

THE UNIVERSITY OF READING

**FRAMEWORK FOR CLASSIFICATION AND PROGRESSION FOR FIRST DEGREES
(FOR COHORTS ENTERING A PROGRAMME IN SEPTEMBER 2007 AND THEREAFTER)**

Approved by the Senate on 5 March 2008

Effective for cohorts entering Year 1 of undergraduate programmes in 2007/08 and thereafter.

Cohorts entering Year 1 in the period between Autumn Term 2002 and Summer Term 2007 are subject to the Framework for Classification and Progression for First Degrees (for cohorts entering a programme in the period Autumn Term 2002-Summer Term 2007).

This Framework does not apply to Foundation Degrees or to Ordinary Degrees.

1. Preliminaries

Each programme should have a Programme Director and each module a Module Convenor. There may also be for each part of a programme a Part Convenor (who may or may not be the Programme Director); where appropriate some of the responsibilities assigned to the Programme Director below may be delegated to a Part Convenor.

Head of School is used throughout to include Head of Department or a member of staff to whom the Head of School/Department has delegated specific responsibilities.

First degree programmes (excluding Foundation or Ordinary degrees) are defined as three-part or four-part, and there is no necessary correspondence between number of parts and the duration of the programmes.

Coursework is used here for any element of continuous assessment which is formally marked and the mark included in the module mark used for progression or awarding. Exhibitions and performances such as those in Fine Art, Music and Film & Drama are included here under the category of University examinations.

2. Principles

The University-wide awarding system is based on the principles in the University *Framework for the Classification of First Degrees (pre-2002 structure)*, best practice in the University and the principles prompted by the new degree structure. It adopts the following principles:

- 2.1 Progression and awards should be decided on the basis of agreed marks for properly presented work after internal and external moderation.
- 2.2 The awarding of three-part degrees should be based on the marks of Part 2 and Part 3 weighted 1:2. The awarding of four-part M degrees should be based on the marks of Parts 2, 3 and 4 weighted either 2:3:5 or 2:4:4. For professional accreditation or exceptionally pressing academic reasons, exceptions may be approved by the University Board for Teaching and Learning and the Senate.
- 2.3 Awards are determined by the Examiners exercising their judgement of the class which best represents the candidate's achievement based on the overall level of performance (the weighted average of the marks for the relevant parts), on the profile of marks overall and the profile of

marks for each part which contributes to the final award, and on any specific restriction which may apply (for accreditation or other proper purposes), with due account taken of any relevant special circumstances.

3. Presentation of work

Progression and awards should be made on the basis of agreed marks for properly presented work after internal and external moderation.

- 3.1 The University endeavours to provide reasonable conditions under which work may be undertaken. University examinations normally guarantee reasonable conditions. For other examinations or tests administered at module level, the Module Convenor should seek to ensure similar reasonable conditions as laid down by the University Board for Teaching and Learning. For coursework of any kind, the Module Convenor, in consultation, where appropriate, with the Programme Director or Part Convenor, should seek to ensure that the conditions, facilities and time appropriate to the assessment task are reasonably available to the students.
- 3.2 To be properly presented, work must be in an appropriate form and submitted in due time. University examinations normally guarantee this, as too should other examinations or tests administered at departmental/School level. For coursework of any kind, the Module Convenor is required to provide students with information as to the required form and the submission deadline for each piece of work as laid down in the Code of Practice on the Assessment of Taught Programmes. The Programme Director should seek to ensure a reasonable distribution of workload with respect to coursework across the programme.
 - 3.2.1 Extensions to dates for the submission of coursework and penalties for late submission of coursework are governed by procedures which apply across the University.

4. Marking and weighting

The following principles and procedures apply:

- 4.1 Marking should be conducted in accordance with the provisions contained in Annex 3.
- 4.2 It is essential that markers make full use of the range of marks available (i.e. all marks from 0 to 100), subject to the provision that work in the first class range should only be awarded one of the following 'step marks': 72, 75, 80, 85, 90, 95, 100. Please note that modules which have a detailed marking scheme capable of yielding a mark of 100, and in which the highest marks are demonstrably achievable by the best candidates performing within the normal range as defined by the University marking criteria (see Annex 3), are excepted from the step-marking provisions. (Markers should also note the provisions relating to *module* marks in 4.3.2, below.)
 - 4.2.1 The University is committed to rewarding excellence by ensuring that First Class achievement is awarded appropriate marks from across the full First Class range (70-100) in order that such achievement is appropriately represented in the weighted average used in classification.

For marking purposes, the first class range is divided in two. Marks in the range 85 –100 should be awarded to work in the upper half of the **normal** range for first class work and are deemed starred first class marks. Marks in the range 70-84 should be awarded to work in the lower half of the **normal** range for first class work. These provisions are designed to ensure that appropriate use is made of the full first class range of marks.

The marker must use his or her professional judgement to assess the work and award the most appropriate allowable mark, in accordance with the following guidelines.

4.2.2 **Step-marking in the first class range should be applied at the point where the primary academic judgement about the quality of a piece of work is being made, i.e. where a piece of work is being marked. Step-marking should be applied once only, and, where more than one piece of work contributes to a module mark, the module mark calculated from its constituent elements should not then be raised to a step mark. In these cases, a module mark in the first class range need not be a step mark.**

4.2.3 However, step-marking should not be applied in an assessment for which an appropriate detailed marking scheme is available which is capable of generating all marks (for instance, an examination paper with a series of questions to which a detailed marking scheme applies). Such assessments are excepted from the step-marking provisions since the full range of first class marks (including 100) is demonstrably available and the highest marks are demonstrably achievable by the best candidates performing within the normal First Class range as defined by the University marking criteria (see Annex 3).

For example:

(a) Where a module mark is derived from one assessment which lacks a detailed marking scheme and where the work demonstrates first class quality, only stepped marks can be used, i.e. 72, 75, 80, 85, 90, 95 and 100.

(b) Where a module mark is derived from one assessment which has a detailed marking scheme capable of generating all marks, the mark generated from the marking scheme should be used, i.e. 0-100.

(c) Where a module mark is derived from several components which do not have detailed mark schemes, each component should be marked using step-marks for work in the First Class range. But when these elements are aggregated, with whatever weighting, in order to produce a module mark, this overall mark can use numbers other than those in the steps.

(d) Where a module mark is derived from several components which do have detailed mark schemes, each component should be marked in accordance with the mark scheme. When these elements are aggregated, with whatever weighting, in order to produce a module mark, this overall mark can use numbers other than those in the steps.

(d) Where a module mark is derived from a number of assessment components, some of which have a detailed marking scheme and some of which do not, those components which have a detailed marking scheme should be marked in accordance with the detailed marking scheme and those which do not should use the stepped marks for the first class. When these elements are aggregated, with whatever weighting, in order to produce a module mark, this overall mark can use numbers other than those in the steps.

