

SCHOOL OF ARTS, LANGUAGES AND CULTURES

UNDERGRADUATE STEPPED MARKING SCHEME AND MARKING CRITERIA (GRADE DESCRIPTORS)

The online version of this document is the definitive version, please make sure you are reading the most up to date copy: <http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=33382>

1. GRADE DESCRIPTORS FOR COURSEWORK ESSAYS AND WRITTEN EXAMINATIONS

NOTE: When marking written examinations, the criteria in the following descriptors that refer to academic and referencing conventions should be set aside entirely, and those that refer to matters of style and presentation should be applied with regard to the standards that may reasonably be expected of work produced under timed conditions.

Class	Descriptor	Mark
	Incorporates the categories of •Structure and Argument •Knowledge and Understanding •Use of Sources and Data •Style and Presentation	
Upper First	Exceptional work of the highest quality. It is exceptional in all or most of the following respects: accuracy and depth of knowledge and understanding; cogency, originality and logical development of argument; structural clarity and integrity; sophistication of methodology or theoretical framework; use of technical vocabulary and notation (where relevant); understanding and successful application of concepts; analytical accuracy and incisiveness; clarity and originality of thought; perceptiveness of insight; methods of data collection and/or analysis (when required); selection and presentation of examples; use of and critical engagement with sources; accuracy, lucidity and fluency of writing style and presentation, including word length, use of academic and referencing conventions (footnotes, bibliography, etc.) and formatting conventions (example numbering, interlinear glossing, etc.). The essential material is presented thoroughly, accurately and weighed appropriately. The work is highly authoritative and amply demonstrates very advanced knowledge and a very advanced ability to integrate the full range of principles, theories, evidence and techniques. The work attains all of the learning objectives of the unit and adheres to all guidelines.	100
Upper First		95
Upper First		92
Mid First	Outstanding work of a very high quality. It is outstanding in all or most of the following respects: accuracy and depth of knowledge and understanding; cogency, originality and logical development of argument; structural clarity and integrity; sophistication of methodology or theoretical framework; use of technical vocabulary and notation (where relevant); understanding and successful application of concepts; analytical accuracy and incisiveness; clarity and originality of thought; perceptiveness of insight; methods of data collection and/or analysis (when required); selection and presentation of examples; use of and critical engagement with sources; accuracy, lucidity and fluency of writing style and presentation, including word length, use of academic and referencing conventions (footnotes, bibliography, etc.) and formatting conventions (example numbering,	88
Mid First		85
Mid First		82

	interlinear glossing, etc.). The essential material is presented thoroughly, accurately and weighed appropriately. The work is very authoritative and amply demonstrates very advanced knowledge and a very advanced ability to integrate the full range of principles, theories, evidence and techniques. A further refinement of the argument, analysis, structure, style and/or presentation is needed to make the work exceptional. The work attains almost all of the learning objectives of the unit and adheres to almost all guidelines.	
Lower First	Excellent work of a high quality. It is excellent in all or most of the following respects: accuracy and depth of knowledge and understanding; cogency, originality and logical development of argument; structural clarity and integrity; sophistication of methodology or theoretical framework; use of technical vocabulary and notation (where relevant); understanding and successful application of concepts; analytical accuracy and incisiveness; clarity and originality of thought; perceptiveness of insight; methods of data collection and/or analysis (when required); selection and presentation of examples; use of and critical engagement with sources; accuracy, lucidity and fluency of writing style and presentation, including word length, use of academic and referencing conventions (footnotes, bibliography, etc.) and formatting conventions (example numbering, interlinear glossing, etc.). The essential material is presented thoroughly, accurately and weighed appropriately. The work is authoritative and demonstrates advanced knowledge and an advanced ability to integrate a wide range of principles, theories, evidence and techniques. The work attains most of the learning objectives of the unit and adheres to most of the guidelines. A further refinement of the argument, analysis, structure, style and/or presentation is needed to make the work exceptional or outstanding.	78
Lower First		75
Lower First		72
Upper 2:1	Good to very good work, which exhibits an above average degree of knowledge and understanding; cogency, originality and logical development of argument; structural clarity and integrity; methodological or theoretical sophistication; use of technical vocabulary and notation (where relevant); understanding and successful application of concepts; analytical accuracy and incisiveness; clarity and originality of thought; methods of data collection and/or analysis (when required); selection and presentation of examples; critical engagement with sources; accuracy, lucidity and fluency of writing style and presentation, including word length, use of academic and referencing conventions (footnotes, bibliography, etc.) and formatting conventions (example numbering, interlinear glossing, etc.). The work addresses the specific topic very well and exhibits very sound skills of argument, analysis, critical engagement, expression and management of sources/evidence. The work attains many of the learning objectives of the unit and adheres to many of the guidelines. A further expansion, deepening, exemplification and/or refinement of the argument, analysis, structure and/or presentation is needed to raise the work to a higher standard.	68
Mid 2:1		65
Lower 2:1		62
Upper 2:2	The work is good in parts and exhibits a reasonable degree of knowledge and understanding; cogency, originality and logical development of argument; structural clarity and integrity; methodological or theoretical sophistication; use of technical vocabulary and notation (where relevant); understanding and successful application of concepts; analytical accuracy	58
Mid 2:2		55
Lower 2:2		52

