

SECTION 10: MARKING

Contents

10.1	Anonymity	1
	Written examinations	1
	Coursework and in-class tests	2
	Anonymity following marking	2
10.2	Markers	2
10.3	Marking ranges for Levels 4-6 (Undergraduate).....	2
10.4	Marking ranges for Level 7 (Postgraduate/Integrated Masters).....	3
10.5	Marking criteria	3
10.6	Marking across the full range	4
10.7	Step-marking in the First Class/Distinction range	4
10.8	Module marks: whole numbers and rounding	5
10.9	Marking illegible scripts	5
	Prevention	5
	In the first instance of finding an illegible script	5
	If the same student produces a further illegible script	6
	Special arrangements	6

10.1 ANONYMITY

Written examinations

- 10.1.1 It is a requirement, in respect of all written examinations whether administered centrally or by a School, that scripts remain anonymous until marking and (unless it is impossible) moderation has been completed.
- 10.1.2 The front covers of answer books used in centrally administered examinations have a folding strip which, at the end of the examination, is sealed by the candidate to conceal his or her name. The Examinations, Student Records and Graduation Office can normally supply Schools with similar cover sheets for use in School examinations, but for security reasons can no longer provide answer books. Schools are asked to make their request at least two weeks before the front covers are required.
- 10.1.3 In centrally administered examinations, candidates are asked to write their Examination Candidate Number on the cover of each answer book. Each student's Examination Candidate Number is included in the information given on their personal timetable, and is also

listed by their name on the seating list for each examination. A decoding list linking students' names to their Candidate Examination Numbers is circulated to all Examination Representatives at the beginning of each examination period.

Coursework and in-class tests

10.1.4 Wherever practicable and appropriate, coursework and in-class tests should remain anonymous to the marker until the marking has been completed. Schools are responsible for determining whether anonymous marking is practicable and appropriate in relation to coursework and in-class tests in their modules. Where a School agrees that anonymisation of coursework/in-class tests is not appropriate and practicable, the School should consider enhancing the moderation process for coursework/in-class tests and must ensure that the extent of the moderation carried out is clearly documented.

Anonymity following marking

10.1.5 Unless it is impracticable, candidates should remain anonymous during the moderation process and until the results have been determined by the Programme Examiners' Meeting.

10.2 MARKERS

10.2.1 Marking shall be carried out by appropriately qualified and properly appointed persons. It should be noted that peer assessment may be used for formative purposes and a marker's determination of a formal mark may be informed by peer marking.

10.3 MARKING RANGES FOR LEVELS 4-6 (UNDERGRADUATE)

10.3.1 The generic marking criteria for modules at Levels 4-6 are set out in Annex 1. Specific marking criteria for particular work should be consistent with the generic marking criteria. The Level 4-6 marking scale is as follows.

Passing categories at Honours level	
70-100	First Class
60-69	Second Class Division 1
50-59	Second Class Division 2
40-49	Third Class
Failing categories at Honours level	
35-39	Below the undergraduate threshold standard
0-35	Unsatisfactory work

10.3.2 Marks of 29 and 39 were previously not permitted as the final module mark for a module at Levels 4-6. This policy was amended with effect from 2017/18. For further details, please see Section 13.2 of the *Assessment Handbook*.

10.3.3 Some modules may be assessed on a Pass/Fail basis.

10.3.4 Other outcomes include:

Assessment Handbook: Section 10

- DN = Deemed Not To Have Sat
 RN = Result Not Yet Available
 NR = No recommendation submitted to the Senate
 U = Unassessed module

10.4 MARKING RANGES FOR LEVEL 7 (POSTGRADUATE/INTEGRATED MASTERS)

10.4.1 The generic marking criteria for modules at Level 7 (whether for an Postgraduate Taught programme or an Integrated Masters programme) are set out in Annex 2. Specific marking criteria for particular work should be consistent with the generic marking criteria.

The Level 7 marking scale is as follows.

