evidence of knowledge and understanding of key concepts is inadequately demonstrated. Insufficient evidence of awareness of relevant critical issues. Literature base very limited; insufficiently current and/or inappropriate.	
Thinking Skills	The ability to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use literature to inform thinking about practice Critically evaluate current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline; Critically evaluate methodologies and develops critiques of them and, where appropriate, propose new hypotheses Analytically engage with complex issues with balance and rigor Make sound well justified judgments Reflect on own practice in the light of literature 	Complex ideas are: handled confidently, are carefully thought through and developed through critical and balanced discussion. Alternative perspectives are considered. Critiquing of literature and/or methodology shows strong evidence of ability for deep thinking and application of sound and justified judgment. Excellent engagement with literature and depth of critical analysis to inform thinking about own practice. Evidence of deep reflection, leading to insightful personal understandings. Evidence of creative/original/innovative thinking and personalisation.	Ideas developed through critical and balanced discussion. Good level of engagement with literature. Analysis, reflection and criticality shows evidence of some deeper thinking which is contextualised within current research/literature and is used to inform thinking about own practice. Good integration of theory and practice.	Use of literature is sound showing evidence of analysis, reflection and critical thinking. It may lack depth and insight.	Over use of unsubstantiated generalised assumptions. Evidence of analytical and critical thinking is weak and lacks depth. Some evidence of limited, emerging reflection and analysis. Literature used superficially	Justifications are over-reliant on unsubstantiated generalised assumptions. Lacks evidence of analytical and critical thinking; the discussion lacks coherence and logic. Requirements of the assignment/unit not appropriately addressed.

Outcomes	Over 70 Excellent All learning outcomes achieved at an excellent/outstanding level	69–60 Good All learning outcomes achieved at a good level	59-50 Pass All learning outcomes achieved at Threshold level	49-45 Marginal Fail Some learning outcomes achieved at Threshold Level	Below 45 Fail Learning outcomes not achieved
Practical Skills The ability to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • apply theoretical perspectives to practice • demonstrate implications for improving professional practice 	Excellent application of theory to practice. Shows insight, rigour and consistency in observing standard and unpredictable situations. Strong awareness of implications for personal and professional development.	Strong ability to apply theory to practice. Awareness of implications for personal and professional development.	Adequate evidence of ability to apply theory to practice. Some awareness of implications for personal and professional development.	Ability to apply theory to practice is limited and weak. Insufficient awareness of implications for personal and professional development	Insufficient evidence of the ability to apply theory to practice appropriately. Little evidence of awareness of the implications for personal and professional development.
Transferable Skills As specifically identified for each unit e.g. ability to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write with coherence, connectedness and flow. • locate and use a range of resources for study • communicate effectively • act and work autonomously and collaboratively as appropriate • collect and use evidence critically to demonstrate arguments and professional development • Where appropriate engages in peer scrutiny/aces and use peer support 	The writing is fluent coherent, well structured and reads well Thoughtful and critical use of all these skills.	The writing has a clear logical/systematic structure. Good evidence of most of these skills.	The writing has structure, coherence and flow but may be lacking in consistency and rigour. Sufficient evidence of most of these skills.	The writing tends to be disjointed and lacking in structure. Insufficient evidence of most of these skills.	The writing lacks coherence, substance and flow. Insufficient evidence of most of these skills.
Notes 1. All assignments must follow the presentation guidelines provided in the relevant Programme Handbook					