All staff should be aware of these guidelines on step marking when undertaking any marking of coursework or examinations. It is also essential that external examiners are aware of these practices, to supplement the information they will receive as a matter of course from the Examinations Office.

4.3 For *individual modules*, marks should be whole numbers.

4.3.1 In calculating the mark for a module, .50 should be rounded up to the next higher whole number and .49 should be rounded down to the next lower whole number.

- 4.3.2 Marks of 29 and 39 are not permitted as the final *module* mark for a module in any Part of an undergraduate programme..

It should be noted that markers may continue to use the marks 29 and 39 in marking work which contributes towards, but is not the sole constituent of, the overall module mark. If the overall module mark, calculated from its constituent elements, computes as 29 or 39, markers must use their professional judgement to determine, after consideration of the relevant criteria, whether the mark for the module should be 28 or 30, or 38 or 40.

- 4.4 Modules are weighted for progression purposes in accordance with their number of credits, and for classification purposes in accordance with their number of credits and the provisions contained in section 7.4.1 and 7.4.3(b) below.
- 4.5 Average marks for a Part and for the combination of Parts should be calculated to one decimal place, with the second decimal place being rounded up if it is 5 or greater and rounded down if it is less than 5.

5. **Moderation**

- 5.1 Marks and results can only be confirmed by Programme and Faculty Examiners following internal and external moderation. In some cases, the most obvious moderation method, double marking of all candidates, is appropriate – when it is built into the teaching system as in school experience on the BA(Ed), for example, or where the mark derives from panel assessment. It is also suitable for small cohorts. For larger cohorts, however, it involves a significant amount of unnecessary labour, out of proportion to the gain, and double marking of a sample is preferable.

Various approaches to sampling can be adopted but the main criteria for selecting an appropriate method are that the sample should be sufficient for the purpose of moderation, and administering its selection should be simple and easily achieved within the time scale. The sample should enable the moderator

- to establish that marking is accurate to common standards applied to shared understandings of the criteria; and
- to confirm that marking at the boundaries of each classification band is accurate.

This requires a sample consisting of at least two exemplars of each class (normally the highest and the lowest performance), failed candidates and any individual candidates the first marker finds significant difficulty in marking. As will be seen below, markers' reluctance to use the whole of the first class mark range is a problem, so there is an argument for, in the medium term, moderating first class marks to check that the full range is used. All this allows an estimate of ten as a minimum sample and as the minimum cohort for which sampling is not worth the effort.

Statistical comparison of mark distributions for modules may be a useful tool in the moderation process.

For some assessment tasks selection of such a sample or double marking (or equivalent) is not possible – notably those which take place in real time such as oral presentations or field work activity. Nonetheless, moderation of a kind can be carried out through various means. Alternative forms of moderation which might be considered include:

- Recording (video or audio) and moderating a sample of the recordings;
- Assessors' notes (and possibly photographs) which explain how the marking criteria were applied and moderating a sample of the notes;

- Co-operative staff development, where staff carry out sample assessments in pairs or groups to establish a shared understanding of the criteria and the standards to apply;
- Comparison with peer assessment, where the staff assessment is compared (for example, by rank order) with peer assessment. (It should be noted that University policy requires that peer assessment per se is not to be used for a formal mark; the formal mark must be determined by an appropriate member of staff. What is suggested here is the use of peer assessment as one check on the reasonable accuracy of the marks of staff, not its use to produce an actual mark.)

It should be noted that such methods are work intensive and do not require excessive frequency. They should be carried out regularly and sufficiently often to provide an adequate check, but not necessarily every year. They could usefully be combined with other staff development – the mentoring of a new lecturer, for example.

Moderation is essentially an iterative process depending on the kind and degree of variation between marker and moderator. If there is no significant difference, the marks can be simply agreed. If there is systematic variation throughout the range, moderator and marker must negotiate an agreed shift in the marking and all the work remarked and re-moderated until no significant difference remains (a second moderator may be called in to assist). If significant disagreement is not widespread but only occurs for occasional individuals, marker and moderator should negotiate an agreed mark for each such individual on a case by case basis (again a second moderator may assist).

Moderation by External Examiners is subject to much the same arguments, but is also dependent on the views of the External Examiners themselves.

5.2 The following procedures for internal and external moderation apply:

5.2.1 **Internal Moderation**

All marking which counts towards a formal mark for awarding or progression should be moderated appropriately internally. Such moderation should be sufficient to give reasonable assurance that the marking is accurate to common standards applied to shared understandings of the criteria, and that the marking at the boundaries of classification bands is accurate. In terms of the investment of staff effort, the moderation process should be commensurate with the weight of the assessment task and the size of the cohort.

Double marking of the whole cohort is a suitable method of moderation for cohorts of ten or fewer, for work which is automatically marked by a panel of two or more assessors or for assessed work of sufficient weight and significance to warrant the workload (some major final part dissertations, for example).

Otherwise, where possible, moderation of a sample should be arranged. The sample should contain a meaningful proportion of the total candidates, which enables the purposes of moderation to be achieved. It is suggested that a minimum of ten candidates might in most cases be appropriate with

- at least two exemplars of each class for which marks are given (normally the highest and lowest performing candidate)
- all failed candidates, or, in the case of modules where there are large numbers of failed candidates, a representative sample of failed candidates, including a number of candidates at the pass/fail borderline and at the borderline 28%/30%;
- sufficient first class candidates to illustrate the range from lowest first class mark given to highest
- any individual candidates the first marker finds significant difficulty in marking.

In cases where the moderation process indicates that marking at the boundaries of classification bands is not accurate, the next lowest performing candidates (in the case of a lower boundary) or the next best performing candidates (in the case of an upper boundary) should be reviewed until marking at the boundaries is satisfactory. If there are wider concerns about the accuracy of marking, all candidates in the relevant mark ranges should be reviewed.

Unless it is impracticable, the marking, selection of the sample and moderating should be made while the candidates remain anonymous.

Where double-marking of a sample is not possible, some other form of moderation should take place, subject to the two conditions of being sufficient for and commensurate with the assessment task. Examples of alternative forms of moderation are given above (see section 5.1).

All marks which are arrived at through addition of subsidiary marks (a total from a mark scheme, a (possibly weighted) average of minor assessments, etc) should have the arithmetic checked by a designated person, who could be a suitable member of the administrative or support staff.

If more than two markers are involved in marking an assessment, appropriate arrangements for moderation across the cadre of markers should be agreed in advance and a report on the outcomes and process provided to the relevant School Director of Teaching and Learning and made available to the External Examiner responsible for the module.

For each assessment, the Module Convenor (in collaboration with the relevant Programme Director, where appropriate) shall propose a suitable method of moderation to be approved by the School Director of Teaching and Learning who will report on moderation processes to the External Examiners. The External Examiners have the right to comment on and suggest changes to moderation processes.

