

**Criteria for Grading (Postgraduate)**

**School of Geographical Sciences**

<b>Class Taught (Diss)</b>	<b>21 Point</b>	<b>101 Point</b>	<b>Knowledge &amp; Understanding</b>	<b>Conceptual Rigour &amp; Argument</b>	<b>Style &amp; Presentation</b>
Dist.	20 19	100 94	Outstanding, exemplary work that goes beyond expectations	Highly sophisticated, critical, and nuanced. Independent analysis engages meticulously with the question. At the highest level, shows evidence of engagement with and ability to innovate and / or critique advanced methods, techniques, and concepts at a level beyond that explicitly taught. The best work will transform the range, scope and/or application of question. Logically and rigorously argued. Highly original argument supported by critically-evaluated evidence, drawing on relevant ideas from across, and, where appropriate, beyond the subject. Work is worthy of dissemination (ex. publication, prize nomination, etc.).	Highly lucid, original, and creative exposition of ideas and argument. Excellent presentation, with exemplary clarity of expression and, where appropriate, creative acumen. Evident attention to detail, with highly polished submission of text, figures, and citations at a professional or publication standard.
Dist.	18 17	83 78	Excellent work with original insights and perspectives	Sophisticated, rigorous, and critical. Analysis engages closely with the question. Logically and thoroughly argued. Original thinking supported by critically-evaluated evidence, drawing on relevant ideas across the subject. Shows evidence of engagement with and ability to deploy advanced methods, techniques and concepts beyond those taught. Sophisticated and considered use of technical vocabulary. Work may be worthy of dissemination (ex. prize nomination, etc.)	Fluent, lucid, and innovative exposition of ideas and arguments. Near flawless presentation with eloquent and/or confident expression. Attention to detail evidenced in careful language, expressive explanation, useful citations, and a well-chosen bibliography.
Dist.	16 15	75 72	Thorough understanding with evidence of extensive reading and critical application	Critical and analytical. Evidences complex engagement with the question. Generally rigorously argued. Independent thought and study beyond the bounds of what has been taught, generally supported by critically-evaluated evidence. Accurate and often sophisticated use of technical, methodological, and conceptual vocabularies seeking to push beyond those taught. Where appropriate and successful, evidences the attempt to be innovative with ideas, interpretations, methods, explanation, and / or expression.	Lucid exposition of ideas and argument. Polished presentation. Articulate expression supported by confident attention to detail, explanatory concision, and consistently correct citation with a developed and considered bibliography.
Dist. (Merit)	14	68	Very good understanding and knowledge, with very good reading and application.	Generally critical, analytical, and quite sophisticated, but lacking either the sustained depth, rigour, and/or close analytic sophistication shown by better work. Evidences a self-conscious and sustained effort at independent thought and argument. Engages diligently with the question. Accurate use of technical, methodological, and conceptual vocabulary. Able to use a range of methods and techniques to come to credible and considered conclusions.	Clear exposition of ideas with well-defined argument, structure, and meaning, including correct use of technical, methodological and conceptual vocabulary. Consistent citation and very good bibliography.
Dist. (Merit)	13	65	Good understanding and knowledge	Attempts independent thought beyond the bounds of what has generally been taught, this being generally supported by evidence which is not always fully critically evaluated. Able to use a range of methods and techniques to come to acceptable conclusions. May lack critical recognition, or conceptual depth, or interpretive facility, or consistent application to a focused argument or explanation necessary for higher marks.	Mostly clear exposition of ideas with mainly well-defined argument, structure, and meaning, including largely correct use of technical, methodological and conceptual vocabulary. Some limitations in expression, structure, and/or sustained argument. Essentially consistent citation & good bibliography.
Merit	12	62	Generally good understanding and knowledge	Limited attempts at independent thought, with some effort to engage material beyond the bounds of what has generally been taught. Generally supported by evidence which is not fully critically evaluated. Able to use a range of methods and techniques to come to plausible conclusions. Partial critical recognition, or lacking a considered richness in conceptual depth, or interpretive facility, or an inconsistently applied argument or explanatory focus.	Largely clear exposition of ideas, with attempt to define argument, structure, and meaning, with only minor errors in technical, methodological or conceptual vocabulary mainly correct. Some limitations in expression, structure, and/or sustained argument. Essentially consistent citation with solid bibliography.

