**UNIT GUIDE 2017/18**

**POLIM1006 SECURITY GOVERNANCE**

**Teaching Block: 1**

**Weeks: 1-12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Owner:</th>
<th>Dr Columba Peoples</th>
<th>Level:</th>
<th>M/7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>0117 33 11075</td>
<td>Credit points:</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:c.peoples@bristol.ac.uk">c.peoples@bristol.ac.uk</a></td>
<td>Prerequisites:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office:</td>
<td>M.01, number 4 Priory Road</td>
<td>Curriculum area:</td>
<td>International Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit owner office hours:** Please check the SPAIS MSc Blackboard site for office hours. (Please note, there are no regular office hours during Reading Weeks)

**Timetabled classes:** Please check your online timetable for day, time and venue of each seminar.

You are also expected to attend ONE seminar each week. Your online personal timetable will inform you to which group you have been allocated. Seminar groups are fixed: you are not allowed to change seminar groups without permission from the office.

Weeks 6, 12, 18 and 24 are Reading Weeks; there is NO regular teaching in these weeks.

In addition to timetabled sessions there is a requirement for private study, reading, revision and assessments. Reading the required readings in advance of each seminar is the *minimum* expectation. The University Guidelines state that one credit point is broadly equivalent to 10 hours of total student input.

**Learning Outcomes:** Upon successful completion of this unit, students should be able to:

- ASSESS the fragmentation of security policy making among multiple actors
- EVALUATE the contributions of different actors to global security
- APPLY theoretical concepts to contemporary security policy making
- ANALYSE the capabilities and strategies of different security actors
- DEFINE the theoretical concepts of ‘security’ and ‘security governance’
- DESCRIBE the decision-making structures of different security actors

**Requirements for passing the unit:**

- Satisfactory attendance at seminars
- Completion of all formative work to an acceptable standard
- Attainment of a composite mark of all summative work to a passing standard (50 or above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment:</th>
<th>Word count:</th>
<th>Weighting:</th>
<th>Deadline:</th>
<th>Day:</th>
<th>Week:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formative assessment:</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>09.30am 6th November</td>
<td>Monday 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Review assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative assessment:</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9.30am 11th January 2018</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Summative essay questions will be made available on the SPAIS MSc Admin Blackboard site.
- Instructions for the submission of coursework will be emailed prior to the submission deadline.
- Assessment in the school is subject to strict penalties regarding late submission, plagiarism and maximum word count. See Appendix.
- Marking criteria can be found in the Appendix.

**Other:** Make sure you check your Bristol email account regularly throughout the course as important information will be communicated to you. Any emails sent to your Bristol address are assumed to have been read. If you wish for emails to be forwarded to an alternative address then please go to [https://support.google.com/mail/answer/10957?hl=en](https://support.google.com/mail/answer/10957?hl=en)
POLIM1006 SECURITY GOVERNANCE

Unit Description
This unit assesses the nature of contemporary security governance and considers the extent to which it constitutes a shift away from or challenges the ideal of the nation-state as security provider. To do so the unit commences by asking what constitutes security governance, and how we can critically study the subject. It then turns to an analysis of a range of different actors that now claim a security role within global governance. We will discuss how different types of actors conceive of and practice contemporary security governance, and critically assess their status as security providers. Specifically, we will examine the roles, capabilities and strategies of: global organizations (the United Nations) and regimes (the nuclear non-proliferation regime); regional alliances and actors (NATO, the European Union, and the African Union); states as potential providers of global security governance (with a specific focus on the United States); and non-state actors (Non-Governmental Organizations and Private Military Companies) as ‘private’ providers of security.

Unit Aims
- To familiarize students with the range of security actors, and to understand how each actor privileges particular types of security concerns
- To provide an overview of the ways in which new regimes of security can be critically studied
- To develop and consolidate research and writing skills as an independent researcher

Learning Outcomes
Upon successful completion of this unit, students should be able to:
- ASSESS the fragmentation of security policy making among multiple actors
- EVALUATE the contributions of different actors to global security
- APPLY theoretical concepts to contemporary security policy making
- ANALYSE the capabilities and strategies of different security actors
- DEFINE the theoretical concepts of ‘security’ and ‘security governance’
- DESCRIBE the decision-making structures of different security actors

Teaching Arrangements
The course is centered on a weekly 2-hour seminar.

