|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark (%);** | **Information and subject knowledge** | **Structure and organisation** | **Attribution of sources** | **Analysis, synthesis and context** |
| 90-100  Dist | An exceptional answer showing a high level of independent background research. Shows flair. Major contribution to the discipline. | Publishable quality. | All sources clearly attributed. | Excellent understanding of evidence and a very high level of critical thinking. Significant independent thinking and critical awareness. Outstanding understanding of topic within a wider context. Outstanding integration of ideas from the wider subject area with a high level of insight. |
| 80-89  Dist | An outstanding answer demonstrating comprehensive knowledge of the subject and theoretical issues. Exemplary. | Potentially publishable quality. | All sources clearly attributed. | Excellent understanding of evidence and a high level of critical thinking. Clear evidence of independent thinking and critical awareness. Excellent flow of ideas, clear insight and understanding of context. Excellent integration of ideas from the wider subject area. |
| 70-79  Dist | An excellent answer, with an accurate and full account going beyond essential reading and lectures. | Very well organised and well written. | No significant unattributed matched to published texts (<1%) | Critical understanding of relevant research evidence underpinning conceptual knowledge. Very good flow and synthesis of ideas showing an appreciation of all major points. Integration of ideas from the wider subject area. Substantial critical analysis; coherent, realistic and well supported argument; Ideas are insightful and expressed clearly. Perceptive appraisal of implications. |
| 60-69  Merit | A comprehensive answer. Use of concepts and theories is largely precise, although there may be a few minor factual errors or inaccuracies. | Well organised with clear and logical presentation. | Use of primary sources with a good level of accuracy. Minor unattributed matches to published texts (<5%) | Consistent use of research evidence showing understanding of methodologies and critical awareness. Considerable critical analysis/ evaluation; well supported argument with a good flow of ideas that are developed logically and clearly expressed. Good understanding of key issues, context and implications; ability to think about these effectively. |
| 50-59  Pass | A satisfactory response that is mostly accurate. Use of concepts and theories may reflect more than minor inaccuracies, e.g. basic factual errors or errors of omission. | Adequately organised but limited in scope and depth.  May answer a slightly different but related question. | Adequate use of primary sources, some reliance on secondary sources. Some unattributed matches to published text (<10%) | Demonstrates some grasp of theory in relation to research data. Some attempt at evaluation but is mostly descriptive and may contain some errors or lack of detailed knowledge of supporting evidence. Central ideas are expressed clearly but does not develop an argument.. Lacks originality and clarity of thought. Some insight and grasp of wider issues but could be developed further. |
| 40-49  Fail | Some evidence of course reading and knowledge of lecture content. Insufficient information. Contains errors, omissions and irrelevancies. | Deficient in structure, organisation and scope. Little attempt to address the question or assignment brief . | Relies on secondary sources. Unattributed matches to published text (10 to 15%) detected. Some published ideas, themes or models are presented as the candidate’s own work. | Below average evaluation and understanding of theory in relation to empirical data. Descriptive with only limited critical analysis or use of research evidence. Ideas are poorly supported, unclear or underdeveloped with little grasp of wider issues. |
| 30-39  Fail | Small amount of acceptable or relevant information. Deficient answer with substantial errors, omissions or irrelevancies. | Poor structure, organisation and scope. Minimal attempt to address the question or assignment brief. | Significant unattributed matches to published text (15 to 20%) detected. A considerable number of published ideas, themes or models are presented as the candidate’s own work. Refer to SU Academic Misconduct Procedures. | Little critical awareness or analysis. Scant use of research evidence, relies on secondary sources. Minimal integration of ideas with limited understanding of context. Limited attempt to present an argument or apply conceptual knowledge. |
| 20-29  Fail | Limited statement of subject knowledge full of misconceptions, errors and irrelevancies | Poor structure, organisation and scope. Minimal attempt to address the question or assignment brief. | Significant unattributed matches to published text (over 20%) detected. A significant number of published ideas, themes or models are presented as the candidate’s own work. Refer to SU Academic Misconduct Procedures. | Very little critical awareness or analysis. Very little or no use of research evidence. Does not answer the question, little evidence of application of concepts or theory or clear argument. No awareness of context; very little linking of ideas. |
| 1 - 20 Fail | Very little familiarity with the subject. No more information that would be expected from a lay person or reading a broad sheet newspaper. | Badly organised work. Does not address the question. | Significant unattributed matches to published text (over 20%) detected. Significant number of published ideas, themes or models are presented as the candidate’s own work. Refer to SU Academic Misconduct Procedures. | Very few, if any, ideas expressed. No evidence of critical awareness. Very little, if any, argument or demonstration of understanding of context or concepts. No linking of ideas. |
| 0  Fail | No content or nothing relevant to subject area  Unfair practice demonstrated– refer to College policy.  Breach of confidentiality  May include Unsafe Practice. | No attempt to answer the question. No evidence of organisation. | Significant unattributed matches to published text (over 20%) detected. Evidence of collusion. Refer to SU Academic Misconduct Procedures. | Non-existent |