IQM3001

LEVEL 3 · SAMPLE ASSESSMENT

English for Academic Purposes

Writing Assessment Paper 2

STAFF ONLY · Mark scheme

Assessment window Sample assessment	**Exam date** _____
Paper P2-B	**Assessment set** Set S of 2026 Stored ID2026-A

Assessment-specific band descriptors and mark allocations for consistent marking.

Assessment: Assessment 3 (Writing Paper 2; HS1.3 template family A2)

Paper: Part B

Total marks: 60

Marker instructions

Apply this mark scheme consistently. Award marks by matching the response to the best-fit descriptor for each criterion.

Total marks: 60

General marking rule: Assess the response against each criterion independently. Select the band whose descriptor best matches the evidence, then award a mark within that band. Award 0 only where nothing creditworthy is seen. Add the four criterion marks to produce a total out of 60.

Task fulfilment

Coverage of both sources, response to the task, analysis and conclusion

Band	Descriptor	Marks
Band 5	An articulate and cohesive response covering both sources reasonably equally and reaching judicious and considered conclusions on the task. There is evaluative and analytical reflection on both sources, which is well integrated into the answer.	13-15
Band 4	A cohesive response covering both sources reasonably equally and reaching considered conclusions on the task. There is analytical reflection on both sources, which is integrated into the answer.	10-12
Band 3	A full response covering both sources reasonably equally and reaching some conclusions on the task. There is reflection on both sources within the answer.	7-9
Band 2	A response covering both sources and reaching some conclusions on the task. There is some reflection on both sources within the answer.	4-6
Band 1	A response covering one or both sources and reaching some conclusions on the task.	1-3
0	Nothing to credit seen in the response.	0

Organisation

Coherence and cohesion; summarising, synthesising and explaining

Band	Descriptor	Marks
Band 5	A response that is well structured, with a clear and succinct introduction, confident development with clear navigation between the sources, comparison, summary and synthesis, and a reasoned and judicious conclusion. Language features for comparison and cohesion are well used and fluid. The conclusion summarises the writer's own response based on earlier content.	17-20
Band 4	A response that is well structured, with a clear introduction and development, with navigation between the sources, comparison, summary and synthesis, and a reasoned conclusion. Language features for comparison and cohesion are used accurately. The conclusion summarises the writer's own response.	13-16
Band 3	A structured response with an introduction and development, including some navigation between the sources, comparison and summary, and a reasoned conclusion. Some or limited language features for comparison and cohesion are used. The conclusion summarises the writer's own response.	9-12
Band 2	A response with some development from opening to conclusion, including some navigation between the sources, comparison or summary. Language features for comparison and cohesion are attempted. The conclusion gives the writer's own response.	5-8
Band 1	A response including some form of opening and conclusion, reference to the sources, and limited comparison or summary.	1-4
0	Nothing to credit seen in the response.	0

Language

Vocabulary, grammar, spelling and punctuation

Band	Descriptor	Marks
Band 5	Vocabulary is precise and used to articulate the writer's own response and source content with fluidity. Grammatical features are used judiciously, suit the purpose and show confident control of sentence construction and meaning. Punctuation is accurate, and a range is used for appropriate tone and effect.	17-20
Band 4	Vocabulary is secure and conveys the writer's own response and source content with confidence. Grammatical features are accurate, suit the purpose and show control of sentence construction and meaning. Punctuation is accurate, and a range is used for appropriate tone and effect.	13-16
Band 3	Vocabulary is appropriate and conveys the writer's own response and source content. Grammatical features are used with some accuracy, which ensures intended meaning. Punctuation is generally accurate.	9-12
Band 2	Vocabulary conveys the writer's own response and source content. Grammatical features ensure intended meaning. Punctuation is sometimes accurate.	5-8
Band 1	Vocabulary may convey the writer's own response and source content. Grammatical features are sometimes appropriate. Punctuation is sometimes accurate.	1-4
0	Nothing to credit seen in the response.	0