	Postgraduate Taught	Integrated Masters
Passing categories		
70-100	Distinction	First Class
60-69	Merit	Second Class Division 1
50-59	Pass	Second Class Division 2
Failing categories		
40-49	Below the Masters threshold standard	Below the Masters threshold standard
0-40	Unsatisfactory work	Unsatisfactory work

10.4.2 Some modules may be assessed on a Pass/Fail basis.

10.4.3 Other outcomes include:

- DN = Deemed Not To Have Sat
 RN = Result Not Yet Available
 NR = No recommendation submitted to the Senate
 U = Unassessed module

10.5 MARKING CRITERIA

10.5.1 Marking shall be conducted in accordance with the relevant marking criteria, as set out in Annexes 1 and 2.

10.5.2 In exceptional cases a module may be designated as assessable on a PASS/FAIL basis provided that it has been agreed at scrutiny that the only relevant consideration in assessing the module is the acquisition of a threshold competence in the skills or knowledge being assessed.

10.6 MARKING ACROSS THE FULL RANGE

- 10.6.1 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 (or Distinction range for the Foundation Degree and for Masters degrees) 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 relevant University marking criteria are excepted from the step-marking provisions. (Markers should also note the provisions relating to module marks in 10.3.2, above.)

10.7 STEP-MARKING IN THE FIRST CLASS/DISTINCTION RANGE

- 10.7.1 The University is committed to rewarding excellence by ensuring that First Class/Distinction achievement is awarded appropriate marks from across the full First Class/Distinction range (70-100) in order that such achievement is appropriately represented in the weighted average used in classification.
- 10.7.2 For marking purposes, the First Class/Distinction 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/Distinction work. Marks in the range 70-84 should be awarded to work in the lower half of the **normal** range for First Class/Distinction work. These provisions are designed to ensure that appropriate use is made of the full First Class/Distinction range of marks.
- 10.7.3 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.
- 10.7.4 **Step-marking in the First Class/Distinction 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.**
- 10.7.5 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/Distinction marks (including 100) is demonstrably available and the highest marks are demonstrably achievable by the best candidates performing within the normal First Class/Distinction range as defined by the University marking criteria (see Annex 1).
- 10.7.6 For example:
- Where a module mark is derived from one assessment which lacks a detailed marking scheme and where the work demonstrates First Class/Distinction quality, only stepped marks can be used, i.e. 72, 75, 80, 85, 90, 95 and 100.
 - 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.
 - 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/Distinction 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.
- e) 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/Distinction. 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, Student Records and Graduation Office.

10.8 MODULE MARKS: WHOLE NUMBERS AND ROUNDING

10.8.1 For individual modules, marks should be whole numbers.

10.8.2 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.

10.9 MARKING ILLEGIBLE SCRIPTS

Prevention

10.9.1 Students are encouraged to seek help from Study Advice should they find handwriting long exam answers difficult.

10.9.2 Tutors/Lecturers should advise students that exam scripts are handwritten and that it is their responsibility to answer the questions in a clear and legible way.

10.9.3 This warning is also printed on the front of every pink answer booklet used for central examinations.

In the first instance of finding an illegible script

10.9.4 Markers are recommended to seek a second opinion, if practical. If a script is genuinely illegible, then the School should contact the student directly and ask them to come in to type up their exam answers on a computer. This is called 'making a fair copy'.

10.9.5 At this point the student has waived the normal exam answer anonymity. The write up should be monitored by staff or an invigilator to ensure that no additional notes or variation is made from the original text. Ideally this should be carried out as soon as possible after the issue is raised, but the student may have further exams which need to be avoided when booking rooms and/or invigilators for this purpose. The department must cover the cost of the invigilator if no departmental staff member is available. (The Examinations, Student Records and Graduation Office can recommend suitably trained invigilators if necessary).

Assessment Handbook: Section 10

- 10.9.6 The student may not be aware that their script is hard to read, so this should be disclosed sensitively. Highlight the possibility that they could benefit from visiting Study Advice team in the Library: www.reading.ac.uk/internal/studyadvice/sta-home.aspx.
- 10.9.7 If the student suspects that they have a Specific Learning Difficulty (like Dyslexia), recommend that they book an appointment with the Disability Advisory Service in the Carrington Building.
- 10.9.8 Explain in writing that this is a warning to take greater care in future, and that this opportunity to 'make a fair copy' will not be offered again. In other universities the penalty can be that the script receives zero marks.

