

Generic Marking Descriptors

Criterion	Distinction A+ A A-	Merit B+ B B-	Pass C+ C C-	Fail F+ F F-	Clear Fail U
Structure Is the work logically organised?	There is a clear and consistent line of argument with a coherent and effective underlying structure.	Work is well-structured showing competent response.	Provides adequate response but lacks consistent argument.	Work is poorly organised and lacks logical structure.	Disorganised and no understanding of the issue, problem or task.
Coherence Does the work have a coherent argument?	Work demonstrates an ability to deal with complex issues coherently, systematically and creatively.	Work demonstrates continuity and coherence of argument that is straightforward to follow.	Work somewhat deficient in integration and coherence and/or showing some lack of intellectual engagement with the material.	Work lacks integration and coherence of issues with unclear argument.	Argument is poorly constructed and confused.
Insight and Analysis Does the work critically address a range of views? Is it self-reflective and analytical?	Shows critical awareness and insightful understanding of the issue to be addressed, problem to be analysed or task to be executed. Informed reflection integrated into practice.	Shows strong grasp of the issue, problem or task, supported by clear understanding of relevant fields of academic knowledge. Evidence of reflection in most areas.	Adequate awareness of issue, problem or task. Analysis not entirely thorough or complete. Some evidence of reflection.	Shows inadequate grasp of issue, problem or task; analysis thin with insufficient knowledge of critical and analytical questions; little evidence of reflection.	Shows misinterpretation of critical ideas and concepts. No evidence of reflection.
Originality Does the work include original illustrations/ examples? Is there a distinctive synthesis of material?	Marked evidence of independence of mind, originality in the application of knowledge, and imaginative use of evidence and concepts; evidence of challenging and changing practice.	Confident and appropriate use of concepts, methods, and forms of analysis. Reasonable attempt to apply knowledge and theory to practice.	Shows insecure handling of analytical/ methodological issues; insufficient originality of view; narrow in scope.	Lacks originality; shows inability to apply ideas to practice.	No originality is evident.

Criterion	Distinction A+ A A-	Merit B+ B B-	Pass C+ C C-	Fail F+ F F-	Clear Fail U
Use of Evidence Is the evidence used accurately, critically and effectively?	Appropriate wide-ranging evidence is discussed and used accurately, critically and effectively throughout; marked evidence of independence of mind and originality in the application of knowledge and understanding.	Appropriate evidence is gathered but work lacks breadth and depth.	Shows limited intellectual and critical engagement with the subject.	Lacks appropriate evidence and no critical engagement with the subject.	Draws on inappropriate evidence with serious factual errors.
Use of Resources Is a range of reading and other resources used appropriately?	Demonstrates wide range of reading and resources consulted with imaginative use of evidence and concepts. Evidence of a thorough grasp of relevant academic literature and scholarship in the field, and of wide, self-directed reading properly integrated in the assignment.	Evidence of some useful self-directed reading with awareness and use of relevant academic literature, both generic and subject-specific. Reference made to other resources.	Confined to standard generic literature and lacks critical engagement. Some use of other resources.	Limited or inappropriate use of relevant academic literature. Little or no use of other resources.	No apparent use of academic literature or other resources.
Presentation Is the work legible, grammatical and fluent? Are data presented accurately and appropriately?	Exemplary presentation with clarity of message and information. Fluent prose style with accurate spelling and grammar.	Well presented, with good prose style; clear, logical and generally error-free.	Satisfactory presentation with limited errors; straightforward to read.	Unsatisfactory presentation with textual errors; poor clarity of expression and inappropriate writing style.	Unsatisfactory presentation that is hard to read and navigate.
Referencing Are sources fully and accurately cited using an appropriate style, e.. Harvard?	Work is fully supported by appropriately cited references applied in a consistently accurate format. A bibliography may also be provided.	Use of references and citations relatively consistently applied.	Some inconsistencies in citations and references which detracts from the reading.	Lacks citations and demonstrates poor referencing style.	Minimal or absent citations and references.