The following methods will be used to convey the course material:
- Critical evaluation of relevant literature (this requires a careful reading of the course material)
- Discussion and group-work
- Note-taking
- Book review assignment (formative assessment)

Formative Assessment
Formative assessment is assessment that is intended to aid your development via feedback, but which does not count towards the overall unit mark.

The formative assessment for the unit is a 1000 word Book Review. The formative assessment is aimed at, among other things, assisting you in preparing for the summative assessment by providing assessment of: your ability to engage critically with existing work related to the topic of security governance; and your
general writing abilities.

Full details of the formative assessment, including the list of book titles that students can choose from for their review, will be circulated in Week 1. The submission deadline details are listed on the cover page above.

**Summative Assessment**
The essay for this unit is a summative essay that decides the final mark (out of 100%) for this unit. Students will choose one question from a list of ten set questions. Essay questions will be distributed around the middle of the teaching block only after they have been reviewed and approved by an external examiner. Students will be notified directly once they are available.

Essays must be written and correctly referenced according to the SPAIS guidelines. These are detailed in the SPAIS ‘Study Guide’. Full details about all requirements and rules regarding assessed essays – including length, formatting, submission, pass marks, extensions, feedback, resubmissions, and so on – are in the appendix to this unit guide and in the Postgraduate taught handbook. The submission deadline details are listed on the cover page above.

**Basic Expectations**
As this is an introduction to the study of Security Governance, the unit will provide an overview of the prevalent approaches and critical debates within the subject area. The shaded boxes indicate the essential readings for that week’s seminar. For a more detailed study of the themes refer to the further readings. This unit is designed as a reading seminar where students lead the conversations and debates. As such it is essential that students participate effectively which requires that readings be conducted prior to arrival in class.

Regular attendance is expected. Students should strive to arrive prior to the commencement of class in order to be on time.

Cell-phones: Few things are as disruptive as cell-phones (mobiles) ringing during a seminar. To respect your class mates, please turn off all cell phones prior to the start of class.

**UNIT READINGS**

**Essential Readings:** Each week’s seminar will proceed on the assumption that you have completed **ALL** of that week’s **essential** reading. The essential readings can be found online through electronic journals, or electronically via the unit Blackboard site where appropriate. You may also read from the further reading list, but which items you choose is at your discretion.

**Other reading:** Further reading should be consulted in preparation for your essay in particular. Note that the supplementary reading merely serves as an initial starting point. The readings lists contained here are not exhaustive, and new work in this field is always being published. So you should always try to go beyond the essential and further readings in your research. To find additional readings check the library catalogue and other online sources such as ‘Google Scholar’.

**Introductory reading:** There is no set or required textbook for this unit, however, students new to the subject areas of International Relations/International Organizations/Global Governance may consider consulting and/or purchasing (optional – available from multiple online sellers) a copy of Thomas G. Weiss and Rorden Wilkinson (eds.) *International Organizations and Global Governance* (Oxon: Routledge, 2014). This textbook contains multiple short introductory chapters on variety of topics and organizations relevant to the unit. Relevant chapters are marked with an asterisk* in the reading lists below. Where applicable useful
chapters from other textbooks are also indicated with an asterisk. NB: Please keep in mind that these are recommended as introductory/background readings only – they are not a substitute for doing the essential and further reading. The latter are required for developing an advanced and critical awareness of the unit themes and content.

**Electronic Journals:** Most journals listed in this syllabus are easily accessible through the University of Bristol Library Catalogue. Google Scholar [http://scholar.google.co.uk/](http://scholar.google.co.uk/) is also very useful, both for searching for specific journal articles and for wider thematic searches; it also usually allows you to link the library holding if applicable.

**Useful Websites:**
Several of the organizations covered by the unit have useful background information on their purposes, structures, history etc. Try not to rely on these too heavily, but they can be useful for the purposes of general familiarization.


**Beware Wikipedia!** Wikipedia [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Main_Page](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Main_Page) is an online free encyclopedia with entries that seem to appear high in Google (but not Google Scholar) searches. Anyone may log on and contribute to this (including interested parties who do so anonymously) and so you should not rely on this – only to a very minor extent at most for initial familiarisation – as it is not subject to any scholarly review, (although Wikipedia has some controls that ensure that at least some entries are reviewed).