	and incisiveness; clarity and originality of thought; methods of data collection and/or analysis (when required); selection and presentation of examples; critical engagement with sources; accuracy, lucidity and fluency of writing style and presentation, including word length, use of academic and referencing conventions(footnotes, bibliography, etc.) and formatting conventions (example numbering, interlinear glossing, etc.). The work goes some way towards addressing the specific topic and exhibits adequate but flawed skills of argument, analysis, critical engagement, expression and/or management of sources and evidence. The work attains some of the learning objectives of the unit and adheres to some of the guidelines. A more competent demonstration of knowledge and understanding and a further expansion, deepening, exemplification and/or refinement of the argument, analysis, structure and/or presentation are needed to raise the work to a higher standard.	
Upper Third	The work exhibits sufficient knowledge and understanding; accuracy; clarity; analytical coherence; methodological or theoretical awareness; skills of data collection (when required) and/or analysis; presentational skills, including referencing and formatting conventions; and use of appropriate sources and evidence to warrant a basic pass. The work attains some of the learning objectives of the unit and adheres to some of the guidelines, but falls short of others by a significant degree. The work goes some way towards addressing the specific topic but exhibits markedly flawed skills of argument; critical engagement; expression and/or management of sources and evidence; data analysis; and use of technical vocabulary and notations (where relevant). Among the work's deficiencies are some or all of the following: failure to address the question adequately; overly descriptive content; lack of detail and depth; simplistic or unnuanced argument; inaccurate or unsupported claims; problems with the application and exemplification of concepts; inept handling and analysis of data; poor critical engagement with sources; poor expression; failure to adhere to prescribed word lengths. A much more competent demonstration of knowledge and understanding and of argument and analysis are needed to raise the work to a higher standard.	48
Mid Third		45
Lower Third		42
Compensatory Fail	The work demonstrates insufficient knowledge, understanding and skills in the specific topic and does not merit a pass mark. The work does not demonstrate adequately the study skills required at this level and fails to attain the learning objectives of the unit. Although the work shows some awareness of the topic, it omits many important facts and concepts, displays a lack of understanding of theoretical concepts, technical vocabulary and notation conventions (where relevant) and includes major errors of fact and analysis. There is little or no attempt to present and critically evaluate evidence or analyse (and collect) data (when required). The argument is difficult to discern and the content is mostly irrelevant. The work has minimal underlying structure and is frequently confused and incoherent, and/or there are problems with the word length. Extensive improvement is required in all of these areas of deficiency to raise the work to a higher standard.	38
Compensatory Fail		35
Compensatory Fail		32
Fail	The work demonstrates inadequate knowledge, understanding and skills in the specific topic and does not merit a pass mark. It does not demonstrate	28
Fail		25