If the same student produces a further illegible script

- 10.9.9 If the student was not aware of the problem with the original script at the time, then treat as above. However, if the student has received notification before and has already used their opportunity to make a fair copy in the past, then it is up to the School to decide how the script should be marked – i.e. crediting only where content is clear. Again, suggest the student seeks additional help from Study Advice/Disability.

Special arrangements

- 10.9.10 Some students will be granted the opportunity to use a PC to type their answers, or an Amanuensis (scribe) to handwrite their answers, but these are both special arrangements which are only granted in advance of the exam period by the Examinations, Student Records and Graduation Office and/or Disability Advisory Service Specialist Teacher Assessor based on a specific, evidenced physical or learning disability (or sometimes a temporary injury). <http://www.reading.ac.uk/disability/about/DyslexiaSLDs/do-dyslexiaandslds.aspx>
- 10.9.11 In very exceptional circumstances, there may be a student whose special arrangements for exams include the opportunity for the student or an amanuensis (scribe) to make a fair copy of their scripts. In this case, this will be decided in advance of the exam period and the Disability and/or Examination Representatives within the department will already be aware of this arrangement. <http://www.reading.ac.uk/internal/exams/student/exa-special.aspx>.

UNIVERSITY MARKING CRITERIA FOR LEVELS 4-6

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: FIRST CLASS

Excellent to outstanding work

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
Contains elements of all or almost all of the listed items which are appropriate to the subject	Originality in argument or problem solving; Lateral thinking; Significant critical insight; Reasoned discourse involving critique and counter critique; Reasoned questioning of assumptions; Reasoned reflection on methodology; Incidences of independent judgement; Successfully applying knowledge and understanding in unfamiliar situations.	Contains elements of all or almost all of the listed items which are appropriate to the subject

60-69: SECOND CLASS DIVISON 1

Good to very good work

Based on a sound to clear understanding of the problem or issue to hand.

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 contain 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.	

50-59: SECOND CLASS DIVISION 2

Competent to sound work

Based on addressing the problem or issue using standard material and approaches.

Top of range (55-59)	Criteria	Bottom of range (50-54)
Relevant for the most part	Relevance;	May contain some irrelevant digressions
Most of the standard literature and/or methods	A familiarity with the standard literature and/or methods;	Much of the standard literature and/or methods
More successfully than not	Use of relevant sources, ideas, methods or techniques normally applied to the problem or issue;	With some success
Sound	Evidence of appropriate study;	Competent
Sound	Sufficient problem solving skills to arrive at a solution or argument to reach a conclusion;	Some success in problem solving or argument to reach a conclusion although it may not be fully developed
Soundly	Adequately written;	Competently
May be present	Evidence of some critical judgement applied either to analysis or the application of standard ideas and/or methods of solving problems.	May be present
<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:THIRD CLASS

Basic work at or just above threshold for honours to satisfactory but limited work

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
<p><i>But may also show the following:</i></p> <p>Some superficiality in understanding and/or use of material</p> <p>An over reliance on limited knowledge at the expense of development of argument, analysis or discussion</p> <p>Weak or limited selection of</p>		<p><i>But may also show the following:</i></p> <p>Marked superficiality in understanding and/or use of material</p> <p>Heavy reliance on limited knowledge at the expense of development of argument, analysis or discussion</p> <p>Poor or very limited selection of material and/or method</p> <p>Some markedly incorrect selection of the material</p>

University Marking Criteria Levels 4-6

material and/or method Some incorrect selection of the material Technical or factual flaws and inaccuracies Some irrelevance		Significant technical or factual flaws and inaccuracies A noticeable degree of irrelevance
---	--	---

Mark range and descriptor	Criteria
<p>35-39 Work just below threshold for honours but showing some evidence of study</p>	<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>
<p>30-34 Work which is not satisfactory but contains elements indicating some work or effort</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>15-29 Clearly failing work</p>	<p>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</p>
<p>1-14 Seriously failing work</p>	<p>Only isolated knowledge displayed</p>
<p>0 No work or work disqualified for lateness or on disciplinary grounds</p>	

UNIVERSITY MARKING CRITERIA FRAMEWORK AT LEVEL 7 (M-LEVEL)

Please note that this framework applies to all modules at Level 7, including those offered in a taught postgraduate Masters programme and those offered in the final Part of an Integrated Masters Programme.