**SEMINAR SCHEDULE**
There are ten 100-minute seminars in the unit (weeks 1-5 and weeks 7-11 inclusive; week 6 and week 12 are ‘Reading Week’). The objective of seminars is to provide you with an opportunity to ask questions, stimulate debates and to engage in the discussion of key questions in security governance related to the week’s essential readings (see below for further details).

Seminar Schedule
Week 1. Introduction to the Unit
Week 2. Theorising Security Governance
Week 4. Global Security Providers: International Regimes
Week 5. Regional Security Providers: NATO
Week 6. [Reading Week – no seminar]
Week 7. Regional Security Providers: The European Union
Week 8. Regional Security Providers: The African Union
Week 9. National Security Providers: The United States
Week 10. Private Security Providers: NGOs
Week 11. Private Security Providers: Private Military Companies
Week 12. [Reading Week – no seminar]
SEMINAR READINGS

Week 1. Introduction to the Unit

In this session we will discuss teaching and learning on the unit, the content of the unit, and go through this unit guide to ensure students’ familiarity with its contents.

As well as this practical introduction the seminar will engage with questions of what is ‘new’ about security governance concerns within the current global environment. Specifically the seminar will introduce students to key themes and key questions covered on the unit – questions that we will revisit in different ways throughout the duration of the unit. We will discuss and reflect on the agenda articulated in the UN’s ‘A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility’ as set out over a decade ago and question the extent to which that agenda remains relevant and achievable. We will also begin to engage some more conceptual questions and issue related to the role of the state and the nature of the international system relative to (global) security governance: is contemporary global security governance inherently prone to crisis and ‘gridlock’? The seminar will also get students thinking about the ‘real world’ dimensions of key debates and questions in the study of security governance.

Learning Outcomes:
At the end of this session students should have an initial awareness of: the key debates covered by the unit; what constitutes the ‘new security governance concerns’ today; and the range of actors that claim to provide security governance in contemporary global politics. Via the seminar discussions, students should also begin to critically reflect on key questions, challenges and debates in contemporary security governance.

Essential Reading

Available via Unit Blackboard Site

Thomas Hale, David Held and Kevin Young (2013) ‘Gridlock: The growing breakdown of global cooperation’, pp.1-4 Available via Unit Blackboard Site


Further Reading:


*Weiss, Thomas G. and Rorden Wilkinson (eds.) International Organizations and Global Governance (Oxon: Routledge, 2014) Chapters 1, 3, 4, 5 and 31 JZ5566

Week 2. Theorising Security Governance
Key questions: What is ‘security governance’? How should we approach, theorise and understand it?

Learning outcomes:
By the end of this seminar you should have gained knowledge of the key characteristics and arguments of contemporary security governance debates; and of how security threats and practices of security governance have been conceptualised.

Essential reading:


Further reading:


Global Security Providers: The United Nations

Key questions: What role does the UN play in the provision of (global) security governance? How has this role changed and evolved over time? In what ways does the institutional structure of the UN enable or constrain its ability to provide global security governance? What might the historical experience of UN peace operations have to tell us in this regard?

Learning outcomes:
By the end of this class, you should be able to explain and assess the structure and contribution of the United Nations to global security, with specific reference to UN peace operations in particular.

Essential reading:


International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) (2001) The Responsibility to Protect, Chapter 1 (pp.1-10), Chapter 2 (pp.11-18) and Chapter 6 (pp.47-56) Available via Unit Blackboard Site

Alex Bellamy and Paul Williams (2010) ‘Peace Operations in Global Politics’ in Alex Bellamy and Paul
Further reading:


31 (2): 167-178. **Electronic journals**


Week 4. Global Security Providers: International Regimes

What constitutes an international regime? To what extent can international regimes provide security governance? How and why do such ‘security regimes’ arise, and what are the conditions for their perpetuation? What are the strengths and weaknesses of regimes in providing security? What does the historical record of and current debates over the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Regime (the NPT in particular as its key component) have to tell us in this regard?

Learning outcomes:
By the end of this class, you should be able to demonstrate a critical understanding of international regimes, and assess the role of regimes in security governance with specific reference to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Regime.