Use of sources

Citation and referencing; integration of the writer's own voice with support

Band	Descriptor	Marks
Band 5	Sources are well used, cited and referenced, and there is judicious control over direct and indirect reference, showing the writer's own voice as well as direct reliance on the sources.	5
Band 4	Sources are correctly used, cited and referenced, and there is a selection of direct and indirect referencing, with evidence of the writer's own voice as well as direct reliance on the sources.	4
Band 3	Sources are generally used, cited and referenced correctly, with some evidence of the writer's own voice as well as direct reliance on the sources.	3
Band 2	Sources are sometimes used, cited and referenced correctly.	2
Band 1	Sources are sometimes cited and referenced correctly.	1
0	Nothing to credit seen in the response.	0

Mark record

Criterion	Maximum	Mark awarded
Task fulfilment	15	
Organisation	20	
Language	20	
Use of sources	5	
Total	60	

Standardisation notes

Task-specific marking guidance

Using both unseen sources, write a short academic essay, aiming for 650–700 words answering this question: How should universities combine indoor study-space improvements and access to outdoor campus spaces to support students’ attention and learning? Compare the kinds of evidence, evaluate their limitations and reach a justified conclusion. Explain which source provides stronger support for one of your key claims and why. Use your own words, Harvard-style in-text citations and a short reference list.

Retain and apply the four rubric criteria above independently: Task fulfilment 15; Organisation 20; Language 20; Use of sources 5. Total 60. Use best fit within each criterion; do not replace the rubric with a checklist or require one prescribed conclusion.

Indicative content

Source suitability is evidenced by the candidate explaining why the kind, relevance or limitations of a supplied source make it stronger or weaker support for a particular claim. Credit a reasoned choice in Task fulfilment and appropriate integration in Use of sources; do not award a separate extra mark or require external research.

A relevant response distinguishes Lu and Fu's survey of perceived restoration across six campuses from Brink and colleagues' pilot measuring indoor conditions, perceptions and short-term performance. Candidates may consider usability, access, comfort and landscape preferences alongside air quality, thermal conditions, acoustics and lighting. Both studies have limits: preferences do not demonstrate attention gains; pilot associations do not prove causation, and the performance relationship explains little variance. The lighting measure requires further validation.

Accept different priorities or combinations when supported by both sources, including a staged local evaluation. Do not require new construction or one preferred landscape. A proposal should distinguish a reasoned application from a finding directly tested by the studies. In-text citations: Lu and Fu (2019) and Brink et al. (2022).

Reference details available to candidates

Lu, M. and Fu, J. (2019) Attention Restoration Space on a University Campus: Exploring Restorative Campus Design Based on Environmental Preferences of Students. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 16(14), 2629. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16142629

Brink, H.W., Loomans, M.G.L.C., Mobach, M.P. and Kort, H.S.M. (2022) A systematic approach to quantify the influence of indoor environmental parameters on students' perceptions, responses, and short-term academic performance. Indoor Air, 32(10), e13116. https://doi.org/10.1111/ina.13116

Marking and administration notes

Word-count guidance: Part A aims for approximately 500 words and Part B for 650–700 words, excluding the reference list. Read and assess the whole response against the published rubric descriptors.

Scope: this scheme covers Part B (120 minutes) of the complete three-hour Writing Paper 2. Each part is marked /60 and contributes 50% of the Paper 2 percentage. Return both parts together for component-level verification. The guide calls Writing Assessment 3; A2 in retained template/file identifiers denotes the HS1.3 writing template family.

Assess the quality of selection, synthesis and acknowledgement, not the number of citations. Accept a consistent recognised Harvard variant. Penalise weaknesses through the relevant rubric descriptors without inventing an automatic deduction. No model response or synthetic learner work is supplied. Paper 2 percentage = average of Part A /60 and Part B /60 percentages. Use only the supplied sources and answer booklet. No dictionaries, personal notes, internet or AI tools are permitted during the assessment. Approved assistive technology may be used only under the agreed access arrangements. Plan, write and proofread within the stated time. The reference list is excluded from the suggested word count.

Part A sources are provided one week in advance, with fresh unannotated copies supplied in the assessment. Part B sources remain unseen until its start. Independent subject review, internal verification and academic approval remain pending.