Level 7 (M-level) work is characterised by an expectation that students demonstrate independence and originality in their ability to appropriately evaluate, synthesise and apply subject knowledge. As outlined in the QAA's Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) a key element of assessed work at Level 7 (M-level) is that it should be informed by an awareness and understanding of current issues and/or new developments, much of which will be at, or informed by, the latest research in the field of study/area of professional practice. Students are therefore expected to demonstrate a specialised area of knowledge, skills and/or professional practice, which will allow them to undertake scholarly, independent research, which *maybe* of publishable quality.

The following tables present a suite of generic criteria which describe the qualities expected for the award of marks from 0-100% at Level 7 (M-level). No criteria can cover all eventualities at this level and the markers/examiners therefore reserve the right to reward creativity, originality and work of particular merit however presented. Furthermore, the appropriate combinations of qualities needed to fulfil the criteria depend on the subject, and the criteria and descriptors need to be interpreted in terms of the attributes required by each subject. It is not expected that every piece of work will demonstrate all the criteria indicated for each range of marks. A student's work will, however, be expected to demonstrate a preponderance of these criteria, as appropriate to the nature of the assessment and discipline context.

Extract from the QAA Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies (October 2014)

'Master's degrees are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

- a systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice
- a comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship
- originality in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline
- conceptual understanding that enables the student:

University Marking Criteria Framework at Level 7

- to evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline
- to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses.

Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

- deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, make sound judgements in the absence of complete data, and communicate their conclusions clearly to specialist and non-specialist audiences
- demonstrate self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems, and act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks at a professional or equivalent level
- continue to advance their knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills to a high level.

And holders will have:

- the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring:
 - the exercise of initiative and personal responsibility
 - decision-making in complex and unpredictable situations
 - the independent learning ability required for continuing professional development.

72-100: DISTINCTION STANDARD

This range of marks is reserved for work of excellent quality which demonstrates evidence of a deep understanding of and insight into the full range of ideas, principles, themes and/or techniques in question and independence of thought. Work demonstrates a full and systematic understanding of knowledge and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights at, or informed by, the latest research in the discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice.

The following table outlines the range of criteria and associated qualities expected for the award of a distinction-level mark.

Top of range (85-100)	Criteria	Bottom of range (72-84)
Total	Relevance to the assignment task	Almost wholly
Outstanding	Knowledge and understanding of the subject	Very good
Complete or almost complete	Accuracy	Highly
Excellent	Knowledge of scholarly conventions and standard literature, research methods and techniques;	Very good
Excellent	Scholarly application and integration of theory with appropriate research-informed literature	Very good
Excellent	Critical awareness of current research, issues/new research & developments in the field of study/professional practice	Very good
Outstanding	Critical evaluation and synthesis of ideas and literature relating to current research/developments in the field of study/professional practice	Strong
Comprehensive	Evidence of study beyond the standard material	Substantive
Excellent	Evidence of analytical and problem-solving skills	Very good
Excellent	Critical evaluation of appropriate research methodologies; where appropriate, propose new hypotheses or interpretation	Very good
Excellent	Technical expertise/performance; adapting research skills and/or knowledge in unfamiliar contexts	Very good

Excellent	Analysis of key issues/concepts/ethics, demonstrating originality in the application of knowledge and independent thinking	Very good
Extensive	Evidence of using own initiative and personal responsibility in professional practice	Very good
Outstanding	Ability to systematically address and communicate complex issues clearly and articulately, as appropriate to the intended audience	Very good
Excellent	Demonstrates originality in argument and/or problem solving	Very good
Outstanding	Conclusions clearly and effectively communicated	Very good
<i>Contains elements of all of the listed items as appropriate to the subject</i>	<i>Work pushes the boundaries of the discipline and may be considered for peer-reviewed publication; Reasoned discourse involving critique and counter critique; Reasoned questioning of assumptions; Demonstrates sound, independent judgements.</i>	<i>Contains elements of at least two of the listed items as appropriate to the subject</i>

For a dissertation which is required to be research-based or which must include a research project, the dissertation report should demonstrate a reflective account of the research methods deployed and either the results of the student's own research with well-reported original data appropriately analysed and deployed to arrive at well-justified conclusions, or the results of the student's original analysis of well-selected secondary data, deployed to arrive at well-justified conclusions.