Essential reading:

Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) text Available via Unit Blackboard Site


Further reading:


---

**Week 5. Regional Security Providers: NATO**

**Key Questions:** Should NATO today be regarded as a ‘regional’ or ‘global’ security provider? How does NATO as an institution conceive of its own purposes as a security provider? How do we account for the continuation and expansion of NATO after the end of the Cold War era? In what ways have NATO’s functions and capabilities evolved and changed over the past two decades?
Learning outcomes:
By the end of this seminar you should be able to discuss and critically evaluate the roles and evolution of NATO as an actor in contemporary global security governance.

Essential reading:

NATO (2010) *Strategic Concept*, text available via unit Blackboard site


Further reading:


Mandelbaum, Michael (1999) ‘A Perfect Failure: NATO’s War Against Yugoslavia’, *Foreign Affairs* 78 (5): 2-
8. **Serial D410.F7**


---

**Week 6.** [Reading Week – No Seminar]

**Week 7.** Regional Security Providers: The EU

Key questions: What kind of security provider is the EU? To what extent does the EU provide security governance within and/or beyond the boundaries of the EU? Has the EU successfully developed an autonomous European Security identity and/or capability? Should the EU or NATO now be considered as the foremost provider of security in Europe?

**Learning Outcomes:**

By the end of this seminar you should be able to discuss and critically evaluate the security competences of the European Union.

**Essential reading:**


---

Further reading:


*Weiss, Thomas G. and Rorden Wilkinson (eds.) International Organizations and Global Governance
**Week 8. Regional Security Providers: The African Union**

**Key questions:** What are the security competences of the African Union? Does the development and evolution of the AU represent the advent of a distinctive ‘African’ security identity and capability? To what extent is the provision of security governance in Africa dependent on the intervention of non-African security providers?

**Learning outcomes:**

By the end of this seminar, you should be able to describe and critically evaluate the development of the African Union as a security provider in Africa.

**Essential reading:**

For those new to the study of the AU, it may be useful to start by browsing the website of the AU [https://au.int/en/](https://au.int/en/) before moving on to the readings below.


Further reading:


Adebajo, Adekeye (2002) *Building Peace in West Africa: Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Guinea-Bissau* (Boulder CO: Lynne Rienner) [Electronic journals](#).


Williams, Paul D. (2007) ‘From non-intervention to non-indifference: the origins and development of the
African Union’s security culture’, *African Affairs* 106 (423): 253-279 Electronic journals

**Week 9. National Security Providers: The United States**

**Key questions:** Should the US be regarded as a key provider of global security or a threat to it? To what extent does the current architecture of global security governance serve US interests or hinder it? What impact has post-9/11 foreign and security policy had on global security governance? To what extent is contemporary global security governance a product of ‘American Hegemony’, and/or dependent on it?

**Learning outcomes:**
By the end of this seminar you should be able to critically assess the ability of states (with specific reference to the US) to provide global security governance.

**Essential reading:**


**Further reading:**
237-268. **Serial JX1.I55**


---

**Week 10. Private Security Providers: NGOs**

**Key questions:** What role do (or should) Non-Governmental Organizations play in the provision of security governance? Do NGOs contribute greater legitimacy to security governance? Are NGOs effective providers of security? Under which circumstances, and on what definition of ‘security’?

**Learning outcomes:**

By the end of this class, you should be able to discuss and critically evaluate the potential roles of ‘NGOs’ within contemporary security governance, describe the ways in which they impact upon global security, and assess the advantages and problems associated with the growing role of NGOs in security governance.

**Essential reading:**


Further reading:
Gordenker, Leon, and Thomas G. Weiss (eds.) (1996) NGOs, the UN, and Global Governance (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner). JX1995 NGO
Hulme, David, and Michael Edwards (1997) NGOs, States and Donors: Too Close for Comfort? (Basingstoke: Macmillan). HC60 NGO
Lindenberg, Marc, and Coralie Bryant (2001) Going Global: Transforming Relief and Development NGOs (Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press). HV544.5 LIN
Richmond, Oliver P. (2003) ‘Introduction: NGOs, Peace and Human Security’, International Peacekeeping, 10 (12): 2-11 [See also the other contributions to this special issue] Electronic journals
Week 11. Private Security Providers: Private Military Companies

Key questions: What does the rise of PMCs/PMSCs (Private Military Companies/Private Military and Security Companies) tell us about the nature of contemporary security governance? Should PMCs/PMSCs be regarded as a welcome supplement to state security or as a threat to it? What political and ethical questions does the existence and operations of PMCs/PMSCs raise for the theory and practice of security governance?

