

School of Sociology & Social Policy
Marking Scheme, as published in Student Handbook

What we are looking for in the 'classes'

Bearing in mind the need to see grades in the context of the aims and learning outcome of the module, we set out briefly below the qualities we are looking for in awarding different classifications to particular pieces of work. It may be helpful to see the lower second class as the starting point, since this grade is awarded to sound work of good overall quality. Achieving a higher result requires something extra - and this will usually be found in the quality of analysis and criticism, in the presentation of a sustained and coherent argument, and in your approach to the topic. On the other hand, work which falls short of the lower second class standard contains some significant deficiencies, as indicated below:

First

86-100% --- The work of exemplary and superlative qualities. It shows complete awareness of the dimensions of the topic and of competing analyses, coupled with a degree of individuality, imagination and insight giving the work a personal stamp. Key theoretical, methodological or policy debates are discussed comprehensively, and source material is treated critically and located within this broader framework of debate. The descriptive and informational content is accurate, relevant and complete, drawing on a comprehensive wide range of material. Any data are excellently presented, and - for essays, projects and the dissertation - the referencing and bibliography completely comply with the standards set out in this Handbook. The work also demonstrates excellent evidence of intellectual ambition.

75%-85% -- The work is outstanding and shows comprehensive awareness of the dimensions of the topic and of competing analyses, coupled with a degree of individuality, imagination and insight giving the work a personal stamp. Key theoretical, methodological or policy debates are discussed, and source material is treated critically and located within this broader framework of debate. The descriptive and informational content is accurate and comprehensive, drawing on a comprehensive wide range of material. Any data are well presented, and - for essays, projects and the dissertation - the referencing and bibliography comply with the standards set out in this Handbook. The work also demonstrates clear evidence of intellectual ambition.

70%-74% -- The work is excellent and shows clear awareness of the dimensions of the topic and of competing analyses, coupled with a degree of individuality, imagination and insight. Key theoretical, methodological or policy debates are discussed, and source material is treated critically and located within this broader

framework of debate. The descriptive and informational content is accurate and relevant, drawing on an appropriately wide range of material. Any data are well presented, and - for essays, projects and the dissertation - the referencing and bibliography comply with the standards set out in this Handbook.

Upper Second (2.1) 60%-69% Work of upper second class standard is characterised by its good quality of problem definition, analysis and criticism, with some recognition of broader theoretical, methodological or policy issues. Source material is treated critically. Concepts are defined, important distinctions are drawn, classifications are evaluated, and the treatment of any correlations and causal links is precise. Coverage of the topic is good, and the material is accurate and relevant. The argument is well structured and clear, with no significant confusion. Any data are well presented, and - for essays, projects and the dissertation - the referencing and bibliography comply with the standards set out in this Handbook.

Lower Second (2.2) 50%-59% Work of lower second class standard is characterised by sound coverage of the topic, with good descriptive content and largely accurate and relevant material. The treatment, however, is dependent on the sources, and critical appraisal is underdeveloped. Analysis lacks depth; for example, some key concepts are not defined, some important distinctions are not drawn, classifications are oversimplified, and the treatment of correlations and causal links is limited. The argument is nevertheless clear and sound, with no significant confusion. The presentation of any data, and - for essays, projects and the dissertation - the bibliography and referencing are good, with only minor problems if any.

Third 40%-49 Work of third class standard is characterised by adequate coverage of the topic, but with significant flaws in other areas. Most of the material presented is shown to be relevant to the topic, though there may be a few significant inaccuracies. Source material is treated uncritically, and analysis is flawed or non-existent. The structure of the argument is weak, with some confusion or lack of logic. The presentation of any data may be poor, and - for essays, projects and the dissertation - there may be deficiencies in bibliography and referencing, such as missing items, and incomplete or inaccurate references.

Fail

30%-39% --- The work falls short of the standard required for a pass mark is of unsatisfactory quality. Coverage of the topic is inadequate and important source material is missing. A substantial amount of material is not shown to be relevant to the question or topic. Some inaccuracies and confusions are displayed. Source material is treated uncritically, and analysis is unsatisfactory or non-existent. The argument is unsatisfactorily structured, confused

or illogical. There may be serious inadequacies in bibliography and referencing - for essays, projects and the dissertation - such as missing items, and incomplete or inaccurate references.

20%- 29% --- The work is of poor quality. Coverage of the topic is grossly incomplete and important source material is missing. A substantial amount of material is not shown to be relevant to the question or topic. Major inaccuracies and confusions are displayed. Source material is given a cursory treatment, and analysis is poor. The argument is poorly structured, confused or illogical. There may be serious inadequacies in bibliography and referencing - for essays, projects and the dissertation - such as missing items, and incomplete or inaccurate references.

0% - 19% --- The work is unacceptable. Coverage of the topic is extremely incomplete and important source material is seriously lacking. A substantial amount of material is not shown to be relevant to the question or topic. Major inaccuracies and confusions are displayed. Source material is given a cursory treatment, and analysis is non-existent. The argument is poorly structured, confused or illogical. Bibliography and referencing - for essays, projects and the dissertation - are completely missing.

