Level 6 Marking and Assessment Criteria (Third / Final Year)

1st (70+)	For essay-based subjects ○ Excellent comprehension of the implications of the question and critical understanding of the theoretical & methodological issues ○ A critical, analytical and sophisticated argument that is logically structured and well-supported ○ Evidence of independent thought and ability to 'see beyond the question' ○ Evidence of reading widely beyond the prescribed reading list and creative use of evidence to enhance the overall argument ○ Extremely well presented: minimal grammatical or spelling errors; written in a fluent and engaging style; exemplary referencing and bibliographic formatting ○ An excellent level of skill in problem solving, which demonstrates powers of critical analysis (NB: where problem solving is an important key learning outcome) For mathematical subjects ○ perfect, or near-perfect answers to a high proportion of the parts of the questions attempted, and a firm grasp of the central issues covered. ○ Answers are presented fluently and logically. ○ Explanations, where required, show evidence of an excellent comprehension of the material. ○ Interpretations, where required, often display a strong critical appreciation of the material. ○ Excellent use of common standard mathematical notation and conventions.

2:1 (60–69)	For essay-based subjects ○ Very good comprehension of the implications of the question and fairly extensive and accurate knowledge and understanding ○ Very good awareness of underlying theoretical and methodological issues, though not always displaying an understanding of how they link to the question ○ A generally critical, analytical argument, which shows attempts at independent thinking and is sensibly structured and generally well-supported ○ Clear and generally critical knowledge of relevant literature; use of works beyond the prescribed reading list; demonstrating the ability to be selective in the range of material used, and the capacity to synthesise rather than describe ○ Very well presented: no significant grammatical or spelling errors; written clearly and concisely; fairly consistent referencing and bibliographic formatting ○ A very good ability to apply principles effectively in the solution of factual problems and to deal with problems in an orderly manner, with realism and discrimination (NB: where problem solving is an important key learning outcome) For mathematical subjects ○ A very good knowledge of much of the important material, possibly excellent in places, but with a limited account of some significant topics, or with some omissions/misunderstandings. ○ There is a good fluency and logical structure to the answers. ○ Explanations, where required, show evidence of good comprehension of the material though there may be some limited understanding of some areas. ○ Interpretations, where required, show some evidence of a critical appreciation of the material. ○ Good use of common standard mathematical notation and conventions

2:2 (50–59)	For essay-based subjects: ○ Generally clear and accurate knowledge, though there may be some errors and/or gaps and some awareness of underlying theoretical/methodological issues with little understanding of how they relate to the question ○ Some attempt at analysis but a tendency to be descriptive rather than critical; ○ Tendency to assert/state opinion rather than argue on the basis of reason and evidence; structure may not be entirely clear or logical ○ Good attempt to go beyond or criticise the 'essential reading' for the unit; but displaying limited capacity to discern between relevant and non-relevant material ○ Adequately presented: writing style conveys meaning but is sometimes awkward; some significant grammatical and spelling errors; inconsistent referencing but generally accurate bibliography. ○ A fairly efficient attempt at solving problems, but a tendency to overlook one or two points (NB: where problem solving is an important key learning outcome) For mathematical subjects ○ A reasonably good knowledge of several important topics, possibly showing some good understanding in places, but with a limited account of some significant topics, or with some significant omissions/misunderstandings. ○ There is a discernible fluency and logical structure to the much of the answers. ○ Explanations, where required, show evidence of good comprehension of the material though there may be some limited understanding of some areas. ○ Interpretations, where required, are generally standard but may in parts show some evidence of a critical appreciation of the material. ○ Limited use of common standard mathematical notation and conventions.