Learning outcomes:
By the end of this class, you should be familiar with key debates surrounding PMCs/PMSCs, and able to critically evaluate their significance within contemporary security governance.

Essential reading:


Further reading:
Aning, Emmanuel Kwesi (2001) ‘Whither Africa’s Security in the New Millennium: State- or Mercenary-
induced Stability?’ Global Society 15 (2): 149-171. Electronic journals


Mileham, P. (2001) ‘But will they fight and will they die?’ *International Affairs* 77 (3): 621-630. **Electronic journals**


Appendix A
Instructions on how to submit essays electronically

1. Log in to Blackboard (https://www.ole.bris.ac.uk/) and select the Blackboard course for the unit you are submitting work for. If you cannot see it, please e-mail f.cooper@bristol.ac.uk with your username and ask to be added.
2. Click on the "Submit Work Here" option on the left hand menu and then find the correct assessment from the list.
3. Select ‘view/complete’ for the appropriate piece of work. It is your responsibility to ensure that you have selected both the correct unit and the correct piece of work.
4. The screen will display ‘single file upload’ and your name. Enter your candidate number as a submission title, and then select the file that you wish to upload by clicking the ‘browse’ button. Click on the ‘upload’ button at the bottom.
5. You will then be shown the essay to be submitted. Check that you have selected the correct essay and click the ‘Submit’ button. This step must be completed or the submission is not complete.
6. You will be informed of a successful submission. A digital receipt is displayed on screen and a copy sent to your email address for your records.

Important notes
- You are only allowed to submit one file to Blackboard (single file upload), so ensure that all parts of your work – references, bibliography etc. – are included in one single document and that you upload the correct version. You will not be able to change the file once you have uploaded.
- Blackboard will accept a variety of file formats, but the School can only accept work submitted in .rtf (Rich Text Format) or .doc/.docx (Word Document) format. If you use another word processing package, please ensure you save in a compatible format.
- By submitting your essay, you are confirming that you have read the regulations on plagiarism and confirm that the submission is not plagiarised. You also confirm that the word count stated on the essay is an accurate statement of essay length.
- If Blackboard is not working email your assessment to f.cooper@bristol.ac.uk with the unit code and title in the subject line.

How to confirm that your essay has been submitted
You will have received a digital receipt by email and if you click on the assessment again (steps 1-4), you will see the title and submission date of the essay you have submitted. If you click on submit, you will not be able to submit again. This table also displays the date of submission. If you click on the title of the essay, it will open in a new window and you can also see what time the essay was submitted.
Appendix B
Summary of Relevant School Regulations
(Further details are in the Postgraduate taught handbook, which takes precedence)

Attendance of Seminars
SPAIS takes attendance of and participation in seminars very seriously. Seminars form an essential part of your learning and you need to make sure you arrive on time, have done the required reading and participate fully. Attendance at all seminars is monitored, with absence only condoned in cases of illness or for other exceptional reasons.
If you are unable to attend a seminar you must inform your seminar tutor. You should also provide evidence to explain your absence, such as a self-certification and/or medical note, counselling letter or other official document. If you are ill or are experiencing some other kind of difficulty which is preventing you from attending seminars for a prolonged period, please contact the Postgraduate Office or the Graduate Administration Manager who can advise on how to proceed.

Requirements for credit points
To be awarded credit points for a taught unit, students must:
- Have a satisfactory attendance record.
- Pass the summative assessment
Where there are multiple summative assessments in a unit, students must achieve the pass mark for the weighted average of the assessments (i.e. in the mark for the unit overall). They do not need to pass each individual piece of assessment.
If any of these conditions are not met, then your ability to progress through your degree may be affected.

Presentation of written work
Coursework must be word-processed. As a guide, use a clear, easy-to-read font such as Arial or Times New Roman, in at least 11pt. You may double-space or single-space your essays as you prefer. Your tutor will let you know if they have a preference.
All pages should be numbered. Ensure that the essay question appears on the first page.
Students are required to complete and include a cover page for essay/summative submissions – the template cover page will be available via the online submission point for students to complete.
Candidate numbers are required on summative work in order to ensure that marking is anonymous. Note that your candidate number is not the same as your student number. This number can be viewed in StudentInfo (https://www.bris.ac.uk/studentinfo). You should regard this number as personal to you and not share it with anyone else. The number is used to ensure that the marking of a student’s work is done anonymously. Please ensure that you memorise your candidate number as you will need to write it on every assessment.