Postgraduate Classification Marking Guide

The complete range of marking standards and associated classifications is as follows:

Classification	Mark	Comments
Distinction	80+	Outstanding piece of work All major and minor objectives achieved Excellent comprehension and informed criticism and analysis Evidence of outstanding work beyond question and some originality Free from errors and showing advanced analytical skills
Distinction	70-79	Excellent piece of work All major and some minor objectives achieved Very good comprehension and analysis of the issues involved Excellent familiarity with the source material No major errors and only occasional minor errors
Merit	60-69	Careful and clear piece of work Most major objectives achieved Good understanding of the topic Good grasp and analysis of major issues No major errors though some minor errors
Pass	50-59	Middle of the range piece of work Basic question answered with relevant analysis Discusses and understands most relevant issues Material a bit thin and/or poorly focused Possible major and some minor errors
Compensatable Fail	40-49	Adequate but relatively poor piece of work Few major objectives achieved Demonstrates understanding of the general field Inadequate reading/preparation Occasional major and some minor errors
Fail	30-39	A failed piece of work Not a full answer to the question set Still shows some understanding of the general field Inadequate reading/preparation Major errors
Fail	0-29	A badly failed piece of work No real attempt to answer the question Poor arguments and lack of relevance Completely inadequate reading/preparation Generally unsound

CLASS	%	QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA - GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR ESSAYS & REPORTS
First A1 A2 A3 A4	100 90 80 73	a. Excellent report structure with professional presentation of figures, tables, diagrams, references etc.; evidence of originality/novelty in presentation. b. Deep understanding of subject; all arguments carefully developed and clearly expounded. c. Considerable and effective use of literature information, beyond that supplied as taught material. d. Clear evidence of critical thinking, originality and novelty.
Upper Second B1 B2 B3	68 65 62	a. Well organised report; appropriate choice of illustrative figures, tables, diagrams etc.; clearly presented throughout. b. Sound grasp of subject material; generally logical arguments. c. Reasonable evidence of wider study beyond lecture material. d. Some evidence of independent thinking and originality.
Lower Second C1 C2 C3	58 55 52	a. Generally clear report conforming with accepted format but with some errors in style and/or omissions in presentation of illustrative figures. b. Reasonable understanding of subject material, but some flaws in the logic of arguments and factual errors. c. Only limited evidence of wider study and use of literature information. d. Very little evidence of independent thinking or originality.
Third D1 D2 D3	48 45 42	a. Little attention given to report structure; limited use of illustrative figures, tables etc.; serious flaws in presentation. b. Limited understanding of subject; considerable factual errors demonstrated. c. Virtually no inclusion of literature information beyond lecture material. d. Virtually no evidence of independent thinking or originality.
Soft Fail E	35	a. Very poorly structured; disorganised; missing sections; minimal presentation of supporting data, figures etc. b. Minimal understanding of subject; serious factual errors; general lack of any logical arguments. c. Virtually no inclusion of literature information. d. No evidence of independent thinking or originality.
Fail F1	25	Very poor coverage of material with little information that is relevant. Virtually no evidence of understanding the question; minimal attempt to provide a structured answer.
Fail F2	10	A few lines of relevant material
Fail F3	0	No relevant material

1. Only broad classes (A,B,C,D and E) have qualitative criteria attached; the division into (e.g.) C1, C2, C3 etc. is at the discretion of the examiner.
2. The qualitative criteria include consideration of :
 - a. The quality of the report/essay etc. - the use of sections; diagrams; figures etc.; citation of references; general neatness etc.
 - b. Student's knowledge of subject; depth and quality of answer.
 - c. Evidence of reading / study beyond regurgitation of standard taught material.
 - d. Independent or critical thinking / originality etc.

CLASS	%	QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA - GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR EXAMINATIONS
First A1 A2 A3 A4	100 90 80 73	a. Deep understanding of subject; carefully balanced arguments clearly presented; all material highly relevant to the question. b. Considerable and effective use of literature information, beyond that supplied as taught material. c. Clear evidence of critical thinking, originality and novelty d. Excellent structure and good use of illustrative diagrams etc.; evidence of originality/novelty in presentation.
Upper Second B1 B2 B3	68 65 62	a. Sound grasp of subject material; presentation of logical arguments relevant to the question. b. Reasonable evidence of wider study beyond lecture material. c. Some evidence of independent thinking and originality. d. Well organised answer; appropriate use of illustrative diagrams; clear presentation.
Lower Second C1 C2 C3	58 55 52	a. Reasonable understanding of subject material, but some flaws in the logic of arguments and factual errors; possibly some irrelevant material. b. Only limited evidence of wider study and use of literature information. c. Little evidence of independent thinking or originality. d. Fairly clear presentation; generally conforming with accepted format but with some flaws in style; little use of illustrative diagrams.
Third D1 D2 D3	48 45 42	a. Limited understanding of subject; numerous flaws in the logic of arguments; considerable factual errors and/or irrelevant material. b. Virtually no inclusion of literature information beyond lecture material. c. Virtually no evidence of independent thinking or originality. d. Little attention given to structure; very limited use of illustrative diagrams; serious flaws in presentation.
Soft Fail E	35	a. Minimal understanding of subject; serious factual errors; general lack of any logical arguments; considerable amount of irrelevant material. b. Virtually no inclusion of literature information. c. No evidence of independent thinking or originality. d. Very poorly structured answer; disorganised and untidy; missing sections; virtually no use of illustrative diagrams.
Fail F1	25	Insubstantial answer; very poor coverage of material with little information that is relevant. Virtually no evidence of understanding the question and minimal attempt at structure
Fail F2	10	A few lines of relevant material
Fail F3	0	No relevant material

1. Only broad classes (A,B,C,D and E) have qualitative criteria attached; the division into (e.g.) C1, C2, C3 etc. is at the discretion of the examiner.
2. The qualitative criteria include consideration of :
 - a. Student's knowledge of subject; depth, relevance and quality of answer.
 - b. Evidence of reading / study beyond regurgitation of standard taught material.
 - c. Independent or critical thinking / originality etc.
 - d. The quality of presentation - structure of answer, the use of sections; diagrams etc., general neatness etc.

