HIGHER EDUCATION ASSESSMENT

School:	Unknown			
Awarding Body:	Unknown		**Module Code:**	Unknown
Programme Title:	Unknown		**Occurrence:**	n/a
Module Title:	Unknown		**Credits:**	Unknown
Assessment Title:	Unknown		**Assessment No.**	Unknown
Tutor Details	**Name**	Unknown	**Telephone No.**	n/a
	Email	Unknown	**Room**	n/a

Internal Verification (IV) *For Staff Use Only*	**Assessment Brief IV** *Must be internally verified prior to distribution to students*	**IV Name:**	Unknown
		Date:	Unknown
	Student Submission IV *To be completed if the assessment submission forms part of the IV sample*	**IV Name:**	Unknown
		Date:	Unknown

Assessment Distribution, Submission & Return *Please note that late submissions may incur a penalty as defined within the assessment regulations of the awarding body*	**Distribution Date:**	Unknown
	Submission Time:	Unknown
	Submission Date:	Unknown
	Submission Point/Location:	Unknown
	Feedback Week Commencing:	n/a

Student Number:	Unknown
Student Name:	Anthony Riley

Assessment Record *For Staff Use Only. All assessment grades are subject to ratification by the University board of examiners and the awarding body.*	**Grade Awarded:**	F	**Submitted:**	☐ On Time ☐ Late____days ***(days NOT working days)***
	Date:	11/11/2019	**Penalty:**	

Student Declaration

It is your responsibility to ensure that your work is in the correct format, that you have submitted the correct file, and that you have submitted all of the work you want assessed. Once you have completed your submission online you can download the file that you have submitted to confirm that your work has been received as intended. If the University is unable to open your file, it may not be marked.

The University has to ensure as far as possible that the work submitted by students is their own and that credit is not given for unreferenced material from other sources. By submitting work for this assignment you acknowledge that the content is entirely your own work and that it has not been submitted whole or in part for the award of a degree or other qualification by you or any other person. You confirm that that all sources have been properly cited and referenced. You are expected to have familiarised yourself with the University regulations relating to assessment and academic malpractice and you should be aware that your work will be subjected to automated checks for plagiarism.

Learning Outcomes Assessed	
1	Unknown – Module information supplied
2	Unknown– Module information supplied
3	Unknown– Module information supplied
4	Unknown– Module information supplied
5	Unknown– Module information supplied
6	Unknown– Module information supplied

No Grade descriptors were available.	
A+ A A-	No Grade descriptors were available.
B+ B B-	No Grade descriptors were available.
C+ C C-	No Grade descriptors were available.
D+ D D-	No Grade descriptors were available.
F	No Grade descriptors were available.

Assessment Feedback

Outcome	Feedback
1	**No learning outcomes were made available**
2	**No learning outcomes were made available**
3	**No learning outcomes were made available**
4	**No learning outcomes were made available**
5	**No learning outcomes were made available**
6	**No learning outcomes were made available**

Overall Feedback

Note: This feedback was written with no knowledge of the modules learning outcomes or grade descriptors as they were not provided. Any feedback below is based solely upon the academic rigour it contains and the research utilised, and whether it has achieved what the author set out to achieve as specified in the dissertation's title question.

The concept was a bold one, and it's always interesting to read bold challenging ideas rather than safe work. However, with challenge comes risk, and you didn't mitigate against much of that risk very well. The whole dissertation seems to be hinged on the idea that not also teaching flat earth, or the electric universe etc. in schools is a partisan political issue. The problem with this is you fail to demonstrate why it is a political issue.
You also neglect to acknowledge that there is no legal requirement for the majority of schools to even teach the National Curriculum, as Academies, which form the majority of secondary schools in the United Kingdom are not obliged to teach it.

Early on in the dissertation, you claim the dissertation would discuss why the subjects discussed are not currently being recognised. Why was this not done?