Assessment Length
Each piece of coursework must not exceed the stipulated maximum length for the assignment (the ‘word count’) listed in the unit guide. Summative work that exceeds the maximum length will be subject to penalties. The word count is absolute (there is no 10% leeway, as commonly rumoured). Five marks will be deducted for every 100 words or part thereof over the word limit. Thus, an essay that is 1 word over the word limit will be penalised 5 marks; an essay that is 101 words over the word limit will be penalised 10 marks, and so on.
The word count includes all text, tables, numbers, footnotes/endnotes, Harvard referencing in the body of the text and direct quotes. It excludes the cover page, bibliography, headers and appendices. However, appendices should only be used for reproducing documents, not additional text written by you.

Students are advised that any attempt to circumvent word count limits by changing essay format, e.g. by removing spaces in references, will be investigated. In these cases, penalties will be applied if the actual word count is exceeded and further disciplinary action may be taken.

Students should be aware that word count penalties will incur a mark reduction that may in turn impact their progress and/or overall qualification.

Referencing and Plagiarism
Students are required to reference the source materials used to inform their submitted work. Students are expected to use the Harvard referencing system as set out in the relevant section of the SPAIS Study Guide. Unless otherwise stated, essays must contain a bibliography. Students should consult the SPAIS Study Guide for full details (students can access this via the SPAIS MSc-Dip Admin Blackboard site).

Inadequate referencing in submitted work can run the risk of plagiarism. Plagiarism is the unacknowledged inclusion in a student's work of material derived from the published or unpublished work of another. This constitutes plagiarism whether it is intentional or unintentional. “Work” includes internet sources as well as printed material.

Plagiarism is a serious academic offence and penalties will be applied in such cases, as is set out in the SPAIS Postgraduate taught handbook. See also the relevant section of the School Study Skills Guide for more information.

Please note that plagiarism may lead to penalties that may prevent students found guilty of such an offence from progressing in their programme of study.

Extensions
Extensions to coursework deadlines will only be granted in exceptional circumstances. If you want to request an extension, complete a Coursework Extension Request Form (available at Blackboard/SPAIS MSC/Dip Administration/forms) and submit the form with your evidence (e.g. medical certificate, death certificate, or hospital letter) to Faye Cooper in the Postgraduate Office, 11 Priory Road or f.cooper@bristol.ac.uk.

Extension requests will not be considered if there is no supporting evidence.
All extension requests should be submitted at least 72 hours prior to the assessment deadline. If the circumstance occurs after this point, then please either telephone or see the Graduate Administration Manager in person. In their absence you can contact Faye Cooper in the PG Office, again in person or by telephone.

Extensions can only be granted by the Graduate Administration Office. They cannot be granted by unit convenors or seminar tutors.

You will receive an email to confirm whether your extension request has been granted or not.

**Submitting Essays/Work for assessment**
Formative work: Where applicable, details on how to submit formative work for assessment will be contained in this unit guide.

Summative work: All summative submissions must be submitted electronically via Blackboard.

Electronic copies enable an efficient system of receipting, providing the student and the School with a record of exactly when an essay was submitted. It also enables the School to systematically check the length of submitted essays and to safeguard against plagiarism.

**Late Submissions**
Penalties are imposed for work submitted late without an approved extension. Any kind of computer/electronic failure is not accepted as a valid reason for an extension, so make sure you back up your work on another computer, memory stick or in the cloud (e.g. One Drive, Dropbox or another equivalent system). Also ensure that the clock on your computer is correct. The following schema of marks deduction for late/non-submission is applied to both formative work and summative work:

- Up to 24 hours late, or part thereof Penalty of 10 marks
- For each additional 24 hours late, or part thereof A further 5 marks deduction for each 24 hours, or part thereof
- Assessment submitted over one week late Treated as a non-submission: fail and mark of zero recorded. This will be noted on your transcript.