3rd (40–49)	For essay-based subjects: ○ Limited knowledge and understanding with significant errors and omissions and generally ignorant or confused awareness of key theoretical/ methodological issues ○ Largely misses the point of the question, asserts rather than argues a case; underdeveloped or chaotic structure; evidence mentioned but used inappropriately or incorrectly ○ Very little attempt at analysis or synthesis, tending towards excessive description ○ Limited, uncritical and generally confused account of a narrow range of sources ○ Poorly presented: not always easy to follow; frequent grammatical and spelling errors; limited attempt at providing references (e.g. only referencing direct quotations) and containing bibliographic omissions ○ Identifies relevant areas for focusing problem solving but makes significant mistakes in solutions indicative of either a lack of discrimination or an understanding of a principle (NB: where problem solving is an important key learning outcome) For mathematical subjects ○ A reasonable spread of relevant knowledge but showing a good grasp of only a minority of the material. Some questions may be answered well, others will have major omissions or misunderstandings. Some questions may not be attempted at all. ○ There is some evidence of a logical structure though it is not evident throughout. ○ Explanations, where required, are short and display a limited understanding of the material. Some explanations are not given. ○ Interpretations, where required, are poor and do not show critical appreciation of the material. ○ Very limited use of common standard mathematical notation and conventions.

Marginal Fail (35–39)	For essay-based subjects: ○ Unsatisfactory level of knowledge and understanding of subject; limited or no understanding of theoretical/methodological issues ○ Very little comprehension of the implications of the question and lacking a coherent structure ○ Lacking any attempt at analysis and critical engagement with issues, based on description or opinion ○ Little use of sources and what is used reflects a very narrow range or are irrelevant and/or misunderstood ○ Unsatisfactory presentation: difficult to follow; very limited attempt at providing references (e.g. only referencing direct quotations) and containing bibliographic omissions ○ Some identification of relevant areas for focusing problem solving but makes significant mistakes in solutions indicative of either a lack of discrimination or an understanding of a principle (NB: where problem solving is an important key learning outcome) For mathematical subjects: ○ Considerable deficiencies, or very partial attempts at questions, across large parts of the topics set, but with some relevant material at places. ○ There is little evidence of a logical structure to the answers. ○ Explanations, where required, are poor or missing. ○ Interpretations, where required, are weak or missing and show almost no critical appreciation of the material. ○ Limited or no use of common standard mathematical notation and conventions.
Outright Fail (0–34)	For essay-based subjects ○ Very limited, and seriously flawed, knowledge and understanding ○ No comprehension of the implications of the question and no attempt to provide a structure ○ No attempt at analysis ○ Limited, uncritical and generally confused account of a very narrow range of sources ○ Very poorly presented: lacking any coherence, significant problems with spelling and grammar, missing or no references and containing bibliographic omissions ○ Little awareness of the points in a problem(NB: where problem solving is an important key learning outcome) For mathematical subjects: ○ For mathematical subjects, substantial deficiencies, or no attempt, across large parts of the topics set, but with a little relevant material at places. ○ There is little or no logical structure to the answers ○ Explanations, where required, are poor or missing. ○ Interpretations, where required, are missing or wrong and show no critical appreciation of the material. ○ Very limited or no use of common standard mathematical notation and conventions.

Level 5 Marking and Assessment Criteria (Second Year)

1st (70+)	For essay-based subjects ○ Excellent knowledge and understanding of the subject and understanding of theoretical & methodological issues ○ A coherent argument that is logically structured and supported by evidence ○ Demonstrates a capacity for intellectual initiative/ independent thought and an ability to engage with the material critically ○ Use of appropriate material from a range of sources extending beyond the reading list ○ High quality organisation and style of presentation (including referencing); minimal grammatical or spelling errors; written in a fluent and engaging style ○ A very high level of skill in problem solving, which demonstrates powers of critical analysis (NB: where problem solving is an important key learning outcome) For mathematical subjects ○ perfect, or near-perfect answers to a high proportion of the parts of the questions attempted, and a firm grasp of the central issues covered. ○ Answers are presented fluently and logically. ○ Explanations, where required, show evidence of an excellent comprehension of the material. ○ Interpretations, where required, often display a strong critical appreciation of the material. ○ Excellent use of common standard mathematical notation and conventions.