There are numerous examples of assumption, such as when discussing Christopher Columbus. Nothing in the national curriculum specifies exactly what facts about Columbus need to be taught – only that it includes that subject. You cannot claim that Columbus is taught as being the "founder" of America, as there's nothing in the dissertation that verifies that fact is indeed being taught. This is poor research and allowing assumptions to creep into the work without verification. This happens again when you state that the Copernican model is "actually subject to legitimate controversy". **How are you legitimising any controversy? Merely existing doesn't legitimise it. You later present some arguments that attempt to explain why, but again, they make claims such as "**there is no evidence that the stars seen in one over the other are actually antipode", **but offer no evidence to demonstrate why that is true. Any reader would have to accept your assertion that this is so. This dissertation is replete with such examples of assumption. (See the sidenotes on the work itself.) You can't make such claims without demonstrating that they are factual. This pattern repeats throughout the dissertation, such as** "This evidence is needed to prove sphericity but it cannot be found"**, yet there clearly are vast amounts of evidence to suggest the earth is spherical – you merely dismiss it all without sufficient explanation as to why it was dismissed.**

As the dissertation progresses, it becomes less and less about the titled subject, and more an essay on flat earth. It also begins to cite conspiracy theory sources of information as legitimate evidence. The whole point of referencing is to offer some reassurance that matters being discussed are backed up by legitimate academic or scientific evidence – that they are not merely your claims. Conspiracy theories, by their very nature, offer nothing but highly contentious circumstantial evidence, otherwise they would not be conspiracy theories, and instead would be accepted fact. While I cannot verify what course of study this dissertation was part of, you do say it was a law based Masters Degree; Do you think citing conspiracy theory websites and material is appropriate for this degree?

The entire dissertation appears to be a personal crusade to legitimise a subject you are clearly passionate about. In itself that is not a bad thing. Where it becomes problematic is when you lose objectivity and demonstrate a lack of reflexivity when it comes to presenting a balanced argument. A dissertation is not meant to offer only evidence for one viewpoint at the exclusion of others, as to do so is to merely do what you suggest the national Curriculum should not – indoctrinate. You are required to also offer evidence for the opposing arguments and give the reader an objective understanding of the subject being examined. You can then make a suggestion as to what you think is the case, but the reader is then well equipped to form their own opinions also. You fail to do this spectacularly. There's genuine anger and incredulity in evidence. This has no place in a post graduate dissertation. The purpose of the dissertation would have been more successful if an attempt to evidence such was made in general instead of picking one single esoteric subject that is problematic to prove.; Perhaps there are legitimate cases of indoctrination occurring in our school system, but a robust investigation to uncover them was not attempted, instead you placed all your eggs in one basket. This indicated bias as a result of incredulity that a subject you strongly believe should be included, is not. This was the dissertations major flaw.

Levels of research are very poor for a post graduate dissertation. The bibliography is narrow and demonstrates poor research skills and inability to utlise all the resources at your disposal. There are a handful of citations from online sources, and none from published material from recognised academic sources. The levels of research evident would be sufficient to fail an undergraduate dissertation, let alone a post graduate dissertation. Did you not take the opportunity to discuss possible sources of reference with your tutors? Was this not highlighted throughout the tutorial process while you were researching this dissertation? Did you seek tutorial support?

The conclusion is weak, mainly because it just re-iterates what the main body of the dissertation contains. You write the dissertation as if it is a 12,000 word conclusion, and offer almost no balance throughout. It is an attack on the national curriculum based on one single thing: The omission of conspiracy theories as evidence of a partisan political bias resulting in indoctrination. You offer no reason as to why this is a "partisan political issue".

There's no evidence of proof reading, and grammatical, syntactic and spelling errors are many. This is not acceptable for a dissertation at this level.

Areas for Future Development

Note: The following feedback is written with no idea of what the module learning outcome requirements were, as none were supplied.

Serious effort should be made to maintain an objective, unbiased view of both sides of an argument in a dissertation. A dissertation should not be presented as a case for prosecution, it is an academic exercise in research, and should strive to present a balanced view with equal amounts of research to assess the validity of both sides of the discussion. From that you may draw a conclusion. Seek tutorial support and offer drafts of the dissertation to your assigned dissertation supervisor or tutor at regular intervals before you commit too much time and effort into the work. Do not work in isolation. The whole point of higher education is to discuss debate and enlighten one's self through peer review. Higher education is not school. You don't complete work in isolation. I can only assume that this dissertation was completed without any tutorial support or the issues discussed above would have been raised.