

Undergraduate Categorical Marking Framework

The framework is suitable for all UG assessments (or assessment subcomponents) where a qualitative mark is given, such as written coursework and dissertations and written exam components. Categorical marking is also suitable for oral presentations, poster presentations, and performances. Otherwise, the following guidelines apply:

- Assessments with a quantifiable right or wrong answer (e.g. multiple choice exams, accounting assessments, clearly defined short answer questions) are not marked categorically.
- For an assessment with sub-components (e.g. an exam comprising two essay questions), the components should each be marked categorically and then combined for a final mark which may not fall into one of the categories. If the component is quantifiable, categorical marking does not apply.

The mapping of numbers to degree classifications applies across all UG programmes and cannot be modified. The assessment criteria are intended as guidance only and can be adapted as necessary.

Grade Categories and Generic Assessment Criteria	
100	An assessment that could not be bettered within the time available
92 85 82	Upper First work demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • achievement beyond the attainment of intended learning outcomes • an outstanding level of independent research and reading • deep reflection on the topic or question • outstanding critical reflection on the material covered: work may extend existing debates, and show originality and/or appropriate application of the topic to other contexts • quality of writing and presentation which is potentially publishable • all qualities for regular first
78 75 72	First work demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • exemplary attainment of learning outcomes • a detailed answer to the question, including extensive critical evaluation of material • very good understanding of the topic • clear evidence of reading beyond essential reading and lectures (e.g., might cross theoretical and discipline boundaries) • inclusion of creative and/or original elements and/or consideration of wider issues and/or real world application • an analytical approach • presentation of valid arguments which are clear, well-organised, purposeful and logical • support of ideas by highly appropriate sources

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • precise use of concepts and terminology • presentation in appropriate formatting, including correct referencing style
68 65 62	<p>2:1 work demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • convincing attainment of learning outcomes • a full answer to the question, including substantial critical evaluation of material • good understanding of the topic • some evidence of wider reading • some consideration of wider issues and/or real world application • some analysis • presentation of valid arguments which are largely well-organised and mostly clear, purposeful and logical • support of ideas by with appropriate and sufficient sources • accurate use of concepts and terminology • presentation in appropriate formatting, including correct referencing style
58 55 52	<p>2:2 work demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • acceptable attainment of learning outcomes • a reasonable answer to the question, including some critical evaluation • mainly good understanding, although there may be some errors/omissions • little or no evidence of reading beyond recommended material • narrow constraint within a given topic: wider issues not considered • mainly descriptive writing, with or without some rudimentary analysis • presentation of valid arguments, which may lack organisation, purpose, clarity or logic in places • limited use of appropriate sources to support • basic use of concepts, which may include a few inaccuracies • presentation in appropriate formatting, including mostly correct referencing style
48 45 42	<p>Third work demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • threshold level of attainment of learning outcomes • limited relevant information and little evidence of critical evaluation • limited understanding of the topic, with evidence of errors and/or omissions • little or no evidence of reading beyond recommended core materials • no exploration of wider context • primarily descriptive writing, with no evidence of analytical thinking • invalid arguments, or valid arguments that are poorly organised and lack clear logic or purpose • occasional use of unsupported assertions and opinions • inadequate use of sources to support ideas • some inappropriate/inaccurate use of concepts and terminology • presentation in appropriate formatting, but omitted references or inaccurate referencing style

38 35 32	Condonable Fail work demonstrates... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • level of attainment of learning outcomes marginally below threshold • substantial errors and/or omissions, or fails to address the topic/question appropriately, or limited in scope (e.g. significantly under the word limit) • inclusion of some relevant information but little evidence of overall understanding of the topic • some discernible line of purposeful, clear and logical argument • frequent use of unsupported assertions and opinions • little evidence of recommended core reading • significant errors in the use of concepts and terminology • presentation which may be inappropriate and/or missing references or inaccurate referencing style
25 15 5	Fail work in this range demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no evidence of attainment of learning outcomes • very limited attempt to answer the question (e.g. substantially under the word limit) • limited familiarity with the topic and/or reliance on lay knowledge • clear lack of understanding or misunderstanding of the topic • presentation which does not meet the expected standard, including absence of appropriate referencing and citation
0	Fail work of 0 demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • nothing of merit, or • non-submission, or • academic misconduct