Fail	even a basic awareness of the subject matter and manifestly fails to attain the learning objectives of the unit. The awareness of principles, theories, evidence is insufficient, as is the understanding of concepts, technical vocabulary, notations and techniques of data analysis and exemplification (where relevant). There is little or no evidence of critical engagement or ability to apply concepts. The argument is non-existent, partial and/or unsubstantiated and the work is badly structured. Insufficient attention is paid to the quality, range and appropriateness of sources and evidence. The level of style and expression is markedly inadequate for this level of study and/or there are problems with the word length. Very extensive improvement is required in all of these areas of deficiency to raise the work to a higher standard.	22
Fail	The work demonstrates severely inadequate knowledge, understanding and skills in the specific topic and does not merit a pass mark. It shows little or confused awareness of the appropriate principles, theories, evidence and techniques, or of the understanding of concepts, technical vocabulary, notations and techniques of data analysis and exemplification (where relevant). The work manifestly fails to attain the learning objectives of the unit. There is little or no evidence of critical engagement or background reading or data collection (when appropriate). The arguments are unsubstantiated, unstructured, poorly presented, misrepresent and/or fail to demonstrate an understanding of the subject. The use of evidence and sources is inappropriate or non-existent. The level of style and expression is severely inadequate for this level of study and/or there are problems with the word length. Very extensive improvement is required in all of these areas of deficiency to raise the work to a higher standard.	15
Fail	The work is profoundly inadequate and does not merit a pass mark. It does not demonstrate any significant awareness of the subject matter and manifestly fails to attain the learning objectives of the unit. The work is confused and incoherent and does not address the question posed. There is little or no evidence of critical engagement or background reading or data collection (when appropriate). The arguments are unsubstantiated, unstructured, poorly presented, misrepresent and/or fail to demonstrate an understanding of the subject. The use of evidence and sources is inappropriate or non-existent. The level of style and expression is severely inadequate for this level of study and/or there are problems with the word length. Very extensive improvement is required in all of these areas of deficiency to raise the work to a higher standard.	5
Fail		0

2. GRADE DESCRIPTORS FOR ORAL PRESENTATIONS

Class	Descriptor	Mark
	Incorporates the categories of •Communication on Skills and Content •Grammatical Accuracy •Vocabulary and Register •Pronunciation and Intonation •Presentation Skills (including structure and communication, knowledge and understanding, use of sources and data)	
Upper First	An exceptional performance demonstrating a complete overall understanding of the major issues and their implications and an exceptionally clear grasp of all the relevant critical or conceptual approaches to the subject and their application. Evidence of very advanced capacity to think independently, to formulate one’s own ideas, criteria and judgements, and to collect (where required) and present data or examples. Argument is exceptionally cogent and very clearly supported by appropriate evidence derived from data and/or sources. Excellent use of technical vocabulary and notational conventions (if slides are used). A flawless performance.	100
Upper First		95
Upper First		92
Mid First	An outstanding performance demonstrating near complete overall understanding of the major issues and an extremely clear grasp of virtually all the relevant critical or conceptual approaches to the subject and their application. Evidence of advanced capacity to think independently, to formulate one’s own ideas, criteria and judgements, and to collect (where required) and present data or examples. Argument is extremely cogent and very clearly supported by appropriate evidence derived from data and/or sources. Excellent use of technical vocabulary and notational conventions (if slides are used). A near flawless performance.	88
Mid First		85
Mid First		82
Lower First	An excellent performance demonstrating a very high degree of understanding of the major issues and very clear grasp of most of the relevant critical or conceptual approaches to the subject and their application. Evidence of well-developed capacity to think independently, to formulate one’s own ideas, criteria and judgements and to collect (where required) and present data or examples. Argument is highly cogent and clearly supported by appropriate evidence derived from data and/or sources. Excellent use of technical vocabulary and notational conventions (if slides are used).The presentation itself is very polished.	78
Lower First		75
Lower First		72
Upper 2:1	Good to very good. A well-focused performance in all or most areas. Shows moderate competence in some areas and excellence in others. Able to present and interpret data or content from sources in a way that demonstrates awareness of major issues, a clear grasp of most of the relevant critical approaches to the subject and a very good understanding and application of concepts. Very competent use of technical vocabulary and notational conventions (if slides are used). Evidence of capacity to think independently and to collect (where required) and present data or examples. Less ambitious in scope than First Class, but still aiming to achieve a very good level of analysis and very well-structured and supported argument. At the lower end of the scale, there may be some shortcomings, but major errors are avoided. Presentation is generally	68
Mid 2:1		65
Lower 2:1		62