- The 24 hour period runs from the deadline for submission, and includes Saturdays, Sundays, bank holidays and university closure days.
- If an essay submitted less than one week late fails solely due to the imposition of a late penalty, then the mark will be capped at 50 and recorded as a second attempt.

*Students should be aware that late penalties will incur a mark reduction that may in turn impact their progress and/or overall qualification.*

**Marks and Feedback**
In addition to an overall mark, students will receive written feedback on their assessed work.

In accordance with the Faculty’s Regulations and Code of Practice for Taught programmes, marks and feedback are typically returned within fifteen working days of the relevant submission deadline, unless exceptional circumstances arise in which case students will be informed of the deadline for return. The process of marking and providing detailed feedback is a labour-intensive one, with most 4000 word essays taking at least 45 minutes to assess and comment upon. Summative work also needs to be
checked for plagiarism and length and moderated by a second member of staff to ensure marking is fair and consistent.

If work is submitted late, then it may not be possible to return feedback within fifteen working days.

**Fails and Resits**
If you fail the unit overall, you will normally be required to resubmit or resit unless you do not meet the progression requirements for your programme. Your School Office will contact you if this is the case.
Appendix C

Level 7 Marking and Assessment Criteria (Postgraduate)
All MSc/Diploma marking in the School is out of 100 on the following scale and with the following classifications:

70 and above Distinction
60-69 Merit
50-59 Pass
Below 50 Fail

Work within each of the classifications is expected to demonstrate the following attributes. Please note that markers do not weight each of these attributes equally when finalising the mark. Markers may also take into account the extent to which achievement of unit-specific intended learning outcomes (see unit guide) has been demonstrated when assessing work and arriving at the mark.

70-100: DISTINCTION
Addresses the Question Set
The work is a highly appropriate response to the question or assignment task that has been set. Coverage and selection of content is exemplary. There is clear analysis of the question or topic. Clear ability to analyse and synthesize ideas is demonstrated. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+), work will be outstanding in (where appropriate) its incorporation and use of empirical evidence/theoretical frameworks/methodological approaches in addressing the question.

Contains coherent structure and argument
The assignment is internally consistent, extremely coherent, concise and well-structured. The introduction is well focused and provides a clear indication of the rationale, key literature base used and organisation of the work. The central argument/structure of the work has a clear and logical sequence of progression. The conclusion draws insights which are logically developed from the analysis. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+), work will be outstanding in the extent to which the structure facilitates the answer to the question.

Demonstrates understanding of key concepts and/or data
A detailed understanding of key concepts and/or data will be demonstrated. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+) sustained evidence of critical understanding of concepts and/or critical analysis of data will be demonstrated.

Supports argument with appropriate evidence
The assignment demonstrates that an excellent knowledge of the topic has been gained from careful research and wide ranging reading that goes well beyond the prescribed reading list. The selection, interpretation, comparison, evaluation, and integration of evidence and source material to support the argument is extremely effective. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+), work will indicate outstanding ability to deal with complexity, contradictions or gaps in the existing academic literature.

Demonstrates critical evaluation
Work at this level will indicate a detailed and critical understanding of central theoretical and/or methodological issues as appropriate. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+) work will show extensive evidence of coherence, creativity, originality and imagination in addressing the question or topic.
Writing, Background Reading, Referencing and Bibliographic format
The work is extremely well presented, with minimal grammatical or spelling errors. It is written in a fluent and engaging style that demonstrates sufficient background reading, with exemplary referencing and bibliographic formatting in accordance with the required conventions. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+), the work will be virtually error-free in these respects.

60-69: MERIT
Addresses the Question Set
The work is a very appropriate response to the set question or assignment task. The question is addressed comprehensively, and a convincing and coherent argument is maintained in doing so. There is very good coverage of content and some evidence of an ability to think critically in relation to the question or topic will be shown. Where appropriate, the work will illustrate good comprehension of the theoretical implications of the set question or assignment.

Contains coherent structure and argument
The structure of the assignment is sound. The introduction is relevant and provides the reader with a clear guide to the central argument and the overall structure of the work. The conclusion will highlight and reflect upon the key points of argument developed within the main body of the essay and relative to the set question or assignment.

Demonstrates understanding of key concepts and/or data
A sound understanding of relevant key concepts and/or date has been developed and demonstrated, with key related issues and debates identified and discussed.