60-69: MERIT STANDARD

This range of marks is for work which demonstrates evidence of a very good understanding of the main ideas, principles, themes and/or techniques in question, coupled with some insight and the expression of some independent thought. Work demonstrates a systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or is informed by, the forefront of the discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice.

The following table outlines the range of criteria and associated qualities expected for the award of a merit-level mark.

Top of range (65-69)	Criteria	Bottom of range (60-64)
Largely relevant	Relevance to the assignment task	Generally relevant
Very Good	Knowledge and understanding of the subject	Good
Good	Accuracy	Mostly
Good	Knowledge of scholarly conventions and standard literature, research methods and techniques;	Sound
Good	Scholarly application and integration of theory with appropriate research-informed literature	Clear argument backed by evidence
Good	Critical awareness of current research, issues/new research & developments in the field of study/professional practice	Clear
Good	Critical evaluation and synthesis of ideas and literature relating to current research/developments in the field of study/professional practice	Some
Some	Evidence of study beyond the standard material	Some
	Evidence of analytical and problem-solving skills	Contains some
Good	Critical evaluation of appropriate research methodologies; where appropriate, propose new hypotheses or interpretation	Contains some
Good	Technical expertise/performance; adapting research skills and/or knowledge in unfamiliar contexts	Some
Good	Analysis of key issues/concepts/ethics, demonstrating originality in the application of knowledge and independent thinking	Good

Good	Some evidence of using own initiative and personal responsibility in professional practice	Some
Very Good	Ability to systematically address and communicate complex issues clearly and articulately, as appropriate to the intended audience	Some
Good	Demonstrates originality in argument and/or problem solving	May contain some
For the most part	Conclusions are mainly clearly and effectively communicated	Some
Good	<i>Reasoned discourse involving critique and counter critique;</i>	<i>Contains elements of at least one of the listed items as appropriate to the subject</i>
In large part	<i>Reasoned questioning of assumptions;</i> <i>Demonstrates sound, independent judgements.</i>	
<i>Contains elements of at least two of the items as appropriate to the subject</i>		

For a dissertation which is required to be research-based or which must include a research project, the dissertation report should show an account of the research methods deployed and either the results of the student's own research with clearly-reported original data appropriately analysed and deployed to arrive at conclusions with justifications, or the results of the student's original analysis of well-selected secondary data, deployed to arrive at conclusions with justifications.

50-59: PASS STANDARD

This range of marks is for work which demonstrates evidence of appropriate study, presented clearly and adequately organised to illustrate the most significant of the main ideas, principles, themes and/or techniques in question and to demonstrate a sound grasp of them. Work demonstrates a good understanding of knowledge and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, some of which is at, or is informed by, the forefront of the discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice.

The following table outlines the range of criteria and associated qualities expected for the award of a mark ranging between 50-59%.

Top of range (55-59)	Criteria	Bottom of range (50-54)
Relevant for the most part	Relevance to the assignment task	May contain some irrelevant digressions
Good	Knowledge and understanding of the subject	Some
Mostly	Accuracy	May contain some inaccuracies
Mostly	Familiarity with scholarly conventions and standard literature, research methods and techniques	A limit to the range of the standard sources, ideas, methods or techniques deployed
Some	Elements of some scholarly application and integration of theory with appropriate research-informed literature	Limited
Some	Critical awareness of current research, issues/new research & developments in the field of study/professional practice	Limited
Some present	Critical evaluation and synthesis of ideas and literature relating to current research/developments in the field of study/professional practice	May be present
Some	Evidence of appropriate study	Limited
Sound	Evidence of some analytical and problem-solving skills	Some
Some	Capacity for some critical evaluation of appropriate research methodologies; where appropriate, propose new hypotheses or interpretation	Limited