The outcome of moderation should normally be that a single, internally agreed mark for each module is recommended to the External Examiners. The moderation process should be adequately documented: as a minimum, there should be a record in respect of each module indicating the pieces of work which have been moderated internally and those which have been moderated externally, and any action taken in the context of moderation. Some Schools indicate the work which has been moderated in a column on a mark spreadsheet, or include on the coversheet for the individual piece of work a field for the moderator's comments.

The internal moderator should explicitly confirm that the full range of the first class band has been used, where appropriate.

5.2.2 External Moderation

External Examiners have the right of access to all assessed work. In practice, in most cases External Examiners will necessarily concentrate on a sample of assessed work. The School Director of Teaching and Learning or a member of staff designated by the Head of School (for example, a Programme Director) should seek the agreement of the External Examiners as to how the sample is selected, bearing in mind that, in the first instance, the same principles as for internal moderation should determine the selection of the sample, but that, in the case of external moderation, consideration should be given to candidates' profile of marks and indicative overall classification as well as to marks for individual modules.

In considering candidates' profile of marks and indicative overall classification, External Examiners may wish to give consideration to: (a) those candidates who fall within the borderline and who fail marginally to fulfil one or other of the criteria for promotion; (b) those who fall marginally short of the threshold overall average which qualifies for inclusion in the borderline and who have fulfilled one or other of the criteria for promotion; and (c) candidates whose profile

is marginal and sufficiently unusual to give rise to concerns about the security of the implied classification. Statistics from previous Sessions indicate that the numbers of students who fall within these categories for any programme will be small.

In respect of modules at Part 1, External Examiners who wish to moderate marks, while having the right of access to all assessed work, would normally be expected only to consider the pass/fail borderline and the borderline at the 30 threshold.

The School Director of Teaching and Learning (or other designated member of staff) should seek to establish whether External Examiners wish for access to assessed work which might not be readily available (e.g. coursework), and should make appropriate arrangements to accommodate such requests.

External Examiners are currently asked to comment on the monitoring of assessment, and, with effect from 2008/09 will be asked explicitly to report that moderation procedures were satisfactory.

6. **Moderation, awarding and progression decisions**

Marks must be agreed, following internal and external moderation, before awards or progression decisions are determined.

This demands a two-stage external examining process – first the confirmation of all marks and then the awarding. The major problem is that with more flexible, modular programmes agreement of some marks may depend on External Examiners outwith the programme. Since it would not be reasonable to expect External Examiners to attend two meetings within a short space of time, it is envisaged that module marks would normally be moderated by post in advance of the period in which Programme Examiners' Meetings are held. In those instances where a student's marks have not been moderated, a final decision on the recommended award should be deferred. This imposes tight constraints on the moderation process. The schedule for the process will be reviewed in the light of experience of the new programme structure and RISIS.

7. **Award of first degrees**

- 7.1 As indicated in section 3.2 above, the awarding of three-year Bachelor's degrees will be based on the marks of Part 2 and Part 3 weighted 1:2. The awarding of four-year Bachelor's degrees (except for programmes incorporating a placement year or a year abroad) will normally be based on the marks for Years 2, 3 and 4, weighted 1:1:4.

In the case of four-year Bachelor's degree programmes with an industrial placement year, the placement year may be pass/fail or may contribute to the degree classification. In the latter case, normally, Year 2 will contribute 23% of the overall assessment, the placement year 10% of the overall assessment and Year 4 will contribute 67% of the overall assessment. Exceptions to this arrangement are set out in Annex 1. The programme specification will set out the manner in which the placement year will contribute.

Certain other four-year Bachelor's degree programmes, notably those with a year abroad, have been approved by Senate under exceptional arrangements. These are given in Annex 1.

The awarding of four-part M degrees will be based on the marks of Parts 2, 3 and 4 weighted either 2:3:5 or 2:4:4, as agreed by the University Board for Teaching and Learning. For professional accreditation or exceptionally pressing academic reasons, exceptions to this pattern may be approved by the University Board for Teaching and Learning and the Senate.

The University has agreed a common format for the presentation of marks at Programme Examiners' Meetings.

- 7.2 Awards are determined by the Examiners exercising their judgement of the class which best represents the candidate's achievement based on the overall level of performance (the weighted average of the marks for the relevant parts), on the profile of marks overall and the profile of marks for each Part which contributes to the final examination, and on any specific restriction which may apply (for accreditation or other proper purposes), with due account taken of any relevant special circumstances.

7.3 **Classification and other results for first degrees**

Degrees with Honours may be awarded with the following classifications:

First Class
Second Class Division 1
Second Class Division 2
Third Class

A Pass degree may be awarded.

Candidates who have failed to fulfil the requirements for a Pass degree shall be stated to have Failed, but may be eligible for an alternative qualification.

An Aegrotat degree may be awarded to a candidate who is prevented by reason of illness from completing the assessment for a degree, in accordance with Ordinance X.

A candidate may at the discretion of the Faculty Examiners be deemed not to have sat the examination if the candidate has been prevented from sitting the examination by illness or other good cause or if the candidate's performance in the examination has been significantly affected by illness or other serious personal circumstance.

No recommendation shall be submitted to the Senate in respect of a candidate who is in debt to the University.

7.4 **A Common University-wide Awarding Method for First Degrees**

The Senate has decided that a Common University-wide Awarding Method be adopted for first degrees (excluding Foundation and Ordinary degrees) which requires that the same criteria be applied in the same order for all programmes; and that the Guidelines for the Application of the Common University-wide Awarding Method, which provides guidance on the use of the awarding method in determining awards, also be adopted. The Senate has further decided that the anonymity of candidates should be preserved until results have been agreed.

7.4.1 **Definitions**

The following definitions apply in the Common University-wide Awarding Method:

Overall Weighted Average

The overall weighted average for a three-year Bachelor's degree is calculated as follows:

$(1/3 \times \text{average Part 2 mark}) + (2/3 \times \text{average Part 3 mark}) = \text{overall weighted average}$

The overall weighted average for a four-year Bachelor's degree without placement or a year abroad is calculated as follows:

$$(1/6 \times (\text{average Year 2 mark} + \text{average Year 3 mark})) + (4/6 \times \text{average Year 4 mark}) = \text{overall weighted average}$$

For four-year Bachelor's degree programmes with an industrial placement year, the placement year may be pass/fail or may contribute to the degree classification. In the latter case, normally, Year 2 will contribute 23% of the overall assessment, the placement year 10% of the overall assessment and Year 4 will contribute 67% of the overall assessment. Exceptions to this arrangement are set out in Annex 1. The programme specification will set out the manner in which the placement year will contribute.

Programmes which Senate has agreed be assessed in ways different from this are listed in Annex 1.