CLASS	%	QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA - GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR POSTERS
First A1 A2 A3 A4	100 90 80 73	a. Excellent use of headings, text appropriate size, figures and diagrams clear and well-labelled, very easy to follow progression of poster theme. b. Visually very attractive and creative. c. Factually very accurate and informative with clear evidence of extensive knowledge of published literature. d. All relevant aspects of own data presented, where inclusion is appropriate.
Upper Second B1 B2 B3	68 65 62	a. Good use of headings, text of appropriate size, some loss of figure clarity or slight errors in labelling, easy to follow progression of poster theme. b. Visually quite attractive and creative. c. Factually accurate and informative with some evidence of knowledge of published literature. d. Most relevant aspects of own data presented, where inclusion is appropriate
Lower Second C1 C2 C3	58 55 52	a. Adequate use of headings, text a little too small, figures not clear and inadequately labelled, more difficult to follow progression of poster theme. b. Visually unstimulating. c. Some factual inaccuracies with only limited evidence of knowledge of published literature. d. Several aspects of own data omitted, where inclusion is appropriate.
Third D1 D2 D3	48 45 42	a. Very poor use of headings, text too small or hand-written, figures unclear and unlabelled, no obvious progression of poster theme. b. Visually unattractive and dull. c. Many factual inaccuracies with very limited evidence of knowledge of published literature. d. Most of own data omitted, where inclusion is appropriate.
Soft Fail E	35	a. No headings used and poster somewhat disorganised. b. Visually unattractive and dull. c. Inaccurate with virtually no evidence of knowledge of published literature. d. None of own data included.
Fail F1	25	a. No headings used and poster very disorganised and difficult to understand. b. Visually very unattractive and dull. c. Inaccurate with no evidence of knowledge of published literature. d. None of own data included.
Fail F2	10	A few lines of relevant material presented
Fail F3	0	No poster presented

1. Only broad classes (A,B,C,D and E) have qualitative criteria attached; the division into (e.g.) C1, C2, C3 etc. is at the discretion of the examiner.
2. The qualitative criteria include consideration of :
 - a. Structure and organisation of the poster.
 - b. Visual impact and attractiveness.
 - c. Accuracy and completeness of the content.
 - d. Where appropriate, inclusion of students' own experimental data.

CLASS	%	QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA - GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR ORAL PRESENTATIONS
First A1 A2 A3 A4	100 90 80 73	a. Clearly audible, well-paced presentation delivered without obviously reading from notes in the time allocated. Addressed to the audience. b. Very well-planned with a clear logical structure focused on the topic being presented. Excellent introduction and summary. c. Excellent use of visual aids which are easy to read and understand. Main points of slides clearly explained. d. Content of presentation very well-researched with relevant data where appropriate. Response to questions asked indicates thorough understanding.
Upper Second B1 B2 B3	68 65 62	a. Clearly audible, well-paced presentation delivered with some reading from notes in the time allocated. Mainly addressed to the audience. b. Quite well-planned with logical structure focused on topic being presented. Good introduction and summary. c. Good use of visual aids which are quite clear to read and understand. Good attempt to explain main points of slides. d. Content of presentation quite well-researched with relevant data where appropriate. Response to questions asked indicates good understanding.
Lower Second C1 C2 C3	58 55 52	a. Audible presentation which may be too fast or too slow. Tendency to read from notes and to address floor or ceiling. May be outside time allocated b. Some flaws in structure and not always focused on the topic being presented. Weak introduction and summary. c. Adequate use of visual aids which are not always easy to read and understand. Little attempt to explain main points of slides. d. Some omissions in literature research and little relevant data presented. Response to questions asked indicates incomplete understanding.
Third D1 D2 D3	48 45 42	a. Difficult to hear. Too fast or too slow. Read from notes and little attempt to address the audience. Outside allocated time. b. Poorly-structured, rambling presentation which strays from topic being presented. Very weak introduction or summary. c. Poor visual aids which are difficult to read and understand. Poor explanation of main points of slides. d. Little evidence of literature research and no data presented. Response to questions indicates poor understanding.
Soft Fail E	35	a. Mumbled, halting presentation. Much too fast or too slow. No attempt to address audience and well outside allocated time. b. No discernible structure to presentation with some relevant material. No introduction or summary. c. Very poor visual aids. No explanation of main points of slides. d. Poor literature research and no data presented. Response to questions shows serious weakness in understanding.
Fail F1	25	a. Extremely difficult to hear presentation and well outside allocated time. b. No discernible structure and very little relevant material. No introduction or summary. c. No visual aids used. d. Little evidence of research. Response to questions shows minimal understanding.
Fail F2	10	Very minimal attempt to give a presentation.
Fail F3	0	Failed to give a presentation.