	competent, though there may be some minor problems related to clarity of the delivery, choice of register and vocabulary or grammatical accuracy.	
Upper 2:2	A performance that is good in parts and reasonably competent in most areas. Shows moderate competence in some areas but weakness in others. Performance would benefit from sharper focus and more reflection. Fairly competent knowledge or understanding of the material presented, but characterised by one or more of the following deficiencies: understanding and application of concepts is not always successful; lack of considered thought and critical thinking; argument not always well structured or relevant; some awareness of critical debates but may be too descriptive or generalised; some gaps in planning and use of evidence; inaccuracies in use of technical vocabulary and/or notational conventions (if slides are used); data or examples presented are not fully appropriate; there are problems with the collection of data (where required) or the selection of sources. Overall, the performance lacks the comprehensiveness, accuracy and/or cohesiveness expected of an Upper Second. The delivery is not flawless and shows problems with clarity of delivery, choice of register and vocabulary and/or grammatical accuracy.	58
Mid 2:2		55
Lower 2:2		52
Upper Third	A sufficient performance in most areas, though tends to be descriptive with uncritical coverage of debates and issues and/or shows problems with the understanding and application of concepts and/or the use of technical vocabulary and notational conventions (if slides are used). Some basic (or minimal, at the lower end of the scale) relevant information and understanding. Some evidence of research, either in the form of consultation and presentation of sources or of collection (when required) and presentation of data or examples. There is an attempt to address question or topic, but with substantial omissions or irrelevant material. Skills of planning, structuring and presentation relatively weak. Barely adequate understanding of concepts; barely adequate use of data and/or sources. Problems with clarity of the delivery, choice of register and vocabulary and grammatical accuracy. Barely satisfactory overall.	48
Mid Third		45
Lower Third		42
Compensatory Fail	An insufficient performance showing minimal achievement but containing some elementary relevant information. Reliant on a minimal range of background reading and/or engagement with data or examples, with poor attention to detail. May consist of a series of weak statements/opinions which may not relate to each other. Assertions made without supporting evidence from data or sources, and use of technical vocabulary and notational conventions is very poor. Minimal reflection, poor planning and presentation. Unconvincing overall.	38
Compensatory Fail		35
Compensatory Fail		32
Fail	An inadequate performance in almost all areas, displaying little knowledge or understanding. Insufficient evidence that the candidate has adequately researched sources or collected data/examples or prepared their presentation. Poorly organised and confused argument. Little or no use of technical vocabulary and conventions. Little or no evidence of analysis, planning or presentation skills; very poor use of sources and data/examples. Very unsatisfactory overall.	28
Fail		25
Fail		22

Fail	A severely inadequate performance in which there is no evidence of understanding or knowledge of the topic and the appropriate vocabulary and conventions. Inability to construct an argument; lack of planning or presentation skills; significant elements of irrelevance or error; no use of sources or data/examples. Extremely poor overall.	15
Fail	A profoundly inadequate performance. Incoherent, irrelevant and error-strewn. No evidence of effort having gone into research or preparation of the topic or task. Extremely poor overall.	5
Fail		0

3. GRADE DESCRIPTORS FOR POSTERS AND WIKI PRESENTATIONS

Class	Descriptor	Mark
Upper First	Incorporates the categories of •Structure and Presentation of Ideas •Knowledge and Understanding •Use of Sources and Data •Visual Presentation and Style Work of exceptional quality with respect to structure, cogency, clarity, originality of argument, analytical and critical skills and collection (where required), analysis and presentation of data. Exceptional deployment of material that takes a completely comprehensive account of the poster/wiki format. The essential material is presented thoroughly and accurately and weighed appropriately. The work is extremely authoritative and fully demonstrates very advanced knowledge and understanding. It also shows a very advanced ability to integrate the full range of principles, theories, evidence and techniques and to discuss and apply concepts and use technical vocabulary. The clarity and originality of thought and the fluency of expression are extremely impressive for this level of work, as is the selection and use of sources and/or data, which are handled in an extremely insightful and original fashion. Exceptionally imaginative design, presentation and style. Entirely appropriate use of images, text and/or diagrams, with an avoidance of unnecessarily complex or distracting material. Could be deemed to be of a professional standard overall. All academic and referencing conventions (footnotes, bibliography, etc.) and formatting conventions (example numbering, interlinear glossing, etc.) are used appropriately.	100
Upper First		95
Upper First		92
Mid First	Work of outstanding quality with respect to structure, cogency, clarity, originality of argument and analytical and critical skills. Outstanding deployment of material that takes full account of the poster/wiki format. The essential material is presented thoroughly and accurately and weighed appropriately. The work is very authoritative and amply demonstrates very advanced knowledge and understanding. It also shows a very advanced ability to integrate the full range of principles, theories, evidence and techniques and to discuss and apply concepts and use technical vocabulary. The clarity and originality of thought and the fluency of expression are very impressive for this level of work, as is the selection and use of sources and/or data, which are handled in a very insightful and original fashion. Exemplary imaginative design, presentation and style. Very appropriate use of images, text and/or diagrams, with an avoidance of unnecessarily complex or distracting material. All academic and referencing conventions (footnotes, bibliography, etc.) and formatting conventions (example numbering, interlinear glossing, etc.) are used appropriately. A further refinement of the argument, analysis, structure, style and/or presentation is needed to make the work exceptional.	88
Mid First		85
Mid First		82
Lower First	Work of excellent quality with respect to structure, cogency, clarity, originality of argument and analytical and critical skills. Excellent deployment of material that takes very good account of the poster/wiki format. The essential material is presented thoroughly and accurately and weighed appropriately. The work is authoritative and amply demonstrates advanced knowledge and understanding. It also shows an advanced ability to integrate an excellent range of principles, theories, evidence and	78
Lower First		75
Lower First		72