The overall weighted average for an M degree is calculated as follows:

Either

$$(0.2 \times \text{average Part 2 mark}) + (0.3 \times \text{average Part 3 mark}) + (0.5 \times \text{average Part 4 mark}) = \text{overall weighted average}$$

Or

$$(0.2 \times \text{average Part 2 mark}) + (0.4 \times \text{average Part 3 mark}) + (0.4 \times \text{average Part 4 mark}) = \text{overall weighted average}$$

(The approved programme specification will state which of these schemes applies.)

Final Year Honours Credit Requirement—the requirement that candidates achieve 80 credits in their Final Part with a mark of at least 40, which is a condition for the award of a classified Honours degree

Final Year BHS Credit Requirement—the requirement that candidates achieve 80 credits in their Final Part with a mark of at least 35 which is a condition for the the result of Pass

Dominant Quality – the class which best represents the profile; that is, the highest class in or above which at least half of the marks fall weighted according to the number of credits and to the Part in the same proportion as in the weighted average mark.

Exit Velocity – the comparison of the marks in the final Part in relation to earlier marks to determine whether the candidate's performance is improving or declining in the final Part of the programme. The Exit Velocity of a candidate is the class in which the candidate's average performance in the final Part of the programme lies.

Absolute Significant Weakness - failure to achieve a specified minimum mark in a designated module (a 'hurdle') which leads automatically to failure of the degree or to restriction to no more than a Pass degree. (Provisions relating to such 'hurdles' must be stated fully in the Programme Specification and the Programme Handbook; the information provided must specify whether failure in a 'hurdle' entails failure in the degree or restriction to a Pass degree. It is intended that the number of such 'hurdles' should be kept to a minimum.)

Borderlines – in respect of the overall weighted average, all programmes use the same ranges for determining candidates within a borderline, as follows:

Boundary	Borderline BELOW
1 st /2i	68.0 – 69.9
2i/2ii	58.0 – 59.9
2ii/3 rd	48.0 – 49.9
3 rd /BHS	38.0 – 39.9
BHS/Fail	33.0 – 34.9

7.4.2 Common University-wide Awarding Method

The Common University-wide Awarding Method requires that the same criteria be applied in the same order for all programmes.

Honours

The Final Year Honours Credit Requirement should be applied. If the Final Years Honours Credit Requirement has been fulfilled (i.e. the candidate has achieved 80 credits in the Final Part with marks of at least 40), consideration can be given to the classification of the degree.

The Overall Weighted Average should then be used to place the candidate in a class.

For those in the borderline below a class:

If the Dominant Quality or the Exit Velocity is in (or higher than) the class above the borderline, the candidate should normally be raised to the class above the borderline.

If the Dominant Quality and Exit Velocity are in (or lower than) the class of the overall weighted average, the candidate should normally be left in that class.

Supplementary conventions relating to specified programmes under the provisions of section 7.4.3(c)(ii) are applied (including any provisions relating to Absolute Significant Weakness).

Pass

If the candidate has not fulfilled the criteria for an Honours classification, consideration should be given to whether the candidate has fulfilled the criteria for a Pass.

The Final Year BHS Credit Requirement should be applied. If the Final Year Honours Credit Requirement has been fulfilled (i.e. the candidate has achieved 80 credits in the Final Part with marks of at least 35), the further criteria for a Pass should be applied:

If the overall weighted average is 35 or more, the candidate qualifies for a Pass.

For those in the borderline below the Pass band:

If the Dominant Quality or the Exit Velocity is in (or higher than) the Pass band, the candidate should normally be raised to Pass.

If the Dominant Quality and the Exit Velocity are in the Fail band, the candidate should normally be left in the Fail category.

Supplementary conventions relating to specified programmes under the provisions of section 7.4.3(c)(ii) are applied (including any provisions relating to Absolute Significant Weakness).

7.4.3 Guidelines for the Application of the Common University-wide Awarding Method

The following conventions provide guidance on the award of all first degrees across the University (excluding Foundation and Ordinary degrees).

- (a) In order to be eligible for a three-year Bachelor's degree, a candidate must have completed 360 credits (of which not less than 100 shall normally be at H level or above, except in the case where a candidate is deemed to have achieved a Pass).

For four-year Bachelor's degrees candidates must have completed 480 credits (of which not less than 100 shall normally be at H level or above) and such additional requirements as Senate shall have approved in the programme specification.

In order to be eligible for an M degree, a candidate must have completed 480 credits (of which not less than 100 shall normally be at H level or above and not less than 120 at M level).

- (b) The classification of a three-year Bachelor's degree shall be based on the marks for Part 2 and Part 3, weighted in a ratio of 1:2. The classification of four-year Bachelor's degrees without placement or a year abroad shall be based on marks weighted in accordance with the conventions specified in section 7.1 above. The weighting of Parts 2, 3 and 4 for classification of M degrees shall be 2:3:5 or 2:4:4, in accordance with the approved programme specification. For professional accreditation or exceptionally pressing academic reasons, exceptions may be approved by the University Board for Teaching and Learning and the Senate.
- (c) The following conventions provide guidance on the award of a Bachelor's degree or an M degree:
- (i) The following conditions should be satisfied for the award indicated. **Where the conditions for a higher class have been met, the higher class should be awarded.**

First Class

80 credits in the Final Part with marks of at least 40

and

[An overall weighted average of at least 70

or

An overall weighted average of at least 68, provided that half or more of the weighted credits have a mark in the range 70-100

or

An overall weighted average of at least 68, provided that the average for modules taken in Part 3 (or for modules taken in Part 4 in the case of M degrees) is 70 or more]

Second Class Division 1

80 credits in the Final Part with marks of at least 40

and

[An overall weighted average within the range 60.0-69.9

or

An overall weighted average of at least 58, provided that half or more of the weighted credits have a mark of 60 or more

or

An overall weighted average of at least 58, provided that the average for modules taken in Part 3 (or for modules taken in Part 4 in the case of M degrees) is 60 or more]

Second Class Division 2

80 credits in the Final Part with marks of at least 40

and

[An overall weighted average within the range 50.0-59.9

or

An overall weighted average of at least 48, provided that half or more of the weighted credits have a mark of 50 or more

or

An overall weighted average of at least 48, provided that the average for modules taken in Part 3 (or for modules taken in Part 4 in the case of M degrees) is 50 or more]

Third Class

80 credits in the Final Part with marks of at least 40

and

[An overall weighted average within the range 40.0-49.9

or

An overall weighted average of at least 38, provided that half or more of the weighted credits have a mark of 40 or more

or

An overall weighted average of at least 38, provided that the average for modules taken in Part 3 (or for modules taken in Part 4 in the case of M degrees) is 40 or more]

Pass

80 credits in the Final Part with marks of at least 35

and

[An overall weighted average within the range 35.0-39.9

or

An overall weighted average of at least 33, provided that half or more of the weighted credits have a mark of 35 or more

or

An overall weighted average of at least 33, provided that the average for modules taken in Part 3 (or for modules taken in Part 4 in the case of M degrees) is 35 or more]

(ii) *Supplementary conventions relating to specified programmes*

Faculty Boards of Teaching and Learning may recommend to the University Board for Teaching and Learning in respect of specified programmes further provisions relating to designated modules, including provisions in respect of Absolute Significant Weakness and other requirements relating to the achievement of minimum marks. Such provisions must be stated in the Programme Specification and in the Programme Handbook. While it is

intended that such supplementary conventions be kept to a minimum, it is recognized that programmes which bear professional accreditation (or the equivalent) may be subject to a number of supplementary conventions.