1. Only broad classes (A,B,C,D and E) have qualitative criteria attached; the division into (e.g.) C1, C2, C3 etc. is at the discretion of the examiner.
2. The qualitative criteria include consideration of :
 - a. Presentation of talk; audibility, speed, use of notes, addressed to audience, time keeping.
 - b. Organisation of talk; logical coherent progression with introduction and summary.
 - c. Use of visual aids; clarity and explanation of salient points.
 - d. Research and response to questioning; evidence of extensive reading, presentation of own data (where relevant), evidence of wider understanding.

CLASS	%	QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA - RESEARCH PROJECT EXPERIMENTAL WORK
First A1 A2 A3 A4	100 90 80 73	a. Extremely independent and able to work with minimal direct supervision. Shows a great deal of initiative and perseverance when things go wrong. b. Very well organised; able to plan time in laboratory/field with minimal assistance. c. Technically extremely competent; learns new methods quickly with minimal training. d. Excellent critical ability and able to appreciate limitations of techniques used.
Upper Second B1 B2 B3	68 65 62	a. Able to work independently with little direct supervision. Shows some initiative and perseverance. b. Well organised; able to plan time in laboratory/field with little assistance. c. Technically competent; learns new methods quite quickly when given training. d. Some critical ability and appreciation of limitations of techniques used.
Lower Second C1 C2 C3	58 55 52	a. Needs quite close supervision and shows little initiative. Tendency to give up too quickly when things go wrong. b. Quite well organised but needs considerable help to plan experiments and time spent in laboratory/field. c. Technically quite competent, but liable to make mistakes is not supervised closely. Slow at learning new techniques. d. Limited critical ability and little appreciation of limitations of techniques used.
Third D1 D2 D3	48 45 42	a. Little or no ability to work independently. Shows very little initiative. Liable to give up when things go wrong. b. Poorly organised; unable to plan time in laboratory/field without direct instruction. c. Technically incompetent. Liable to make mistakes even when supervised closely. Very slow at learning new techniques. d. Virtually no critical ability or appreciation of limitations of techniques used.
Soft Fail E	35	a. No ability to work independently. Minimal effort put into work. b. Poorly organised and liable to miss planned work sessions. c. Technically very incompetent. Often makes mistakes, even when closely supervised. Extremely slow at learning new techniques. d. No critical ability or appreciation of limitations of techniques used.
Fail F1	25	a. Rarely does any experimental work. b. Very likely to miss planned work sessions. c. Often makes errors when carrying out simple procedures. d. No critical ability or appreciation of limitations of techniques used.
Fail F2	10	Very minimal laboratory/field work attempted.
Fail F3	0	No laboratory/field work attempted

1. Only broad classes (A,B,C,D and E) have qualitative criteria attached; the division into (e.g.) C1, C2, C3 etc. is at the discretion of the examiner.
2. The qualitative criteria include consideration of :
 - a. Independence and initiative. Perseverance when work does not go according to plan.
 - b. Organisational ability; can the student plan their use of time effectively and efficiently?
 - c. Technical ability; can the student carry out work competently and learn new techniques quickly
 - d. Critical ability and appreciation of the limitations of the work.

MARKING CRITERIA

Your work will be marked using CATEGORICAL MARKING, following the criteria outlined below unless otherwise stated for a specific piece of work:

Examinations and Coursework

First Class: "Outstanding" or "Excellent" [72%, 75%, 85%, 95%, 100%]

Work which is excellent in both range and command of materials covered and arguments presented. The work should show an excellent understanding and appreciation of the subject and should engage the material closely. The work should show originality, treating evidence critically and incorporating information from a wide range of appropriate sources, with specific reference to the use of scientific evidence to support arguments. In the case of lecture-related material, evidence of wider research would be expected, with the material fully synthesised into the body of the work. The product should be well structured and focussed. First Class marks must reflect **Excellent** work at the very upper end of undergraduate performance.

Upper Second Class: "Highly competent" or "Very Good" [62%, 65%, 68%]

Work in this class should show a good broad-based knowledge of the topic and lecture material which is presented in a clearly argued, logical and focussed manner. Work at the upper end of the class should show evidence of critical evaluation of material from different sources. Work at the lower end of this class would be a competent reproduction of lecture material but may lack focus or have omitted too much factual knowledge.

Lower Second Class: "Satisfactory" [52%, 55%, 58%]

This class reflects an adequate piece of work which although broadly relevant and competent shows lack of focus and organisation, misunderstandings of the lecture material/topic and omits important relevant material. Material at the top of the class would show competent understanding of much of the lecture material and work at the lower end of the class would show significant gaps with poor organisation and focus.

Third Class: "Poor" [42%, 45%, 48%]

Work that shows some knowledge of the topic but with serious deficiencies in understanding and coverage. This class will include work which misses the point of the question/assessment or is unduly brief.

Fail: "Very Poor" or "Unsatisfactory" [0%, 5%, 15%, 25%, 35%, 38%]

Work that is irrelevant, showing a considerable degree of ignorance and/or in which the question is barely attempted.