Supports argument with appropriate evidence
Overall there is a very good selection and use of sources which are well integrated, interpreted and evaluated. The work will demonstrate the ability to be selective in the range of material used. Some independent reading and research that goes beyond the prescribed reading list will be demonstrated, although the range of evidence used will be more restricted in comparison with an assignment awarded a higher grade.

Demonstrates critical evaluation
The work will clearly demonstrate a capacity to synthesise and critically evaluate source materials and/or debates in relation to the set question or assignment rather than simply describe or summarise them.

Writing, Background Reading, Referencing and Bibliographic format
The work is clear and fluent and largely conforms to referencing and bibliographic conventions. It has been well edited and demonstrates sufficient background reading. Proof-reading has resulted in there being few grammatical or spelling errors.

50-59: PASS
Addresses the Question Set
The work is a reasonably appropriate response to the set question or assignment task. All aspects of the set question or topic have been addressed. The work will show some comprehension of the underlying theoretical/methodological implications of the question where appropriate, but there may be limitations in the understanding of how these issues relate to the question.
Contains coherent structure and argument
The assignment has been effectively structured, although more careful editing may have improved the overall coherence of argument. The introduction is well focused and provides a sense of the central argument and overall organisation. The conclusion provides a summary of the discussion, although may be primarily descriptive in nature and may fail to reflect upon or support the argument fully.

Demonstrates understanding of key concepts and/or data
A basic level of understanding of relevant key concepts and/or data has been demonstrated, though there may be some errors and/or gaps in the knowledge and understanding. Key related issues have been identified and discussed but without many significant insights being developed.

Supports argument with appropriate evidence
The argument will be supported by reference to and incorporation of some relevant evidence, but with scope for greater range and depth of evidence. The work will indicate a generally clear understanding of appropriate evidence, but this may be presented in an uncritical/descriptive manner and/or insufficiently incorporated into the overall argument in response to the set question or assignment task.

Demonstrates critical evaluation
A good range of relevant content has been covered, and there is some attempt at analysis but a tendency to be descriptive rather than critical. Work in this classification may also exhibit a tendency to assert/state points of argument rather than argue on the basis of reasoning and evidence.

Writing, Background Reading, Referencing and Bibliographic format
The style of writing is appropriate and presents few comprehension difficulties for the reader. The assignment is not as fluently written as it might have been, and there may be scope for improvement in spelling and grammar. There is evidence of sufficient background reading. Referencing and bibliographic formatting generally conform to the conventions, but there may be scope for further improvement in accuracy and consistency in accordance with the required conventions.

0-49 FAIL
Addresses the Question Set
Although some attempt will have been made, the work largely fails to address and/or significantly misunderstands the set question or assignment task. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) there is little or no understanding of the set question or assignment task in evidence.

Contains coherent structure and argument
The work does not contain a sufficiently structured argument, and may be ineffectively organised. The introduction may lack a clear rationale or statement of argument, and/or may lack a clear outline of the overall structure of the assignment. The conclusion may lack any indication of insights in relation to the set question or assignment task. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) the structure of the work may be incoherent or illogical, and/or the work may lack a clearly developed argument.

Demonstrates understanding of key concepts and/or data
There is limited knowledge and understanding of key concepts and/or data, with significant errors and/or omissions in this respect. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) there may be significant lack of awareness or understanding of key concepts and/or data.
Supports argument with appropriate evidence
Few key points of appropriate evidence are identified and/or there may be very little attempt at analysis of evidence, with the work tending towards excessive description. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) evidence referred to and included in the work may not be relevant to the addressing the set question or assignment task.

Demonstrates critical evaluation
The approach is typified by a general lack of critical evaluation in relation to relevant literature and issues. Work that simply asserts rather than argues a case may also fall into this classification. The use of sources may be excessively derivative of existing work, with little or no indication of an ability to independently analyse relevant material. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) there is little or no evidence of critical evaluation.

Writing, Background Reading, Referencing and Bibliographic format
The standard of writing presents difficulties for the reader, with frequent grammatical and spelling errors to a degree that inhibits communication. The range and depth of background reading may be insufficient. The approach to referencing and bibliographic formatting does not follow the required conventions to a sufficiently consistent level. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) the use of language may present considerable comprehension difficulties for the reader. The assignment may not meet stipulations in terms of layout and/or length, and the approach to referencing may not meet expected conventions