- (iii) Examiners may recommend a higher or lower classification than the guidelines imply, where they deem this to be appropriate. The grounds for such a recommendation should be recorded in the Minutes.

A statement clarifying the conditions under which Examiners might properly exercise discretion to agree a classification at variance with the algorithm contained in the *Framework* is included as Annex 2.

- (d) ***Aegrotat***

In accordance with Ordinance X, an Aegrotat degree may be awarded to a candidate who is prevented by reason of illness from completing the assessment for a degree, provided that the Internal and External Examiners for the programme, the Faculty Examiners and the Senate are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the candidate merits an award. An Aegrotat degree shall not be placed in a class.

8. Eligibility for the award of Certificate/Diploma of Higher Education and for Progression

8.1 Threshold Performance at Part 1

- 8.1.1 To be considered to have achieved a threshold performance at Part 1 a student shall normally be required to:

- achieve an overall average of 40% over 120 credits taken in Part 1, where all the credits are at C level or above; and
- achieve a mark of at least 30% in individual modules amounting to not less than 100 credits taken in Part 1.

- 8.1.2 For programmes at Part 1 in which part of the material taught is at Foundation level (pass mark 55%) and part at the C level (pass mark 40%) the mark required to pass Part 1 will be the weighted average of the pass marks for the modules taken in Part 1. That is, if x credits are taken at Foundation level and $120 - x$ at C level, the pass mark will be

$$\frac{x \times 55 + (120 - x) \times 40}{120} \left(= 40 + \frac{x}{8} \right) .$$

To be considered to have achieved a threshold performance at Part 1 a student following such a programme shall normally be required to:

- (a) achieve an overall average of the pass mark, as calculated in the paragraph above, over 120 credits taken in Part 1; and
- (b) achieve a mark of at least 30% in individual modules amounting to not less than 100 credits taken in Part 1.

8.2 Threshold performance at Part 2

To be considered to have achieved a threshold performance at Part 2 a student shall normally be required to:

- achieve an overall average of 40% over 120 credits taken in Part 2; and
- achieve a mark of at least 30% in individual modules amounting to not less than 100 credits taken in Part 2.

8.3 **Rules for progression from Part 1 to Part 2**

8.3.1 In order to progress from Part 1 to Part 2 of a Bachelor's or an M programme, a student shall normally be required to:

- (a) achieve a threshold performance at Part 1; and
- (b) fulfil any programme-specific requirements which are stipulated in the relevant programme specification.*

* Programme-specific requirements will normally relate to the achievement of a minimum mark (normally 30 or 40, or, where a module is Foundation level, 55) in a named module or modules directly relevant to the programme or to the achievement of a minimum average over a group of modules directly relevant to the programme. Such requirements must be approved by the Faculty Board for Teaching and Learning responsible for the programme. The Faculty Boards are encouraged to approve such requirements only where failure to achieve the specified mark or average would strongly imply that a student would not be in a position to undertake successfully the next Part of the programme.

8.4 **Progression from Part 2 to Part 3**

8.4.1 In order to progress from Part 2 to Part 3 of a Bachelor's programme, a student shall normally be required to:

- (a) achieve a threshold performance at Part 2; and
- (b) fulfil any programme-specific requirements which are stipulated in the relevant programme specification.*

* Programme-specific requirements will normally relate to the achievement of a minimum mark (normally 30 or 40) in named module or modules directly relevant to the programme or to the achievement of a minimum average over a group of modules directly relevant to the programme. In the case of programmes with a placement or a language year abroad in Year 3, progression from Part 2 to Part 3 will be determined on the basis of Part 2 work, subject to any specific requirements in relation to the placement. Such requirements must be approved by the Faculty Board for Teaching and Learning responsible for the programme. The Faculty Boards are encouraged to approve such requirements only where failure to achieve the specified mark or average would strongly imply that a student would not be in a position to undertake successfully the next Part of the programme.

8.4.2 In order to progress from Part 2 to Part 3 of an M programme, a student shall normally be required to:

- (a) achieve a threshold performance at Part 2; and
- (b) achieve an overall average of 50% over 120 credits taken in Part 2 (of which not less than 100 credits should normally be at I level or above); and

- (c) fulfil any programme-specific requirements which are stipulated in the relevant programme specification.*

* Programme-specific requirements will normally relate to the achievement of a minimum mark (normally 30, 40 or 50) in a module or modules directly relevant to the programme or to the achievement of a minimum average over a group of modules directly relevant to the programme. Such requirements must be approved by the Faculty Board for Teaching and Learning responsible for the programme. The Faculty Boards are encouraged to approve such requirements only where failure to achieve the specified mark or average would strongly imply that a student would not be in a position to undertake successfully the next Part of the programme.

8.5 **Progression from Part 3 to Part 4 (M programmes)**

There is not normally a formal requirement for progression from Part 3 to Part 4 of M programmes.

8.6 **Supplementary progression requirements relating to specified programmes**

The Faculty Board for Teaching and Learning may approve such further requirements as may be necessary for professional accreditation.

8.7 **Exceptional rules for progression relating to specified programmes**

Exceptionally, Senate may approve programmes whose specifications allow for variation on the normal rules for progression to Part 2 or to Part 3 (specified in 8.2-8.5 above), in which case the approved rules apply to progression for that programme.

8.8 **Results**

Failed A candidate who has failed to achieve a threshold performance shall be stated to have failed.

Not qualified A candidate who (i) has achieved a threshold performance at Part 1 or Part 2 but who has not fulfilled a programme-specific requirement, or (ii) in the case of a candidate registered for Part 2 of an M programme, has achieved a threshold performance at Part 2 and has either not achieved an overall average of 50% at Part 2 or not fulfilled a programme specific rule, shall be stated to have not qualified to proceed; such a candidate may be eligible for the award of a Certificate or Diploma of Higher Education in accordance with the provisions of 8.9 below.