Project Dissertations

First Class : "Outstanding" or "Excellent" [72%, 75%, 85%, 95%, 100%]

Work which is excellent in both range and command of issues covered and arguments presented. A first class mark should be awarded to work which demonstrates the majority of the following characteristics:

- a comprehensive and authoritative background to the project.
- a thorough understanding and critical evaluation of the arguments and concepts.
- work which is stylish, sophisticated and may be original or unorthodox.
- The **Abstract** is an excellent free-standing piece of work which would be acceptable for publication in a scientific journal. The abstract should concisely cover the Background with objectives/hypothesis, Methods, Results (highlighting important data and statistical differences), a Discussion which contains a clearly stated conclusion.
- The **Introduction** is outstanding, concisely written as an authoritative review, with the literature fully explored and the project placed in full context; the relevant objectives or hypothesis should be clearly stated.

- The **Methods** should be comprehensive in terms of materials, methodology and protocol with appropriate references, allowing replication by others. All analyses clearly stated and critically reviewed.
- The **Results** should be totally comprehensive with full and appropriate analysis and original analysis might be expected in work of high First Class standard. The figures should be free-standing. For CAL projects the package represents an excellent piece of work which shows an identifiable teaching strategy, high originality in the use of the medium and all relevant areas are thoroughly covered. The package should include more advanced/recent information if appropriate.
- The conclusions in the **Discussion** are drawn which effectively summarise the issues and arguments and place the work fully in the context of the Introduction and the wider literature, and should demonstrate originality of thought. All appropriate inferences should be drawn on the results. There should be a thorough evaluation of the errors and discrepancies. For CAL projects there is a thorough evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the package with suggestions for improvement.

First Class marks must reflect overall **Excellent** work at the very upper end of undergraduate performance.

Upper Second Class : “Highly Competent” or “Very Good” [62%, 65%, 68%]

Work that shows good broad-based knowledge of the topic and is clearly presented, argued and focussed. An Upper Second Class mark should be awarded to work which demonstrates the majority of the following characteristics:

- The **Abstract** is a very good free-standing piece of work. The abstract concisely covers the Background with objectives/hypothesis, Methods, Results, a Discussion which contains a conclusion.
- The **Introduction** should show a good understanding of the literature and relevant concepts, with objectives or an hypothesis stated.
- The **Methods** should be self-contained with full regard to the analytical and statistical techniques.
- The **Results** should be clearly presented, with appropriate analysis and with clear and free-standing figures. For CAL projects the package is a competent piece of work which clearly teaches all of the major issues and may introduce information from a variety of sources. It should demonstrate the appropriate use of the medium
- The **Discussion** should take account of the project in relation to the literature with appropriately drawn conclusions; in the case of CAL projects the Discussion should evaluate the package.

Work at the upper end of the class might show originality with good coverage of the relevant material. Work at the lower end of the class might contain a few conceptual errors or omissions of detail.

Lower Second Class “Satisfactory” [52%, 55%, 58%]

An adequate piece of work but may be weak in coverage, focus or demonstrate weakness in understanding. A Lower Second Class mark should be awarded to work which demonstrates the majority of the following characteristics:

- The **Abstract** should summarise the work adequately but may omit key points, not follow standard guidelines or fail to mention valid conclusions.
- The **Introduction** would lack focus, with poor coverage of the relevant research material, with important omissions and conceptual errors.
- The **Methods** are hard to follow with poor or little consideration of the underlying principles.
- The **Results** would be presented in a manner which is difficult to follow and inconsistent, with errors in the figures or with figures which are not free standing. For CAL projects the package represents an adequate piece of work which covers some but not all of the main issues and may lack style or sophistication; there may be inappropriate use of CAL e.g. just “page turning”.

- The **Discussion**, whilst describing the work, may fail to pay full regard to the relevant literature, place the work in context or draw appropriate conclusions. For CAL there may be poor or missing evaluation.

Third Class "Poor" [42%, 45%, 48%]

Work that shows some knowledge of the topic but with serious deficiencies in understanding and coverage. This class will include work which misses the point of the project and lacks focus.

A Third Class mark should be awarded to work which demonstrates the majority of the following characteristics:

- The **Abstract** is a poor summary of the project which may not conform to guidelines, fails to convey the key points and lacks a conclusion.
- The **Introduction** takes insufficient account of the background literature.
- The **Methods** are inadequately detailed with no critical understanding.
- The **Results** are not adequately presented and show serious omissions and errors; for CAL projects the package is not adequately presented and shows serious omissions and/or errors.
- The **Discussion** is not sufficiently related to the project and does not demonstrate a sufficiently adequate knowledge of the project or the literature.

Fail "Very Poor" or "Unsatisfactory" [0%, 5%, 15%, 25%, 35%, 38%]

Work that is irrelevant, showing a considerable degree of ignorance of the project with major omissions.

3 ASSESSMENT

3.1 End of Year examinations

At the end of the summer term there is a period of computer based, written and practical examinations during which you will be assessed on all modules you have studied that year. For those modules that are assessed partly or wholly in other ways, you will find the details of the assessment (including the weight given to the examination) on WebCT or confirmed by the Module Leader. When the final examination timetable is known, copies will be placed on your year notice board.

It is your responsibility to ensure that you turn up for your examinations at the correct place and at the correct time on the correct day. Please be aware that, if you miss an examination without sufficient cause, you will FAIL that examination and be awarded a mark of ZERO for it. Consequently, it is likely that you will be unable to progress to the following year of your course without further examination. Moreover, as your mark (excluding the Preliminary Year) counts towards your degree classification, then it is the mark of ZERO that will count, not the resit mark. 'Sufficient cause' in this context means some emergency such as illness or accident; it does NOT include oversleeping, missing the bus or turning up in the afternoon for an exam that is scheduled for the morning.