	techniques and to discuss and apply concepts and use technical vocabulary. The clarity and originality of thought and the fluency of expression are very impressive for this level of work, as is the selection and use of sources and/or data, which are handled in a very insightful and original fashion. Excellent standard of imaginative design, presentation and style. Highly appropriate use of images, text and/or diagrams, with a general avoidance of unnecessarily complex or distracting material. Almost all academic and referencing conventions (footnotes, bibliography, etc.) and formatting conventions (example numbering, interlinear glossing, etc.) are used appropriately. A further refinement of the argument, analysis, structure, style and/or presentation is needed to make the work exceptional or outstanding.	
Upper 2:1	Work of good to very good quality with respect to structure, cogency, clarity, originality of argument and analytical and critical skills. Attention is paid to the need to make material suitable for the poster/wiki format. Most of the essential material is presented accurately and weighed appropriately for the most part. The work demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding. It also shows a well-developed ability to integrate most of the relevant principles, theories, evidence and techniques and to discuss and apply concepts and use technical vocabulary. There is evidence of clarity and originality of thought, fluency of expression and a well-informed selection and use of sources and/or data. The design, presentation and style are very good, with few errors. There is an appropriate use of images, text and/or diagrams, which are generally well integrated. Most academic and referencing conventions (footnotes, bibliography, etc.) and formatting conventions (example numbering, interlinear glossing, etc.) are used appropriately. To improve future performance there is a need to identify and strengthen weaker parts of the argument and/or its presentation; ensure that conflicting evidence and/or opposing viewpoints are decisively addressed; ensure all concepts and technical terms are accurately understood and used; and further extend the range and use of supporting sources and/or data.	68
Mid 2:1		65
Lower 2:1		62
Upper 2:2	The work is good in parts . A discernible attempt is made to structure the material but the organisation is at times unclear and the main argument and ideas are not always expressed clearly or coherently. Some, but not enough, attention is paid to the need to make the material suitable for the poster/wiki format. The work goes some way towards addressing the essential material but there are notable gaps in the coverage. There is some evidence of knowledge and understanding but it is flawed in important respects. The range of sources and/or data is limited and the analysis and critical response to them sometimes lacks depth and sophistication. There are some lapses in design, presentation and/or style. There is a generally appropriate use of images, text and/or diagrams but the work does not always clearly illustrate the main ideas. The content is at times irrelevant, peripheral and/or distracting. There are lapses in the use of academic and referencing conventions (footnotes, bibliography, etc.) and formatting conventions (example numbering, interlinear glossing, etc.). To improve future performance there is a need to enhance the structural and/or stylistic clarity and coherence of the work; identify and strengthen weaker parts of the argument and/or its presentation; deepen	58
Mid 2:2		55
Lower 2:2		52