Passed A candidate who has achieved a threshold performance at Part 1 or Part 2 and all relevant programme-specific requirements for progression and, if following Part 2 of an M programme, has achieved an overall average of 50% shall be stated to have passed; such a candidate may be eligible for the award of a Certificate or Diploma of Higher Education in accordance with the provisions of 8.9 below.

Deemed not to have sat A candidate may, at the discretion of the Faculty Examiners, be deemed not to have sat the examination if the candidate has been prevented from sitting the examination by illness or other good cause or if the candidate's performance in the examination has been significantly affected by illness or other serious personal circumstance.

8.9 **Certificate of Higher Education and Diploma of Higher Education**

A student who achieves a threshold performance at Part 1 and who has taken modules including at least 100 credits at level C or above shall be eligible for the award of a Certificate of Higher Education. If the student takes fewer than 100 credits at level C or above in Part 1 but subsequently takes further credits at level C or above the later credits may contribute to the award of the Certificate of Higher Education unless the student is eligible for a higher qualification.

A student who achieves a threshold performance at Part 2 and who has, taken a total of 240 credits, and taken modules including at least 100 credits at level I or above shall be eligible for the award of a Diploma of Higher Education. If the student takes fewer than 100 credits at level I or above in Part 2 but subsequently takes further credits at level I or above the later credits may contribute to the award of the Diploma of Higher Education unless the student is eligible for a higher qualification.

9. **Re-assessment**

9.1 **Re-assessment in Parts 1 and 2**

A candidate who in the Part 1 or the Part 2 Examination has failed, or is not qualified to proceed, has the right to be re-assessed on one further occasion at the next opportunity (normally August/September); and such a candidate, if he or she elects to be re-assessed, may only be re-assessed in those modules in which he or she achieved less than 40 (or the relevant pass mark in the case of M programmes). Subject to this restriction, a re-examinee may select those modules in which he or she wishes to be re-assessed.

A re-examinee will be given a mark for the re-assessed module which reflects the candidate's performance in the re-assessment. The mark used for purposes of *progression* shall be the higher of (a) the mark achieved in the original examination or (b) the actual mark on re-examination.

The Part 2 mark to be used in determining the *classification* is the higher of (a) the first attempt mark or (b) the lower of 40 and the mark achieved in the re-examination.

9.2 **Re-assessment in Part 3 (or Parts 3 and 4)**

A candidate who has failed a degree shall have the right to be re-assessed on one further occasion at the next opportunity (normally August/September), and, if he or she elects to be re-assessed, may only be re-assessed in those modules in Part 3 (or, in the case of M courses, in Parts 3 and 4) in which he or she achieved less than 40. Subject to this restriction, a re-examinee may select those modules in which he or she wishes to be re-assessed.

A candidate who is re-assessed shall not be eligible for an Honours degree. The actual mark achieved in the re-assessment or the mark achieved in the original examination, whichever is higher, shall be used in determining whether a candidate has passed or failed.

9.3 **Mode of re-assessment**

Arrangements for assessment following a result of deemed not to have sat and for re-assessment should be informed by the following principles:

- (a) The assessment method at re-assessment, or assessment following a result of deemed not to have sat, must be effective in measuring student attainment of the range of intended learning outcomes.
- (b) The assessment method at re-assessment, or an assessment following a result of deemed not to have sat, should, as far as is practicable, reflect the assessment method for the first

attempt. In determining practicability, Schools should take into consideration both the feasibility of arrangements within the School and feasibility for the student undertaking re-assessment (including factors such as volume of work, and availability of resources when students may not be able to access the Library or other University resources).

- (c) Where the first attempt assessment involves a series of coursework assignments, the School may wish to consider setting as the re-assessment for the coursework element a single synoptic assignment. Equally, where the first attempt assessment involves a long piece of coursework, Schools may wish to require a shorter piece of work for the re-assessment; such a substitution would not normally be appropriate in the case of a dissertation or substantial project, where the intended learning outcomes could not be adequately demonstrated in a shorter piece of work. For re-assessment of coursework, Schools may, at their discretion, set either the same assignment as was set at the first attempt or a different assignment.
- (d) Where a student is re-assessed in a module, the re-assessment should be capable of yielding a mark of 100% prior to any capping.
- (e) Where the assessment and re-assessment methods involve a combination of coursework and examination, students who are eligible for re-assessment should have the right to re-assessment in all elements of the re-assessment (for example, coursework and re-examination) even if they have previously passed one of those elements.

It is expected, however, that the majority of students would probably elect not to repeat an element in which they had already passed.

In the event that a candidate re-submits/resits an element and achieves a lower mark in the re-assessment of the element, the mark for the first attempt should be used in the calculation of the module mark; the mark for the first attempt of those elements **not** re-submitted/resat would be used by default. In the case where a candidate has resat/re-submitted none of the elements of the re-assessment for which s/he was registered, a mark of zero for the re-assessment in the module would be recorded and, in accordance with current procedures, the mark for the first attempt would be used for progression or awarding purposes.

- (f) It is recognised that there may need to be some greater measure of flexibility in respect of students who have been deemed not to have sat, since their first attempt may have been affected differently by their various circumstances. It is, however, important that there is equivalence with other candidates and that the relevant learning outcomes have been assessed.

Students who have been deemed not to have sat should normally have the right to undertake a further assessment only in those elements which were affected by the circumstances which had led to the student being deemed not to have sat.

Where appropriate, the assessment method in the case of students who had been deemed not to have sat may be aligned with the re-assessment method.

- (g) The module description should clearly state the method of re-assessment.

10. **Examiners and Examiners' Meetings**

- 10.1 External Examiners are required for all Parts of degrees in the post-2002 programme structure, since Part 1 may lead to the award of the Certificate of Higher Education and Part 2 both may lead to the award of a Diploma of Higher Education and contributes to the final classification of the Bachelor's or M degree.

- 10.2 The number of Internal and External Examiners nominated for each of the Parts is at the discretion of the School and subject to approval by the Faculty and University Board for Teaching and Learning.
- 10.3 Each Examiners' Meeting shall appoint a Special Cases Sub-Committee to consider any cases for which there are special circumstances. Guidance on the procedures for consideration of special circumstances is given in *Procedures for consideration of extenuating circumstances in relation to undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes*
- 10.4 A schedule for required meetings might be:

Completion of Final Examinations

Marking, Internal Moderation and Selection of Samples for Externals

External Moderation

Confirmation of moderated module marks*

- * Moderated module marks may be confirmed either by the Examination Representative in consultation with those responsible for marking and moderation or by a Module Examiners' Meeting.