LEVEL 3 ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

MARK	80 - 100	70 - 79	60 - 69	50 - 59	45 - 49	40 - 44	30 - 39 (Fail)	Below 30
Knowledge and Understanding	Deep knowledge of the topic, explicitly related to comprehensive knowledge of the discipline(s). Evaluates and contributes to current knowledge.	Deep knowledge of the topic, explicitly related to comprehensive knowledge of the discipline(s). Evaluates current knowledge.	Thorough, explicit knowledge & understanding of the topic. Some appreciation of and explicit links to a wider field.	Sound knowledge and understanding of central topic issues, some explicitly identified. Some appreciation of a wider field.	Adequate, largely implicit knowledge and understanding of central topic issues.	Basic, implicit knowledge of central topic issues. Partial understanding.	Inadequate knowledge or understanding of central topic issues.	Poor knowledge or understanding of central topic issues.
Thinking Skills: Reflection and Analysis	Consistently high level of ability to analyse critically using a wide range of appropriate criteria, sources and perspectives. Excellent synthesis of elements of the argument including contrary views.	High level of ability to analyse critically using a range of perspectives. Excellent synthesis of elements of the argument including contrary views.	Can present a coherent critical argument demonstrating the ability to analyse, synthesise and evaluate to form a balanced and supportable judgement.	Can develop a critical analysis without guidance. Some ability to synthesise concepts, theories and practice. Can apply a range of analytical methods appropriate to the task.	Evidence of some critical awareness. Analysis can be structured within guidance. May be some difficulty in balancing and substantiating points.	Largely descriptive. Inconsistent in the application of critical judgements. Some unsubstantiated assertion.	Work is descriptive and uncritical. May contain unsubstantiated assertion and hyperbole.	Work is purely descriptive and uncritical. Contains unsubstantiated assertion and hyperbole.
Thinking Skills: Relevance to the set task	Discussion is wholly relevant to all aspects of the task. The work is insightful and thought provoking.	All aspects of the task are addressed in full with some evidence of independent thought.	All aspects of the task are addressed in a confident manner and in proportion to their significance.	All aspects of the task are addressed at an effective level.	All aspects of the set task are addressed but issues may not gain the attention their significance demands.	The work addresses the task in most respects. May contain some irrelevant discussion or over-emphasise peripheral issues.	Work does not address the set task. Little appreciation of the significance of central issues.	Work does not address the set task. No appreciation of the significance of central issues.
Thinking Skills: Use of source material	Discussion is always well supported by reference to and engagement with an extended range of contrasting source material and texts, including a wide range of original sources.	Discussion is well supported by reference to and engagement with an extended range of source material, including a selection of original sources. Accurate use of reference style.	Discussion is well informed by reference to and engagement with relevant learning material, including a range of original sources. Accurate use of reference style.	Good use made of further reading, including original sources, to illustrate and extend the discussion. Accurate use of referencing technique.	Limited use of further relevant reading in support of the discussion and minimal engagement with original sources. Largely accurate use of referencing technique.	Poor use of source material. Little evidence of additional reading. Generally accurate use of reference style.	Work does not address the set task. Little appreciation of the significance of central issues.	Work does not address the set task. No appreciation of the significance of central issues.
Practical and Transferable Skills: Structure	Structure supports a full response and there is evidence of substantial independent thought.	Organisational rationale complements and enhances the clarity of the argument and there is evidence of independent thought.	Organisational rationale clearly aids the clarity and coherence of the discussion.	Organisational rationale clearly aids the clarity and coherence of the discussion.	Clear organisational rationale that serves to shape the discussion in an appropriate manner.	Poorly organised but some attempt to order the argument. Major features may be poorly explored. Some repetition.	Little evidence of an organisational rationale. Major features may not be sufficiently defined or may be absent. Work may be repetitive.	No evidence of an organisational rationale. Major features are not sufficiently defined or are absent. Work is repetitive.
Transferable Skills: Use of language	Work displays an excellent use of standard written English.	Work displays an excellent use of standard written English.	Work displays a very good use of standard written English. All statements are clearly expressed and there is good flow from one point to the next.	Work displays a good use of standard written English with few, if any, grammatical errors. It is written in an appropriately academic style.	The work is written to an acceptable standard of English. There are few, if any, grammatical errors. The work may need more careful editing.	Generally poor standard of English usage. and often unacademic style. Much more care needed with language construction and checking of the text.	Poor standard of basic English and unacademic style.. Much more care needed with language construction and checking of the text.	Very poor standard of basic English and very unacademic style.. Much more care needed with language construction and checking of the text.