Criteria for Grading (Postgraduate)					School of Geographical Sciences
Pass	11 10	58 55	Generally sound understanding, but with some misconceptions	Some effort at analysis and synthesis, but rarely critical. May not properly engage with the question and may show some limitations in attaining intended learning outcomes. Not always clearly argued / structured. Little originality; general evidence of study and comprehension of what has been taught but little evidence of work beyond taught material. Rare critical evaluation of evidence. Able to use most of the methods and techniques taught.	Adequate exposition of ideas with reasonably clear meaning and argument. Flaws in citation and/or bibliography. Some inaccurate use of technical, methodological or conceptual vocabulary.
Pass	9	52	Weak understanding with misconceptions	Weak attempt at analysis and synthesis. Lacks recognition of critique or its application. May not properly engage with the question and may show some limitations in attaining intended learning outcomes. No originality; general evidence of study and comprehension of what has been taught but little evidence of work beyond taught material. Rare critical evaluation of evidence. Able to use main methods and techniques taught.	Weakly argued / structured. Insecure and clumsy exposition of ideas partially obscuring meaning or argument. Errors in citation and / or bibliography. Consistently weak use of technical, methodological or conceptual vocabulary.
Marginal Fail (Eligible for resit)	8 7	48 45	Some knowledge, but limited understanding	Limited attempt at analysis and synthesis, with little argument, explanation, or sustained reasoning. Largely misses the point of the question and may show significant limitations in attaining learning outcomes. Repetition of taught content with no evident attempt at independent thought or application. Range of evidence mentioned but grasp of that evidence in places vague and insecure and the evidence not critically evaluated. Able to use a proportion of the basic methods and techniques taught. Higher work in this range may attempt analysis, but with substantive errors, omissions, weaknesses of interpretation, or explanation.	Poorly argued / structured. Poor exposition of ideas, often obscuring meaning or argument. Flaws and omissions in citation and / or bibliography. Little and often inaccurate use of technical, methodological, and conceptual vocabulary. Little care evidenced, with weak or deficient attention to detail.
Fail (Not eligible for resit)	6 5	42 35	Some relevant knowledge, but with omissions / errors	Poor attempt at analysis and synthesis which struggles to articulate and / or employ argument within an already limited understanding. Taught content is relied upon almost entirely with the grasp being weak / incomplete at the lower level. No attempt at independent thought or application. Some attempt to address the question at the higher level. Attainment of only a minority of the learning outcomes. Limited range of evidence mentioned but with little / no critical evaluation. Able to use some basic taught methods and techniques but may be misapplied / misinterpreted.	Argument is mostly / consistently poorly articulated and poorly structured, such that the point is often lost. Some / most references but may be incorrect / missing. Little use of technical, methodological, and conceptual vocabulary which is quite often used inaccurately. Little care evidenced with poor / inadequate attention to detail.
Fail (Not eligible for resit)	4 3 2	29 22 15	Little relevant general knowledge with fundamental errors	Failure to address question. Attainment of nearly all learning outcomes deficient. No analysis or synthesis. Illogical structure. Lacking originality. Very limited sources. Little reference to evidence. Lack of ability to use the right techniques and methods taught. Incorrect or negligible use of technical, methodological and conceptual vocabulary	Exposition of ideas may be incoherent making meaning and argument very unclear or wholly incoherent. Few references. Poorly presented bibliography. No care evidenced.
Fail (Not eligible for resit)	1	7	No knowledge relevant to the question	Wholly deficient in learning outcomes. No effort to address question asked. No use of evidence or material taught. Techniques totally irrelevant to question.	Little written. No references or bibliography. Incoherent and/or largely incomplete.
Fail (Not eligible for resit)	0	0	Nothing Written		