All marks should be moderated and agreed by a specified date in the Summer Term before any Programme Examiners' Meetings

Programme Examiners' Special Cases Sub-Committee

Programme Examiners' Meeting

Faculty Examiners' Meeting

Senate and Graduation

10.5 Part 1 and Part 2 arrangements

10.5.1 Part 1 arrangements

Programme External Examiners appointed for Part 1, where they are satisfied with the conduct of assessment at Parts 2 and 3, are not expected to approve examination papers or to moderate marks at Part 1 or foundation level, although they have the right to do so. Where marks for the Part 1 Examination are moderated, External Examiners are normally expected to consider a sample at the pass/fail borderline and at the borderline of the 30% threshold. The intention is to establish the borderline, so that it can be safely agreed that all candidates ranked higher have passed the Certificate (Part 1). They will also meet the first criterion to progress; whether or not they do so will also depend on whether or not they are qualified for a particular programme. This means that a candidate who has passed but is not qualified to proceed is normally eligible for the award of a Certificate which in the event of their leaving the University will be so awarded.

Overall results for Part 1 need to be approved by External Examiners. Programme External Examiners are not responsible for approving the overall result at Part 1. A Faculty External Examiner will be appointed for each Faculty with responsibility for approving all overall results at Part 1 in the Faculty. Faculty External Examiners for Part 1 will be invited to attend the Faculty Examiners' Meetings, will have the right to attend, provided advance notice had been given, any departmental Examiners' meeting at which Part 1 modules are considered, and will have the right to request statistical information in relation to module grade profiles. They will be required to assure themselves that the University's procedures had been followed in respect of the Part 1 examination process. The Faculty External Examiner for Part 1 will normally be drawn from the Faculty's Programme External Examiners. The Institute of Education may require its

own External Examiners given the differences in the examination process for its Part 1 programmes.

10.5.2 **Part 2 arrangements**

Programme External Examiners have responsibilities for approving examination papers for Part 2 and for moderating module marks for Part 2 across the range of marks, in accordance with the provisions of 5.2.2 above, since Part 2 marks contribute both to progression and to classification.

The overall result for Part 2 determines eligibility for the award of the Diploma of Higher Education. Programme External Examiners are not responsible for approving the overall result at Part 2. A Faculty External Examiner will be appointed for each Faculty with responsibility for approving all overall results at Part 2 in the Faculty. The responsibilities of Faculty External Examiners for Part 2 and the related procedures are the same *mutatis mutandis* as for Part 1.

Annex 1

Programmes for which exceptional arrangements have been approved by Senate

Programmes in the School of Modern Languages

In order to be eligible for a four-year Bachelor's degree in the School of Modern Languages which incorporate a language year abroad a candidate must have completed 480 credits (of which not less than 180 credits shall normally be at H level or above, except in the case where a candidate is deemed to have achieved a Pass).

In the case of programmes in the School of Modern Languages incorporating a language year abroad, the overall weighted average is calculated as follows:

$(2/9 \times \text{average Year 2 mark}) + (3/9 \times \text{average Year Abroad mark}) + (4/9 \times \text{average Year 4 mark}) = \text{overall weighted average}$

Programmes in Art

In order to be eligible for a four-year BA in Art, a candidate must have completed 480 credits (of which 140 must be at level H). Certain modules in Years 2-4 serve a purely formative function. The overall weighted average for the single Honours four-year Art programme is based upon a weighting of 1:2:7 between the Years 2, 3 and 4; this weighting also informs the overall weighted average for joint programmes involving Art.

Programme in Speech and Language Therapy

In order to be eligible for a four-year BSc in Speech and Language Therapy, a candidate must have completed 480 credits (of which 150 must be at level H).

The overall weighted average for the BSc in Speech and Language Therapy is calculated as follows:

$(0.2 \times \text{average Year 2 mark}) + (0.3 \times \text{average Year 3 mark}) + (0.5 \times \text{average Year 4 mark}) = \text{overall weighted average}$

Programmes in Environmental Sciences with placement year

In order to be eligible for a four-year BSc in an Environmental Sciences programme with a placement year, a candidate must have completed 480 credits (of which 100 must be at level H).

In respect of cohorts admitted in October 2005 and thereafter, the overall weighted average for four-year BSc programmes in Environmental Sciences is calculated as follows:

$(0.297 \times \text{average Year 2 mark}) + (0.033 \times \text{placement mark}) + (0.67 \times \text{average Year 4 mark}) = \text{overall weighted average}$

Programme in BA(Ed)

Special arrangements apply to the classification of the BA(Ed) programme due to the complex professional requirements of the programme.

Annex 2

Examiners' discretion within the classification framework

The University's present awarding rules for both undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes lay down guidelines for the award of the degrees and the various classifications within them. The examiners are asked to use their professional judgement in setting, marking and moderating students' work to ensure that the marks awarded for the various components conform to descriptors in the *Framework for Classification and Progression for First Degrees (post-2002 structure)* and the *Marking Criteria and Classification Framework for Taught Postgraduate Programmes*. These give verbal descriptions of the sort of performance required for the award of a mark in the various classes.

In awarding the various degree classes for first degrees and Merits and Distinctions for taught postgraduate degrees there is inevitably a need to balance the components where a student's performance is not completely uniform. The University's classification rules are in place to ensure, as far as possible, that students are treated equally across the University. This does not remove the Examiners' need for judgement but the requirement for equity inevitably reduces their freedom of action.

The Examiners need to be content that the modules have been appropriately marked, and these marks form the basis of subsequent calculations. Even where this is the case, there will occasionally be cases where the proposed overall result of a candidate does not match with the Examiners' judgement. In such cases the Examiners may wish to look at the marks for those components which have the greatest influence on the overall outcome, and satisfy themselves that the individual performances correspond to the marks awarded. Having done this, the Examiners may still judge that a candidate's overall result does not correspond to the qualitative description of the proposed award. Where this is the case, the Examiners have the discretion to raise the class awarded, provided their reasons are clearly stated in the minutes of the examiners meeting and that the criteria justifying this decision are applied to all candidates. The Examiners may not award a class lower than that calculated by the awarding procedures. The reasons for varying an award should be academically justified and may be based on accepted practice in the sector. They may not be based on the Examiners' preference for a different set of awarding procedures.

[Approved by the University Board for Teaching and Learning, Spring Term 2006]

Annex 3

Marking Criteria

The following tables provide guidance in terms of criteria appropriate to the ranges of marks and classes. Obviously, this guidance is in very general terms and will need to be interpreted in the light of:

the combination of knowledge, understanding, skills, techniques, scholarship and vocational achievement required by the subject;

the kind of assessment – the marking conventions and guidance will need to be interpreted in terms of what can reasonably be expected from the piece of work being marked – there will be different expectations for an assignment based on one month's writing time (say) than for an answer in a written examination;

the recognition that no guidelines at this level can cover every eventuality, and markers should reward creativity, originality, insight, maturity of scholarship or technical application and work of particular merit however presented.