	the analysis; ensure that conflicting evidence and/or opposing viewpoints are decisively addressed; ensure that all concepts and technical terms are accurately understood and used; and extend the range and use of supporting sources and/or data.	
Upper Third	The work is of sufficient quality to warrant a pass. A rudimentary attempt is made to structure the material but the organisation, clarity and coherence of the argument and/or analysis are consistently flawed. Little attention is paid to the need to make material suitable for the poster/wiki format. The work is overly descriptive and/or does not fully address the issues raised by the question and/or displays a lack of understanding and ability to apply concepts and technical terminology. There is some knowledge and understanding of the topic but key issues are overlooked and/or are handled inaccurately. There are significant lapses in design, presentation and/or style. The use of images, text and/or diagrams is often inappropriate and lacking in clarity. The presentation is hard to follow at times and the content is often irrelevant, peripheral and/or distracting. There are lapses in the use of academic and referencing conventions (footnotes, bibliography, etc.) and formatting conventions (example numbering, interlinear glossing, etc.). To improve future performance there is a need to enhance the structural and/or stylistic clarity and coherence of the work; identify and strengthen weaker parts of the argument and/or its presentation; deepen the analysis; ensure that conflicting evidence and/or opposing viewpoints are decisively addressed; ensure that all concepts and technical terms are accurately understood and used; and extend the range and use of supporting sources and/or data.	48
Mid Third		45
Lower Third		42
Compensatory Fail	The work is of insufficient quality to warrant a pass. It contains serious deficiencies in knowledge and understanding, has minimal underlying structure and/or is frequently confused and incoherent. Little or no attempt is made to engage with the poster/wiki format. There is very limited use of background reading and/or data collection (when required). Sources and data/examples are handled with consistent inadequacy. Concepts and technical terminology are not understood and applied correctly. There are very significant lapses in design, presentation and/or style. The use of images, text and/or diagrams is notably inappropriate and lacking in clarity. The presentation is hard to follow and the content is often irrelevant, peripheral and/or distracting. There are numerous lapses in the use of academic and referencing conventions (footnotes, bibliography, etc.) and formatting conventions (example numbering, interlinear glossing, etc.). Extensive improvement is required in all of these areas to raise the work to a higher standard.	38
Compensatory Fail		35
Compensatory Fail		32
Fail	The work is of inadequate quality. It fails to demonstrate even a basic awareness of the subject matter, has minimal underlying structure and is frequently confused and incoherent. Little or no attempt is made to engage with the poster or wiki format. The work is markedly deficient in its style, presentation and use of sources and/or data, images, text and/or diagrams. The work is hard to follow and the content is consistently irrelevant, peripheral and/or distracting. Concepts and technical terminology are not understood and applied correctly, or are even completely absent. There are extensive lapses in the use of academic and referencing conventions	28
Fail		25
Fail		22

	(footnotes, bibliography, etc.) and formatting conventions (example numbering, interlinear glossing, etc.). Very extensive improvement is required in all of these areas to raise the work to a higher standard.	
Fail	The work is of severely inadequate quality. It fails to demonstrate even a basic awareness of the subject matter and has minimal structure, clarity and coherence. No attempt is made to engage with the poster/wiki format. The work is highly deficient in its style, presentation and use of sources and/or data. Arguments are unsubstantiated and/or unstructured. There is little or no use of concepts and technical terminology. The work is hard to follow and error-strewn, with extensive lapses in the use of academic and referencing conventions (footnotes, bibliography, etc.) and formatting conventions (example numbering, interlinear glossing, etc.). Very extensive improvement is required in all of these areas to raise the work to a higher standard.	15
Fail	The work is profoundly inadequate . It misrepresents or misunderstands thinking on the topic and is devoid of structure, clarity and coherence. No attempt is made to engage with the poster/wiki format. The work is profoundly deficient in its style, presentation and use of sources and/or data. Arguments are unsubstantiated and/or unstructured. There is little or no use of concepts and technical terminology. The work is very hard to follow and profoundly error-strewn. Very extensive improvement is required in all of these areas to raise the work to a higher standard.	5
Fail		0

