



Collaborative Enhancement Project 2022/2023



Optionality in Assessment: Case Studies

Case Study 9

Author: Paul McFarlane

Institution: University College London

Discipline/Field of Study: Crime Science

Type of Assessment: Essay – Briefing report – Video

Credits: 15

Level: Level 6

Unit Type: Mandatory or core for all students on a particular programme

Type of Optionality: Mode and for the report and video, a further level of choice is related to the topic selected

Assessment Details:

The assessment is to write an essay that analyses and discusses the key features of an investigative failure OR create a video about a novel piece of research that has been developed at UCL.

a. Instructions for completing the assessment

Instructions for each assessment mode:

[CS9_SECU0051_assessment_1_2023.pdf](#)

[CS9_SECU0051_essay_2023.pdf](#)

b. Marking rubric

Logical sequencing of argument (Max. 10)	Arguments and support are provided in a logical order that make it easy and interesting to follow the student's train of thought. All arguments are supported, and conclusions are directly linked to these. Signposting and transition sentences are used to indicate the direction the argument is going.	Arguments and support are provided in a fairly logical order that makes it possible to follow the student's train of thought. Most arguments are supported, and conclusions are indirectly linked to these.	A few of the arguments are not in a logical order; distracting the reader and making the essay seem a little confusing. Several arguments are unsupported, and overgeneralisations are made. The conclusions are not clearly related to the arguments and support.	Many of the arguments are not in a logical order; distracting the reader and making the essay seem very confusing.
Conclusion (Max. 10)	The closing paragraph is strong and leaves the reader with a solid understanding of the reasoning behind the conclusion.	The closing paragraph recaps the key points of the essay and expresses a clear concluding statement that relates to these points.	There is little reference to the key points of the essay in the closing paragraph and/or there is no clear concluding statement given.	There is no conclusion – the argument just ends.
Referencing / Appropriate use of authority (Max. 10)	All sources used are credible and cited correctly. There is excellent correspondence between the main text and the reference list. Excellent formatting of reference list.	All sources used are credible and most are cited correctly. There is good correspondence between the main text and the reference list. Good formatting of reference list.	Most sources are credible and cited correctly. Some inconsistencies between the main text and the reference list. Several formatting errors in the reference list.	Many sources are not credible and/or are not cited correctly. Poor correspondence between the main text and the reference list. Reference list inadequately and/or inconsistently formatted.
Presentation (Max. 10)	The argument is grammatically sound and free of typos. The writing style is clear and conventional language is used.	Any spelling or grammatical errors are minor and do not distract the reader from the content. Conventional language is often used. Some sentences are slightly unclear.	There are several spelling or grammatical errors that distract the reader from the content. Conventional language is often not used. Some sentences are somewhat unclear.	There are many spelling or grammatical errors that distract the reader from the content. Conventional language is not used. Many sentences are unclear.

CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION AND INTELLIGENCE ASSIGNMENT 2 MARKING CRITERIA

CATEGORY	A	B	C	F
Documentary Introduction (Max. 10)	The documentary topic is introduced in a clear and inviting way, states relevance, importance and previews the structure of the documentary video.	The opening of the documentary introduces the topic area, states relevance, importance and previews the structure of the documentary video.	The opening of the documentary does not adequately introduce the topic and/or state relevance and/or importance and/or preview the structure of the documentary video.	There is no clear introduction in the documentary of the topic, the relevance and/or importance or the structure of the documentary video.
Identification of relevant issues and theoretical understanding (Max. 20)	Documentary demonstrates a clear understanding of the nuances of the chosen theory/ theories/area of research. Key aspects are explained and intelligently discussed in relation to the aim of the documentary.	Documentary demonstrates a competent understanding of the chosen theory/ theories/area of research. Key aspects are not fully explained. Application to the aim of the documentary is somewhat unclear.	Documentary demonstrates some understanding of the theory/ theories/area of research but does not correctly apply it to the aim of the documentary.	It is not clear that the student has a full understanding of the theory/ theories/area of research and/or the aim of the documentary.
Supporting evidence and examples (Max. 10)	All of the evidence and examples in the documentary are specific, relevant, and explanations are given that show how each piece of evidence supports the argument. Includes evidence not sourced from the lectures and core set reading.	Most of the evidence and/or examples in the documentary are specific, relevant, and explanations are given that show how each piece of evidence supports the argument.	At least one of the pieces of evidence and/or examples in the documentary is relevant and has an explanation that shows how each piece of evidence supports the argument.	Evidence and examples in the documentary are not relevant and/or are not explained.
Critical thought / evaluation (Max. 20)	The documentary skillfully evaluates evidence and articulates plausible relationships between ideas. Concerns about theoretical/empirical weaknesses are anticipated and alleviated.	The documentary competently evaluates evidence and articulates plausible relationships between ideas. Concerns about theoretical/empirical weaknesses are not fully anticipated and alleviated.	The documentary includes a simplistic analysis of evidence and/or issues; limited clarity and complex of thought. Concerns about theoretical/ empirical weaknesses are not anticipated and alleviated.	The documentary includes insufficient reasoning and lacks complexity of thought.
Logical sequencing of argument (Max. 20)	Arguments and support are provided in a logical order that make the documentary easy and interesting to follow. All arguments are supported, and conclusions are directly linked to these.	Arguments and support are provided in a fairly logical order that makes the documentary possible to follow. Most arguments are supported, and conclusions are indirectly linked to these.	A few of the arguments are not in a logical order; distracting and making the documentary a little confusing. Several arguments are unsupported, and overgeneralisations are made. The conclusions are not clearly related to the arguments and support.	Many of the arguments are not in a logical order; distracting and making the documentary seem very confusing.
Conclusion (Max. 10)	The closing of the documentary is strong and leaves the viewer with a solid understanding of the reasoning behind the conclusion.	The closing of the documentary recaps the key points and expresses a clear concluding statement that relates to these points.	There is little reference to the key points in the closing of the documentary and/or there is no clear concluding statement given.	There is no conclusion – the documentary just ends.
Presentation and communication style (Max. 10)	The documentary was well presented. The language style is clear and conventional considering needs of diverse audience.	The documentary was well presented. Conventional language is often used. Some parts are slightly unclear.	The documentary was presented satisfactorily. Conventional language is often not used. Some parts are somewhat unclear.	The documentary was not presented satisfactorily. Many parts of the documentary are unclear.

CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION AND INTELLIGENCE ASSESSMENT 3 MARKING CRITERIA

CATEGORY	A	B	C	F
Briefing Doc. Introduction (Max. 10)	The briefing document is introduced in a clear and inviting way, states relevance, importance and previews the structure of the document for the specified audience.	The opening of the briefing document introduces the topic area, states relevance, importance and previews the structure of the document for the specified audience.	The opening of the briefing document does not adequately introduce the topic and/or state relevance and/or importance and/or preview the structure of the document for the specified audience.	There is no clear introduction in the briefing document of the topic, the relevance and/or importance or the structure of the document for the specified audience.
Identification of relevant issues and theoretical understanding (Max. 20)	Document demonstrates a clear understanding of the nuances of relevant theory/ theories/areas of research relied on. Key aspects are explained and intelligently discussed in relation to the aim of the document.	Document demonstrates a competent understanding of relevant theory/ theories/areas of research relied on. Key aspects are not fully explained. Application to the aim of the document is somewhat unclear.	Document demonstrates some understanding of the relevant theory/ theories/area of research relied on but does not correctly apply it to the aim of the document.	It is not clear that the student has a full understanding of relevant theory/ theories/area of research and/or the aim of the document.
Supporting evidence and examples (Max. 10)	All the evidence and examples in the document are specific, relevant, and explanations are given that show how each piece of evidence supports the argument. Includes evidence not sourced from the lectures and core set reading.	Most of the evidence and/or examples in the document are specific, relevant, and explanations are given that show how each piece of evidence supports the argument.	At least one of the pieces of evidence and/or examples in the document is relevant and has an explanation that shows how each piece of evidence supports the argument.	Evidence and examples in the document are not relevant and/or are not explained.
Critical thought / evaluation (Max. 20)	The document skilfully evaluates evidence and articulates plausible relationships between ideas. Concerns about theoretical/empirical weaknesses are anticipated and alleviated.	The document competently evaluates evidence and articulates plausible relationships between ideas. Concerns about theoretical/empirical weaknesses are not fully anticipated and alleviated.	The document includes a simplistic analysis of evidence and/or issues; limited clarity and complexion of thought. Concerns about theoretical/ empirical weaknesses are not anticipated and alleviated.	The document includes insufficient reasoning and lacks complexity of thought.
Logical sequencing of argument / key points (Max. 20)	Arguments/key points and support are provided in a logical order that make the document easy and interesting to follow. All arguments are supported, and conclusions are directly linked to these.	Arguments/key points and support are provided in a fairly logical order that makes the document possible to follow. Most arguments are supported, and conclusions are indirectly linked to these.	A few of the arguments/key points are not in a logical order; distracting and making the document a little confusing. Several arguments are unsupported, and overgeneralisations are made. The conclusions are not clearly related to the arguments and support.	Many of the arguments/key points are not in a logical order; distracting and making the document seem very confusing.
Conclusion (Max. 10)	The conclusion is strong and leaves the viewer with a solid understanding of the reasoning behind the conclusion.	The conclusion recaps the key points and expresses a clear concluding statement that relates to these points.	There is little reference to the key points in the closing of the document and/or there is no clear concluding statement given.	There is no conclusion – the document just ends.
Presentation and communication style (Max. 10)	The document was well presented. The language style is clear and conventional considering needs of diverse audience.	The document was well presented. Conventional language is often used. Some parts are slightly unclear.	The document was presented satisfactorily. Conventional language is often not used. Some parts are somewhat unclear.	The document was not presented satisfactorily. Many parts of the document are unclear.

c. Teaching materials:

d. Other links or pertinent information

Link to an article in Campus that sets out the rationale as to why this might be a relevant case study. <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/campus/students-terms-offering-options-assessment-empower-learning>