70-100 Excellent to outstanding work
First class Based on a thorough to full understanding of the problem or issue to hand

Top of range (85-100)	Criteria	Bottom of range (70-84)
Totally	Relevance;	Almost wholly
Complete mastery of the full range	Standard literature and/or methods and techniques;	Strong grasp of a wide range
Good	Evidence of study beyond the standard material;	Some
Excellent	Selection of sources, ideas, methods or techniques brought to bear with insight;	Well judged
Full	Integration of theory and evidence well organised to address the issue or problem;	Strong
Excellent and with flair	Scholarship;	Very good
Mature	Clear evidence of high analytic and problem solving skills or of evaluation and critical thought in analysis;	Very good
Excellent	Well justified and full conclusions;	Very good
Completely, or almost completely	Accurate;	Highly
With lucidity of expression as appropriate to the subject	Fluently written;	With clarity of expression as appropriate to the subject, excellent
	{ Originality in argument or problem solving;	}
	{ Lateral thinking;	}
Contains elements of all or almost all of the listed items which are appropriate to the subject	{ Significant critical insight;	} Contains elements of all
	{ Reasoned discourse involving critique and counter critique;	} or almost all of the
	{ Reasoned questioning of assumptions;	} listed items which are
	{ Reasoned reflection on methodology;	} appropriate to the subject
	{ Incidences of independent judgement;	}
	{ Successfully applying knowledge and understanding in unfamiliar situations.	}

60-69 Good to very good work
Second class Based on a sound to clear understanding of the problem or issue to hand
Division 1

Top of range (65-69)	Criteria	Bottom of range (60-64)
Largely relevant	Relevance;	Generally relevant
Good and secure grasp of a wide part	Standard literature and/or methods and techniques;	A solid grasp of a range
A good selection	Sources, ideas, methods or techniques brought to bear;	An appropriate selection
Good integration and well organised	Integration of theory and evidence organised to address the issue or problem;	Clear argument backed by evidence soundly organised
Some significant elements	Elements of good scholarship;	Some
Very clear	Clarity of argument;	Clear
Good	Evidence of analytic and problem solving skills or of evaluation and critical thought in analysis;	Sound
Well justified	Justified conclusions stemming from balanced argument;	Soundly justified
To a good standard	Accurate;	Mostly
For the most part	Fluently written;	In large part
May contain some	Originality in argument or problem solving;	May contain some
May contain some	Reasoned reflection on methodology or questioning of assumptions;	May contain some
May contains some of the listed items which are appropriate to the subject	{ Some study beyond the standard; { Lateral thinking; { Significant insight; { Reasoned discourse involving critique and counter critique; { Incidences of independent judgement; { Application of knowledge and understanding in unfamiliar situations.	May contain some

50-59 Competent to sound work
Second class Based on addressing the problem or issue using standard material and approaches
Division 2

Top of range (55-59)	Criteria	Bottom of range (50-54)
<p>Relevant for the most part</p> <p>Most of the standard literature and/or methods</p> <p>More successfully than not</p> <p>Sound</p> <p>Sound</p> <p>Soundly</p> <p>May be present</p>	<p>Relevance;</p> <p>A familiarity with the standard literature and/or methods;</p> <p>Use of relevant sources, ideas, methods or techniques normally applied to the problem or issue;</p> <p>Evidence of appropriate study;</p> <p>Sufficient problem solving skills to arrive at a solution or argument to reach a conclusion;</p> <p>Adequately written;</p> <p>Evidence of some critical judgement applied either to analysis or the application of standard ideas and/or methods of solving problems.</p>	<p>May contain some irrelevant digressions</p> <p>Much of the standard literature and/or methods</p> <p>With some success</p> <p>Competent</p> <p>Some success in problem solving or argument to reach a conclusion although it may not be fully developed</p> <p>Competently</p> <p>May be present</p>
<p><i>But may also show the following:</i></p> <p>Some imbalance between knowledge and argument or discussion</p> <p>Some minor difficulties with the organisation of the material or full understanding of the problem or issue</p> <p>Some technical or factual flaws and inaccuracies</p>		<p><i>But may also show the following:</i></p> <p>More reliance on knowledge than on argument, analysis or discussion</p> <p>Some difficulties with organisation of the material or full understanding of the problem or issue</p> <p>A limit to the range of the standard sources, ideas, methods or techniques deployed;</p> <p>Some technical or factual flaws and inaccuracies</p>

40-49 Basic work at or just above threshold for honours to satisfactory but limited work
Third class Based on a reasonable attempt to address the problem or issue using the more obvious standard material and approaches.

Top of range (45-49)	Criteria	Bottom of range (40-44)
Limited	Familiarity with the standard literature and/or methods;	Very limited
Satisfactory	Evidence of appropriate study;	Sufficient study but no indication of more
Satisfactory	Some deployment of standard sources, ideas, methods or techniques normally applied to the problem or issue;	Only some standard sources, ideas, methods or techniques normally applied to the problem or issue used
Satisfactory	Some success in solving problems or marshalling an argument to reach a conclusion although it may only be partially realised;	An attempt to solve a problem or marshal an argument to reach a conclusion but poorly realised
In large part	Adequately written;	Although in parts may only be barely so
May be present	Successful conclusions to parts of the problem or to elements of the issue.	Some indications of successful conclusions to parts of the problem or to elements of the issue may be present
<i>But may also show the following:</i> Some superficiality in understanding and/or use of material An over reliance on limited knowledge at the expense of development of argument, analysis or discussion Weak or limited selection of material and/or method Some incorrect selection of the material Technical or factual flaws and inaccuracies Some irrelevance		<i>But may also show the following:</i> Marked superficiality in understanding and/or use of material Heavy reliance on limited knowledge at the expense of development of argument, analysis or discussion Poor or very limited selection of material and/or method Some markedly incorrect selection of the material Significant technical or factual flaws and inaccuracies A noticeable degree of irrelevance

Mark range and descriptor	Criteria
35-39 Work just below threshold for honours but showing some evidence of study	<p><i>Either</i></p> <p>Based on evidence of effort and some study and an attempt to construct an argument or discussion which demonstrates some awareness of the issue and that although not reaching the standard of an honours degree because of error, poor or incorrect use of material and/or technique the candidate has benefited from the course and gained some useful knowledge;</p> <p><i>Or</i></p> <p>For answers which while substantially unfinished or otherwise incomplete or in large part irrelevant, nonetheless provide evidence that the candidate has the basis for a sound response to the problem or issue</p>
30-34 Work which is not satisfactory but contains elements indicating some work or effort	Based on the display of some very limited knowledge gained from study and an attempt to construct an argument or discussion but significantly flawed by the inclusion of irrelevant content and/or use of inappropriate method.
15-29 Clearly failing work	Deserving of some recognition only for making an effort and showing a little knowledge has been gained and a minimally coherent presentation of material or argument has been attempted
1-14 Seriously failing work	Only isolated knowledge displayed
0 No work or work disqualified for lateness or on disciplinary grounds	