

UG MARKING CRITERIA FOR LITERATURE MODULES

General Description	Grade	Criteria
<p>FIRST (1st)</p> <p>Work in this range shows full (70-79), excellent (80-89) or outstanding (90-100) understanding and knowledge of the subject, ranging well beyond module material. It represents the work of a highly competent undergraduate (70-79), displays exceptional qualities (80-89) and, in the top level the mark range (90-100) demonstrates a level of excellence rarely seen in undergraduate work. Style and expression are of a high academic standard, polished and fluent, with a strong command of discipline-specific vocabulary. This work distinguishes itself from the upper second band by its maturity and consistent display of high-level critical thinking.</p>	90-100	<p>Redefines the terms of critical debates and theories, develops innovative methodologies or contributes significant new knowledge to the research field.</p> <p>An authoritative and insightful argument, executed with a high level of skill and polish.</p>
	80-89	<p>Engages persuasively with criticism, methodologies, and theories, establishing a clear independent position.</p> <p>An ambitious and well-supported argument, demonstrating striking critical and analytical insight written in a clear and persuasive style.</p>
	70-79	<p>Thorough knowledge of primary/secondary materials and key critical issues, or of relevant theories and methods. A skilfully executed argument, demonstrating independence/originality, and that is attuned to the complexities of critical issues, and debates.</p>
<p>UPPER SECOND (2:1)</p> <p>Work in this range shows strong knowledge of the subject, ranging beyond module material. Style and expression show competence in academic style, with a command of discipline-specific vocabulary. At the top end, these qualities will be displayed with consistency, though will not achieve the analytical sophistication of work in the first band. May present some problems of style and expression, but these do not interfere with the communication of the argument. This work distinguishes itself from the lower second band by its independence and its persuasive level of competence.</p>	60-69	<p>Detailed and secure knowledge of primary/secondary materials and key critical issues or of relevant theories and methods. A clear, persuasive, structured argument that is effectively supported with carefully chosen evidence or data.</p> <p>Evidence of independence of thought and an effort to engage with the complexities of critical positions, theories and/or methods, particularly in the top range of the band.</p>
<p>LOWER SECOND (2:2)</p> <p>Work in this range shows adequate knowledge of the subject and some ability to think beyond module material. Style and expression display an uneven command of academic style and discipline-specific vocabulary. At the top end, the work will show some evidence of analytical thinking, though it will lack the polish and independence of upper second work and may present problems of style and expression that affect the communication of the argument. This work distinguishes itself from the third band by its degree of accuracy.</p>	50-59	<p>Basic knowledge of primary/secondary materials or theories and key critical issues or of relevant theories and methods.</p> <p>An identifiable argument, supported with appropriate evidence, but may be too general, unevenly developed, more descriptive than analytical, or evidence gaps in logic or reason, especially at the lower end of the band.</p> <p>Work may lack independence, be too heavily reliant on module material and/or secondary sources</p>
<p>THIRD (3rd)</p> <p>Work in this range shows some knowledge of the subject and module material. Style and expression display a limited or flawed command of academic style and discipline-specific vocabulary. At the top end, it will display greater accuracy and an effort to present an argument. This work distinguishes itself from a marginal fail in terms of degree of knowledge and its demonstration of a very basic level of competence.</p>	40-49	<p>Partial knowledge of primary materials or theories, with highly limited or inaccurate knowledge of secondary materials, key critical issues, or methods.</p> <p>An argument that may not be fully coherent, may not sustain focus on the question posed, may lack structure, or uses primary/secondary material, theories or methodologies inappropriately or inaccurately.</p> <p>Work may be largely descriptive with oversimplified analysis of the material.</p>
<p>MARGINAL FAIL</p> <p>Work in this range shows insufficient or flawed knowledge of the subject and module material, falling short of basic competence. Style/expression display little to no command of academic style and discipline-specific vocabulary. This work distinguishes itself from a fail by showing some knowledge and effort, even if it is highly limited.</p>	35-39	<p>Highly limited or partially inaccurate knowledge of the primary materials or theories, with little to no sense of secondary materials, key critical issues, or methods.</p> <p>A response that relies on opinion or unsupported assertion, rather than argument.</p> <p>Work lacks coherence, structure, and/or focus.</p>
<p>FAIL</p> <p>Work in this range is incomplete and/or shows a lack of knowledge of the subject and incompetence in handling of material. Style and expression are of a very poor standard, largely incoherent.</p>	0-34	<p>Lack of understanding of primary/secondary materials, theories, methods, and key critical issues</p> <p>Minimal effort and understanding.</p> <p>May violate rubrics and appropriate academic standards.</p>