DIDSBURY AND CREWE CAMPUS ADMINISTRATION (STUDENT AND ACADEMIC SERVICES)



**Manchester
Metropolitan
University**

ASSESSMENT SUBMISSION FORM

You will receive an electronic e-mail receipt via your MMU e-mail account approximately 2 days after the Deadline submission date.

Student Name	
MMU Student ID	

Unit Code (must be completed)	
Unit Title	
Assessment Title	

Programme Route e.g. Education, SEN etc	PGCert / PGDip / MA / MSc
Qualified Teacher Status? (QTS)	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
Unit Tutor	

Submission Deadline Date	1 st attempt [tick]	
	1 st Resubmission [tick]	
	2 nd Resubmission [tick]	
	Paid resubmission fee [tick]	

Word Count	
Academic Level	Master

STUDENT DECLARATION: *The material contained in this assignment is all my own work; when the work of others has been adopted/paraphrased (e.g. books, articles, handouts, conference reports etc) it has been acknowledged according to appropriate academic convention. Direct quotes from other works are clearly identified.*

- *I have read and understand the University's statement concerning plagiarism.*
- *I have included all aspects of the assignment.*
- *If applicable, I have paid the resubmission fee.*

Student Signature		Date:
--------------------------	--	--------------

IF SUBMITTING BY POST PLEASE SEND TO ONE OF THE FOLLOWING MARKING YOUR PACKAGE "PDP ASSESSMENT"

- IOE-MMU, STUDENT LIFE OFFICE, 799 WILMSLOW ROAD, MANCHESTER, M20 2RR
- IOE-MMU, STUDENT LIFE OFFICE, CREWE CAMPUS, CREWE GREEN ROAD, CREWE, CW1 5DU

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME EVIDENCE LOG OF LEARNING OUTCOMES



Manchester
Metropolitan
University

UNIT NAME:

UNIT NUMBER:

STUDENT NAME:

<i>On completion of this unit, participants should demonstrate...</i>	Evidence on page(s):

A completed version of his page must be submitted with unit assessment task(s)

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME UNIT EVALUATION DOCUMENT

**A COMPLETED COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT MUST BE SUBMITTED WITH THE
UNIT ASSESSMENT**

UNIT TITLE: CLIMATE CHANGE AND SCIENCE EDUCATION

UNIT NUMBER:

Name of respondent (optional).....

Please tick the appropriate box(es): ✓

1. The teaching/learning on the unit was stimulating/challenging

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	-------	----------	----------	----------------------

Please comment further...

2. Class discussions were effective learning occasions

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	-------	----------	----------	----------------------

Please comment further...

3. My background experience was respected and built upon

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	-------	----------	----------	----------------------

Please comment further...

4. I was helped to learn in a way, and at a rate, that was effective for me

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	-------	----------	----------	----------------------

Please comment further...

5. Assessment tasks were relevant to professional/organisation needs in my workplace

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	-------	----------	----------	----------------------

Please comment further...

6. Assessment reflected the content of the unit

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	-------	----------	----------	----------------------

Please comment further

7. Class materials (handouts, videos, simulations, etc) were suitable

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
-------------------	-------	----------	----------	----------------------

Please comment further...

8. The class was well managed by the tutor

STRONGLY	AGREE	NOT SURE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY
----------	-------	----------	----------	----------

My confidence or professional self esteem

Creation/membership of new networks

My performance management targets/priorities

My capacity for reflection on professional practice

Improved learner/client/pupil experience, motivation or academic achievement

Ability to be a 'practitioner researcher'

Other types of impact the unit has or could make

11. Please suggest any ways in which the course/unit could be improved

12. Any other comments/observations?



WORK IN PROGRESS SUBMISSION SHEET

Student Name	
MMU Student ID	

Unit Code (must be completed)	
Unit Title	
Assessment Title	

Programme Route e.g. Education, SEN etc	PGCert / PGDip / MA / MSc
Unit Tutor	

Student Signature		Date:	
--------------------------	--	--------------	--