2:1 (60–69)	For essay-based subjects ○ Very good knowledge and understanding of the subject and displays awareness of underlying theoretical and methodological issues ○ A generally critical, analytical argument that is reasonably well structured and well-supported ○ Some critical capacity to see the implications of the question, though not able to 'see beyond the question' enough to develop an independent approach ○ Some critical knowledge of relevant literature; use of works beyond the prescribed reading list; demonstrating some ability to be selective in the range of material used and to synthesise rather than describe ○ Well presented: no significant grammatical or spelling errors; written clearly and concisely; fairly consistent referencing and bibliographic formatting ○ A very good ability to apply principles effectively in the solution of factual problems and to deal with problems in an orderly manner, with realism and discrimination (NB: where problem solving is an important key learning outcome) For mathematical subjects ○ A very good knowledge of much of the important material, possibly excellent in places, but with a limited account of some significant topics, or with some omissions/misunderstandings. ○ There is a good fluency and logical structure to most of the answers. ○ Explanations, where required, show evidence of good comprehension of the material though there may be some limited understanding of some areas. ○ Interpretations, where required, show some evidence of a critical appreciation of the material. ○ Some good use of common standard mathematical notation and conventions

2:2 (50–59)	For essay-based subjects ○ Good comprehension of the subject, though there may be some errors and/or gaps, and some awareness of underlying theoretical/methodological issues with little understanding of how they relate to the question ○ Capacity for argument is limited with a tendency to assert/state opinion rather than argue on the basis of reason and evidence; structure may not be evident ○ Tendency to be descriptive rather than critical, but some attempt at analysis ○ Some attempt to go beyond or criticise the 'essential reading' for the unit; displaying limited capacity to discern between relevant and non-relevant material ○ Adequately presented: writing style conveys meaning but is sometimes awkward; some significant grammatical and spelling errors; inconsistent referencing but generally accurate bibliography. ○ An efficient attempt at solving problems, but a tendency to overlook a number of points (NB: where problem solving is an important key learning outcome) For mathematical subjects ○ A reasonably good knowledge of several important topics, possibly showing some good understanding in places, but with a limited account of some significant topics, or with some significant omissions/misunderstandings. ○ There is fluency and logical structure to some of the the answers. ○ Explanations, where required, show evidence of good comprehension of the material though with limited understanding in some areas. ○ Interpretations, where required, are generally standard but may in parts show some evidence of a critical appreciation of the material. ○ Limited use of common standard mathematical notation and conventions.

3rd (40–49)	For essay-based subjects ○ Limited knowledge and understanding with significant errors and omissions and generally ignorant or confused awareness of key theoretical/ methodological issues ○ Largely misses the point of the question, asserts rather than argues a case; underdeveloped or chaotic structure; evidence mentioned but used inappropriately or incorrectly ○ Very little attempt at analysis or synthesis, tending towards excessive description. ○ Limited, uncritical and generally confused account of a narrow range of sources ○ Satisfactorily presented: but not always easy to follow; frequent grammatical and spelling errors; limited attempt at providing references (e.g. only referencing direct quotations) and containing bibliographic omissions. ○ Attempts to Identify relevant areas for focusing problem solving but makes significant mistakes in solutions indicative of either a lack of discrimination or an understanding of a principle (NB: where problem solving is an important key learning outcome) For mathematical subjects ○ A reasonable spread of relevant knowledge but showing a good grasp of only a minority of the material. Some questions may be answered well, others will have major omissions or misunderstandings. Some questions may not be attempted at all. ○ There may be some evidence of a logical structure to the answers in some areas. ○ Explanations, where required, are short and display a limited understanding of the material. Some explanations are not given. ○ Interpretations, where required, are poor and do not show critical appreciation of the material. ○ Very limited use of common standard mathematical notation and conventions.