You will be informed when the examination results will be available. You should contact your Personal Tutor to find out your marks for your individual modules and to discuss your performance.

3.2 In-course assessment and examinations

Most Module Leaders will provide you with assignments which you are expected to complete. Depending on the module, this work may fall into one of two categories:

- Assignments which will be assessed and contribute towards your overall grade for the module (termed summative assessments);
- Assignments which do not contribute to your grade for the module but which you should do so as to maximise your understanding of the material (termed formative assessments).

The Module Leader will make clear which category each in-module assignment falls into and, for work which is to be assessed, will also specify the deadline for submission, (or the date of the assessment, for example, a practical assessment).

In-module assessments, which will be scheduled within your timetable, include for example OSPEs (Objective Structured Practical Exams), Lab based practical exams, exam conditions essay, short-answer exams and evaluation of your Personal Portfolio.

Assessment in the Preliminary Year also includes end of module exams.

3.3 Handing in Coursework

Electronic coursework should be submitted to the SV-TLA email address or uploaded via WebCT. Hardcopy coursework is to be submitted to the School via the post box located outside the School Office; a coursework submission sheet must be completed and attached to the coursework.

3.4 Late submission of coursework

Coursework submitted up to five working days late will be penalised by the loss of 25% of the full mark at a rate of 5% of the full mark for each late working day unless there are extenuating circumstances, in which case an extension may be granted (see below). Work that is more than five working days late will normally be given a mark of zero. Work for must pass elements of the course that is submitted late will result in a fail.

3.5 Assessment Criteria

The Nottingham course awards three separate degrees; in Year 3 the degree of BVMedSci is awarded and is followed by the BVM BVS phases in Year 5. The BVMedSci does not carry any professional validation, but is a requirement to progress to the BVM BVS.

High level marking criteria are as follows in Table 2, more detailed information is available in Appendix C.

Mark	Description	Understanding of concepts and critical ability	Factual information and integration of knowledge	Presentation
0-9%	No, or very limited answer	None	None, or no relevant information.	Extremely poor expression and style
10%-19%	Incompetent answer	None	Very few pieces of relevant factual information, largely incorrect	Extremely poor expression and style
20%-29%	Very poor answer	Very little or no understanding, no critical ability	Very few pieces of relevant factual information, largely incorrect	Very poor expression and style
30%-39%	Poor answer	Poor understanding, no critical ability	Some relevant factual information but lacking in breadth and depth, largely incorrect, no integration of knowledge	Poor expression and style
40%-49%	Barely adequate answer (pass BVMedSci only)	Limited understanding, very limited critical ability	Some relevant factual information but lacking in breadth and depth, some integration of knowledge	Barely adequate expression and style
50%-59%	Adequate answer (pass BVM BVS)	Understanding of main concepts, some critical ability	Sufficient relevant factual information, some integration of knowledge	Adequate expression and style
60%-69%	Good answer, merit standard (pass Preliminary Year)	Good understanding, moderate critical ability	Relevant factual information well covered, some integration of knowledge	Generally good expression and style
70%-79%	Very good answer, distinction standard	Very good understanding, good critical ability	Relevant factual information well covered, good integration of knowledge	Good expression and style
80%-89%	Excellent answer	Full understanding with some originality, good critical ability	Factually almost flawless, good integration of knowledge	Very good expression and style
90%-100%	Outstanding answer	Full understanding, evidence of originality, excellent critical ability	Factually flawless, excellent integration of knowledge	Excellent expression and style

Table 2. High level marking criteria

3.6 The Examiners

Recommendations about whether or not students should progress are decided at the meeting of the Board of Examiners, at the end of the Summer Term. This Board consists of the internal examiners (members of the School, who will have taught the modules and set and marked the papers) and the External Examiners. External Examiners are appointed by the University to ensure that the standards of degrees at Nottingham are comparable with those at similar universities. They will have seen, commented on and approved the examination papers in advance of the examinations, and their opinions carry particular weight in the decisions reached by the Board of Examiners. External Examiners

6.3 Marking Criteria for Qualifying Year Modules

6.3.1 Marking Criteria and Marks for Qualifying Year Coursework

Below are guidelines to the qualities that the School of Geography associates with the different degree classes in the assessment of projects/essays and the corresponding marks that will be awarded to assessed work:

CLASS	MARKS	INDICATIVE MARKING CRITERIA
High First	100	Goes beyond simply answering the question. Full achievement of objectives, coupled with an original & scholarly approach to the topic(s) addressed. As good an essay as could be expected from a first-year student.
	95	
	90	
Clear First	85	Excellent work, showing real critical insight and appreciation of the topic and associated literature coupled with excellent presentation and stylish writing.
	80	
First	75	Wide breadth and depth of access to literature or data plus a coherent structure based on sustained arguments and/or analysis. Conclusions fully supported by arguments and consistent with findings presented in the body of the essay/project.
	72	
Upper Second	68	Thorough, clear treatment showing an understanding of the factual material, issues and context. Efficient and substantial use of data/literature with no serious flaws or misconceptions. Minor errors are acceptable.
	65	
	62	
Lower Second	58	A reasonable piece of work, but lacking perception of the fundamental issues underlying the topic. Pedestrian treatment based on adequate knowledge and some background research. Sound conclusion. Some errors acceptable.
	55	
	52	
Third	48	Basic approach that does not do the topic justice. Lacking background and contextual material and with conclusions that are not supported by the text/analysis.
	45	
	42	
Fail *	38	A poor essay/project, with a very basic approach. Adequate effort, but the essay does not engage with the issues of the topic. Poor presentation and no conclusions.
	35	
	32	
	25	Unacceptable essay or project based on inadequate effort. Some intellectual and factual content.
	20	
	15	No adherence to project/essay title or outline. No clue as to what was required.
10		
5	As above, but highly foreshortened and with clear absence of effort.	
0	Copied or plagiarised answer with no intellectual input from the student, resulting in immediate academic failure of the module; OR work penalised for late submission, having been submitted without the granting of a specific dated extension.	