Some	Technical expertise/performance; adapting research skills and/or knowledge in unfamiliar contexts	Limited
Some	Analysis of key issues/concepts/ethics, demonstrating capacity for some originality in the application of knowledge and independent thinking	Limited
Some	Some evidence of using own initiative and personal responsibility in professional practice	Limited
Some	Ability to systematically address and communicate complex issues clearly and articulately, as appropriate to the intended audience	May be present
Mostly	Demonstrates originality in argument and/or problem solving	With some success in reaching a conclusion, although it may not be fully developed
Some	Conclusions are generally clearly and effectively communicated	With limited success
<i>Present</i>	<i>Some reasoned discourse involving critique and counter critique; some reasoned questioning of assumptions; some independent judgements.</i>	<i>May be present</i>

For a dissertation which is required to be research-based or which must include a research project, the dissertation report should contain a description of the research and/or analytical methods used and a presentation of results in appropriate form. The work should develop an argument based on information, some of which must be obtained from the student's own research or re-analysis of secondary data, to illustrate the major themes of the dissertation and the conclusions to be drawn from the research project.

40-49: BELOW THRESHOLD STANDARD

This is a failing category. This represents the range of marks reserved for work that is lacking in some respects or contains flaws which are noticeable and serious enough to warrant the award of a failing grade, but nonetheless essentially approaches the criteria necessary for the good category sufficiently for it of itself not to prevent the award of an overall pass.

Top of range (45-49)	Criteria	Bottom of range (40-44)
Some irrelevance	Relevance to the assignment task	Noticeable degree of irrelevance
Satisfactory	Knowledge and understanding of the subject	Very limited
Technical or factual flaws and inaccuracies	Accuracy	Significant technical or factual flaws and inaccuracies
Weak or limited selection of materials and/or methods	Some familiarity with scholarly conventions and standard literature, research methods and techniques	Poor or very limited selection of materials and/or methods
Some superficiality in understanding and/or use of materials	Contains limited scholarly application and integration of theory with appropriate research-informed literature	Marked superficiality in understanding and/or use of materials
May be present	Some awareness of current research, issues/new research & developments in the field of study/professional practice	Not present
Limited	Critical evaluation and synthesis of ideas and literature relating to current research/developments in the field of study/professional practice	Very limited, if present
Limited	Evidence of appropriate study	Very limited
Limited	Evidence of some analytical and problem-solving skills	Very limited, if present

Limited	Technical expertise/performance; adapting research skills and/or knowledge in unfamiliar contexts	Very limited
Limited	Evidence of some analysis of key issues/concepts/ethics	Very limited
May be present	Some evidence of using own initiative and personal responsibility in professional practice	Not present
With limited success	Ability to systematically address and communicate complex issues clearly and articulately, as appropriate to the intended audience	Very limited success
With limited success	Conclusions clearly and effectively communicated	Very limited success

<40: UNSATISFACTORY STANDARD (FAIL)

This is a failed category. It is reserved for work which fails to meet or in significant ways does not approach the criteria described for a good grade. This may be because there is not adequate evidence of sufficient study or that there are serious inaccuracies in presenting the material. It may be that there is evidence of not understanding one or more of the key ideas, principles, themes and/or techniques in question or of a lack of coherence in the organisation of the material and the work's structure resulting in the candidate's not making effective use of study.

Mark range	Criteria
35-39 Work just below the failing standard	There may be major inaccuracies in the work and evidence of weak understanding of one or more key ideas/principles, themes and/or techniques. There may also be a lack of coherence in how the work is organised.
30-34 Work which contains elements indicating some work/effort	There are likely to be major inaccuracies in the work and weak understanding of one or more key ideas/principles, themes and/or techniques. Likely to be accompanied by a limited awareness of the subject or professional practice.
15-29 Work which contains little evidence of work/effort	There are major inaccuracies and/or misconceptions in the work and weak understanding of one or more key ideas/principles, themes and/or techniques. Likely to be accompanied by a limited awareness of the subject or professional practice.
1-14 Seriously failing work in which only isolated knowledge is evidenced	There are major inaccuracies and/or misconceptions throughout the work and clear evidence of a lack of understanding of one or more key ideas/principles, themes and/or techniques. Lacks evidence of sufficient study, showing only fragmentary evidence of familiarity with course material or awareness of the subject/professional practice.
0 No work submitted or work disqualified for lateness or on disciplinary grounds	No work is submitted or the work is disqualified for lateness or on disciplinary grounds.