Marginal Fail (35–39)	For essay-based subjects ○ Shows very limited understanding and knowledge of the subject and/or misses the point of the question ○ Incoherent or illogical structure; evidence used inappropriately or incorrectly. ○ Unsatisfactory analytical skills ○ Limited, uncritical and generally confused account of a very narrow range of sources. ○ Unsatisfactory presentation e.g. not always easy to follow; frequent grammatical and spelling errors and limited or no attempt at providing references and containing bibliographic omissions. ○ Limited attempt to Identify relevant areas for focusing problem solving but makes significant mistakes in solutions indicative of either a lack of discrimination or an understanding of a principle (NB: where problem solving is an important key learning outcome) For mathematical subjects: ○ Considerable deficiencies, or very partial attempts at questions, across large parts of the topics set, but with some relevant material at places. ○ There is little evidence of a logical structure to the answers. ○ Explanations, where required, are poor or missing. ○ Interpretations, where required, are weak or missing and show almost no critical appreciation of the material. ○ Limited or no use of common standard mathematical notation and conventions.
Outright Fail (0–34)	For essay-based subjects ○ Shows little or no knowledge and understanding of the subject, no awareness of key theoretical/ methodological issues and/or fails to address the question ○ Unsuccessful or no attempt to construct an argument and an incoherent or illogical structure; evidence used inappropriately or incorrectly ○ Very poor analytical skills ○ Limited, uncritical and generally confused account of a very narrow range of sources. ○ Very poor quality of presentation and limited or no attempt at providing references and containing bibliographic omissions ○ Overlooks most of the points in a problem (NB: where problem solving is an important key learning outcome) For mathematical subjects: ○ Substantial deficiencies, or no attempt, across large parts of the topics set, but with a little relevant material at places. ○ There is little or no logical structure to the answers ○ Explanations, where required, are poor or missing. ○ Interpretations, where required, are missing or wrong and show no critical appreciation of the material. ○ Very limited or no use of common standard mathematical notation and conventions.

Level 4 Marking and Assessment Criteria (First Year)

1st (70+) 1st)	○ Excellent knowledge and understanding of the subject, as well as a recognition of alternative perspectives and viewpoints ○ Uses an argument that is logically structured and supported by evidence ○ Engages with the material critically and demonstrates some capacity for intellectual initiative/ independent thought ○ Incorporates one or two sources from beyond the reading list ○ High quality organisation and style of presentation (including referencing) with few grammatical or spelling errors and attention to writing style ○ A high level of skill in problem solving, which demonstrates powers of critical analysis (NB: where problem solving is an important key learning outcome) For mathematical subjects ○ perfect, or near-perfect answers to a considerable proportion of the parts of the questions attempted, and a firm grasp of the central issues covered. ○ Answers are largely presented fluently and logically. ○ In most questions explanations, where required, show evidence of an excellent comprehension of the material. ○ Interpretations, where required, often display a strong critical appreciation of the material. ○ Evidence of ability to use common standard mathematical notation and conventions
2:1 (60–69)	○ Good knowledge and understanding of subject and some recognition of other viewpoints and perspectives ○ Evidence of an argument that is logically structured, but it may not be consistently developed ○ Some evidence of critical thinking in places ○ Some attempt to go beyond or criticise the 'essential reading' ○ Presentation showing promise: effective writing style but some grammatical and spelling errors; referencing and bibliographic formatting satisfactory on the whole. ○ A satisfactory ability to apply principles effectively in the solution of factual problems and to deal with problems in an orderly manner, with realism and discrimination (NB: where problem solving is an important key learning outcome) For mathematical subjects ○ A very good knowledge of much of the important material, possibly excellent in places, but with a limited account of some significant topics, or with some omissions/misunderstandings. ○ There is a good fluency and logical structure to many answers. ○ Explanations, where required, show evidence of good comprehension of the material though there may be some limited understanding of some areas. ○ Interpretations, where required, show some evidence of a critical appreciation of the material. ○ Some evidence of the use of common standard mathematical notation and conventions