6.3.2 Marking Criteria and Marks for Qualifying Year Examinations

Below are guidelines to the qualities that the School of Geography associates with the different degree classes in the assessment of examinations and the corresponding marks that will be awarded and recorded on examination scripts:

CLASS	MARKS	INDICATIVE MARKING CRITERIA
High First	100	Goes beyond simply answering the question, adding an original and scholarly insight into the topic(s) addressed. As good an answer as could be expected from a first-year student under examination conditions.
	95	
	90	
Clear First	85	A comprehensive, complete and well-written answer that shows a deep understanding of the subject based on substantial background research and a strong critical stance in assessing the content of texts and learned journals.
	80	
First	75	Perceptive and focused and with good use of relevant material. Well structured, with coherent lines of sustained argument and a mature approach to writing.
	72	
Upper Second	68	A good answer based on thorough knowledge of the relevant material, coherently presented and with some insight. Some flair and no serious misconceptions but minor factual errors are acceptable. Must show evidence of background research and a deep approach to study.
	65	
	62	
Lower Second	58	A reasonably sound answer based on lecture material but lacking insight or strong argument on the major issues. Some misunderstanding or factual/conceptual errors or only shallow treatment of the topic. OR: good answer but lacking any evidence of background research.
	55	
	52	
Third	48	Disappointing answer that presents useful material but does not engage with the question. Poorly structured and weakly expressed arguments with some misconceptions.
	45	
	42	
Fail *	38	Poor answer. Limited scope and knowledge. Largely unstructured and incoherent. OR rushed answer that is brief (may be in note form), but which shows some promise.
	35	
	32	
	25	Unacceptable answer of very limited relevance to the question.
	20	
	15	Insignificant factual material and no relevant commentary or analysis of question.
	10	
	5	As above, but highly foreshortened and with clear absence of effort.
0	Copied or plagiarised answer with no intellectual input from the student, resulting in immediate academic failure of the module; OR work penalised for late submission, having been submitted without the granting of a specific dated extension.	

* Compensatable if other marks are of a required standard (see notes on progression)

6.4 Marking Criteria for Honours (Part I & II) Modules

Moderation of Part I and II essay and examination marks. All assessments are moderated prior to the relevant Examination Boards, typically by remarking of a sample of borderline, class-centred and failed pieces of work. Any recommendations are taken to the Examination Boards for consideration and action.

6.4.1 Marking Criteria and Marks for Part I and II Coursework

CLASS	MARKS	INDICATIVE MARKING CRITERIA
High First	100	Outstanding work, going far beyond simply answering the question. Full achievement of objectives, coupled with an original and scholarly contribution to the topic(s) addressed. As good a piece of work as could be achieved in the time available.
	95	
	90	
Clear First	85	Excellent work, worthy of retention for future reference and application to teaching or research. Based on critical appraisal of a large volume of material, and showing a deep approach to the subject.
	80	
First	75	Shows critical insight & appreciation of the topic and associated literature. Well written and well presented. Abundant evidence of background research. Conclusions fully justified.
	72	
Upper Second	68	Thorough, clear treatment showing an understanding of the major arguments, facts, theoretical underpinnings and context. Sound and coherent conclusions. Efficient and substantial use of literature/data, with no serious flaws or misconceptions; minor errors are acceptable.
	65	
	62	
Lower Second	58	Pedestrian treatment of wide literature or database OR adequate treatment of incomplete data or literature with little spark or critical insight. Reproduces material covered in lectures/seminars but adds only a little that comes from the student's own research & investigation.
	55	
	52	
Third	48	Basic approach to a narrow or misguided selection of material. Deficient in background or flawed in arguments. Lines of reasoning not sustained and conclusions not supported by the text/project analysis.
	45	
	42	
Fail*	38	Adequate effort, but work is shallow and poorly presented and the approach is very basic. Lacking in sustained lines of thought or reasoning. No conclusions or conclusions incorrect.
	35	
	32	
	25	Inadequate and without any serious scholarly content, but with some saving graces.
	20	
	15	No adherence to project/essay outline or title. No clue as to what was required. Seriously deficient in effort.
	10	
	5	As above, but highly foreshortened and with clear absence of effort.
	0	Copied or plagiarised answer with no intellectual input from the student, resulting in immediate academic failure of the module; OR work penalised for late submission, having been submitted without the granting of a specific dated extension.