2:2 (50–59)	○ Reasonable knowledge and understanding of subject and an ability to answer the question, but there may be some gaps ○ A tendency to assert/state opinion rather than argue on the basis of reason and evidence; structure may not be entirely clear or logical ○ Some attempt at analysis but a tendency to be descriptive rather than critical. ○ Little attempt to go beyond or criticise the 'essential reading' for the unit; displaying limited capacity to discern between relevant and non-relevant material ○ Satisfactory presentation: writing style conveys meaning but is sometimes clumsy; some significant grammatical and spelling errors; inconsistent referencing but generally accurate bibliography ○ Some attempt at solving problems, but a tendency to overlook a number of points (NB: where problem solving is an important key learning outcome) For mathematical subjects ○ A reasonably good knowledge of several important topics, possibly showing some good understanding in places, but with a limited account of some significant topics, or with some significant omissions/misunderstandings. ○ There is evidence of some fluency and logical structure in some questions. ○ Explanations, where required, show evidence of good comprehension of the material though with limited understanding in some areas. ○ Interpretations, where required, are generally standard but may in parts show some evidence of a critical appreciation of the material. ○ Limited use of common standard mathematical notation and conventions.
3rd (40–49)	○ Shows some knowledge and understanding of the subject and some awareness of key theoretical/ methodological issues but misses the point of the question ○ Demonstrates little/no ability to construct an argument and an underdeveloped or chaotic structure with only minimal attempt to use evidence ○ Limited, uncritical and generally confused account of a narrow range of sources ○ Poorly presented: writing style unclear with significant grammatical and spelling errors; limited attempt at providing references (e.g. only referencing direct quotations) and containing bibliographic omissions. ○ Some awareness of relevant areas for focusing problem solving but makes significant mistakes in solutions indicative of either a lack of discrimination or an understanding of a principle (NB: where problem solving is an important key learning outcome) For mathematical subjects ○ A reasonable spread of relevant knowledge but showing a good grasp of only a minority of the material. Some questions may be answered well, others will have major omissions or misunderstandings. Some questions may not be attempted at all. ○ There may be some evidence of a logical structure to the answers in some areas but this is limited. ○ Explanations, where required, are short and display a limited understanding of the material. Some explanations are not given. ○ Interpretations, where required, are poor and do not show critical appreciation of the material. ○ Very limited use of common standard mathematical notation and conventions

Marginal Fail (35–39)	○ Shows limited understanding and knowledge of the subject and omits significant parts of the question ○ Little or no argument and incoherent or illogical structure; evidence used inappropriately or incorrectly ○ Inadequate use of analytical skills and tendency to assert opinion rather than engage in critique ○ Some evidence of reading but little comprehension ○ Inadequate presentation e.g. not always easy to follow; frequent grammatical and spelling errors; some attempt to provide references but inconsistent and containing bibliographic omissions. ○ Little or no awareness of relevant areas for focusing problem solving and makes significant mistakes in solutions indicative of either a lack of discrimination or an understanding of a principle (NB: where problem solving is an important key learning outcome) For mathematical subjects: ○ Considerable deficiencies, or very partial attempts at questions, across large parts of the topics set, but with some relevant material at places. ○ There is little evidence of a logical structure to the answers. ○ Explanations, where required, are poor or missing. ○ Interpretations, where required, are weak or missing and show almost no critical appreciation of the material. ○ Limited or no use of common standard mathematical notation and conventions.
Outright Fail (0–34)	○ Very limited, and seriously flawed, knowledge and understanding ; little understanding of the question or fails to address the question entirely ○ No attempt to construct an argument and incoherent or illogical structure ○ No evidence of analytical skill ○ Uncritical and generally confused account of a very narrow range of sources. ○ Very poor presentation: poor writing style; significant errors in spelling and grammar with limited or no attempt at providing references and containing bibliographic omissions ○ Misses most of the points in a problem (NB: where problem solving is an important key learning outcome) For mathematical subjects: ○ Substantial deficiencies, or no attempt, across large parts of the topics set, but with a little relevant material at places. ○ There is little or no logical structure to the answers ○ Explanations, where required, are poor or missing. ○ Interpretations, where required, are missing or wrong and show no critical appreciation of the material. ○ Very limited or no use of common standard mathematical notation and conventions