6.4.2 Marking Criteria and Marks for Part I and II Examinations

CLASS	MARKS	INDICATIVE MARKING CRITERIA
High First	100	Goes far beyond simply answering the question, adding original and scholarly insights into the topic(s) addressed, and based on an encyclopaedic knowledge of the facts. As good an answer as could be achieved under examination conditions.
	95	
	90	
Clear First	85	A comprehensive, complete and well-written answer that shows a deep understanding of the subject. Critical and intelligent use of a wide range of relevant material, showing some originality and going far beyond lecture/seminar material.
	80	
First	75	Perceptive and focused, with good use of relevant material. Abundant evidence of background research. Well-structured work, with coherent lines of sustained argument and well-balanced conclusions.
	72	
Upper Second	68	Good understanding of the issues plus a coherent, well-read and stylish treatment, but lacking the perception/ originality of a first-class answer. Analytical and critical treatment of material. Must show evidence of background research, going beyond simply reproducing lecture/seminar material.
	65	
	62	
Lower Second	58	A "correct" answer, based largely on lecture material. Little detail or originality, but presented in an adequate framework. Lacks evidence of significant background research and, while sound, does not penetrate the subject sufficiently, nor display the critical evaluation needed for an upper second.
	55	
	52	
Third	48	Engages with question, but poorly structured answer based entirely on lecture material or containing several important errors of concept and/or fact. Overall, concepts are disordered or flawed, factual material is poorly presented and there is only shallow consideration of issues.
	45	
	42	
Fail*	38	Some attempt to engage with the question, but with significant errors of content and scope. Poor in knowledge, structure and expression. OR rushed answer that is brief (may be in note form), but which shows some promise.
	35	
	32	
	25	Inability to engage with the question. Either an answer to an imaginary question, or material irrelevant to the question posed.
	20	
15	Insignificant factual material and no relevant commentary or analysis of question.	
10		
5	As above, but highly foreshortened and with clear absence of effort.	
0	Copied or plagiarised answer with no intellectual input from the student, resulting in immediate academic failure of the module; OR work penalised for late submission, having been submitted without the granting of a specific dated extension.	

* Compensatable in Part 1 if other marks are of a required standard (see notes on progression)

6.4.3 Marking Criteria and Marks for Part II Dissertations

All dissertations are marked independently by two markers. If the resulting two marks are in the same class there is a case conference and a final mark is agreed. If agreement is not forthcoming, or if the original marks are in different classes, a third independent marker is appointed, followed by a case conference. If agreement cannot be reached the dissertation is referred to the External Examiners for moderation.

CLASS	Marks	MARKING CRITERIA – DISSERTATION PROPOSALS	MARKING CRITERIA – DISSERTATIONS
High First	100	As good a dissertation proposal as can reasonably be achieved.	As good a dissertation as can reasonably be achieved.
	95		
	90		
Clear First	85	An original idea, coupled with innovative research methods, excellent understanding of the context and the literature and a suitable plan of action.	Full achievement of an original, worthwhile aim and completion of stated objectives. Good, philosophical review of shortcomings. Clear, critical and intelligent appreciation of the subject, context, study methods and findings.
	80		
First	75	Worthwhile aims and objectives, with clearly thought-out and appropriate methods. Good, critical appreciation of the context of the proposed work and identification with professional research approach.	Identification with professional research approach. Achievement of worthwhile objectives & good, philosophical review of shortcomings. Well written and well structured, with a critical approach, attention to detail and a good appreciation of the literature, methods and findings.
	72		
Upper Second	68	Clear formulation of research question, showing critical appreciation of the relevant literature. Workable programme of investigation, which <u>must</u> include an appropriate research strategy.	Clear programme of study and worthwhile objectives but not sufficiently innovative or painstaking to result in original findings. Conclusions merited by the findings and good awareness of the context of the study. A highly satisfactory piece of work, but with unfulfilled potential.
	65		
	62		
Lower Second	58	Lacking in imagination or critical appreciation of the literature. A workable idea, but some inconsistency between aims and proposed methods.	Good effort and sound outcome, but pedestrian or lacking in imagination and critical insight. Failure to achieve objectives fully. Programme of work not particularly ambitious or innovative. Reasonable interpretation of the findings and the literature. Satisfactory, but not stylish or perceptive.
	55		
	52		
Third	48	Programme of study not well thought through. Little awareness of the context/literature and/or some misconceptions about the research process.	Somewhat deficient in effort or arguments/discussion poorly resourced. Undue faith in the literature. Few signs of analytical technique or depth, little attention to detail and some errors of interpretation. No clear programme of work and insufficiently clear objectives.
	45		
	42		
Fail*	38	Insufficient focus on the formulation of the research question; too general. Low input of effort.	Low input of effort and superficial write-up, conveying little of the context or value of the research. Serious errors of interpretation and lack of critical thought. Probably referred to Externals in view of heavy weighting of dissertation.
	35		
	32		
	25	Insufficient effort and no evidence of a coherent research strategy.	Insufficient effort to complete a reasonable piece of work. No evidence of sustained thought or application. An inadequate thesis, with little in the way of saving graces.
	20		
	15	No clue as to what is required. Entirely unacceptable as a dissertation proposal.	Little or nothing of any relevance. Entirely unacceptable as a dissertation.
	10		
5	As above, but highly foreshortened and with clear absence of effort.		
0	Copied or plagiarised answer with no intellectual input from the student, resulting in immediate academic failure of the module; OR work penalised for late submission, having been submitted without the granting of a specific dated extension.		