4. GRADE DESCRIPTORS FOR COMPOSITION IN THE TARGET LANGUAGE

Class	Descriptor	Mark
	Incorporates the categories of •Structure and Quality of Argument •Knowledge and Understanding •Quality of Language	
Upper First	Exceptional work with respect to structure, clarity, cogency, coverage and originality of argument. Exhibits analytical and critical skills of the highest quality. Demonstrates comprehensive knowledge and understanding and complete accuracy and relevance, as well as exceptional powers of critical reasoning and expression. The work is thoroughly original and insightful. Exceptional range and relevance of exemplification and command of lexis, morphology and syntax. Wholly authentic use of idiom.	100
Upper First		95
Upper First		92
Mid First	Outstanding work with respect to structure, clarity, cogency, coverage and originality of argument. Exhibits analytical and critical skills of a very high order. Demonstrates comprehensive knowledge and understanding and near complete accuracy and relevance, as well as outstanding powers of critical reasoning and expression. The work is thoroughly original and insightful. Outstanding range and relevance of exemplification and command of lexis, morphology and syntax. Authentic use of idiom. Virtually error-free; any imperfections there are are amply compensated by strengths elsewhere.	88
Mid First		85
Mid First		82
Lower First	Excellent work with respect to structure, clarity, cogency, coverage and originality of argument. Exhibits analytical and critical skills of a high order. Demonstrates very sound knowledge and understanding and very good accuracy and relevance, as well as very well-developed powers of critical reasoning and expression. The work is generally original and insightful. The range and relevance of exemplification and command of lexis, morphology and syntax are mostly excellent. Generally authentic use of idiom. A few errors, which are compensated by strengths elsewhere.	78
Lower First		75
Lower First		72
Upper 2:1	Good to very good work with respect to structure, clarity, cogency, coverage and argument. Exhibits generally sound levels of knowledge, understanding and analytical and critical ability. The content is mostly accurate and relevant and the powers of reasoning and expression are well-developed. The range and relevance of exemplification are quite comprehensive and there is a generally very sound command of lexis, morphology and syntax, despite some errors. The use of idiom is mostly authentic, though the sense may not always be fully clear and some of the phrasing is awkward.	68
Mid 2:1		65
Lower 2:1		62
Upper 2:2	Good in parts. While there is a semblance of structure and argument, these elements are not as clear and cogent as they should be, with some conspicuous lapses and mistakes. The command of lexis, morphology and syntax is generally adequate, but there are quite numerous errors. There are also gaps in coverage, knowledge and understanding. Relevant issues are discussed and concepts are presented, but are not always fully grasped. The powers of reasoning and expression on display are only fair and the use of idiom is uncertain. The sense is unclear in places and much	58
Mid 2:2		55
Lower 2:2		52

	of the phrasing is awkward. To improve future performance there is a need to address the shortcomings in the areas identified above.	
Upper Third	The work is of sufficient quality to warrant a pass. While there is a discussion of relevant points in some order, there are significant weaknesses with respect to structure, clarity, cogency, coverage and/or argument. The work shows sufficient knowledge of the subject but only limited understanding. The candidate has not identified the key issues and/or has handled material inaccurately, superficially and/or in a purely descriptive manner. The powers of reasoning and expression on display are under-developed. The question may be addressed but only indirectly. The command of lexis, morphology and syntax is sufficient, although there are frequent errors. There is little feel for idiom. Extensive improvement is required in all of these areas to raise the work to a higher standard.	48
Mid Third		45
Lower Third		42
Compensatory Fail	The work is of insufficient quality to warrant a basic pass. There are marked flaws with respect to structure, clarity, cogency, coverage and argument. The work is structurally inadequate structure, without evidence of planning and/or logical sequence. The argument is difficult to discern and the content is mostly irrelevant. There is insufficient appropriate knowledge and understanding on display and only isolated instances of attempts to engage with the topic. The powers of reasoning and expression on display are weak. The command of lexis, morphology and syntax is insufficient, with very numerous errors. The sense is mostly unclear and there is little or no feel for idiom. Extensive improvement is required in all of these areas to secure a pass.	38
Compensatory Fail		35
Compensatory Fail		32
Fail	The work is of inadequate quality. It contains serious deficiencies in knowledge and understanding, has minimal underlying structure and is frequently confused and incoherent. The argument is erroneous and/or virtually impossible to discern. The content is almost totally irrelevant and no serious or accurate attempt has been made to engage with the topic. The command of lexis, morphology and syntax is inadequate and the work is full of errors. The powers of reasoning and expression are very deficient. The work makes very little sense and there is no feel for idiom at all. Very extensive improvement is required in all of these areas to secure a pass.	28
Fail		25
Fail		22
Fail	Severely inadequate work with respect to structure, clarity, cogency, coverage and argument. Almost completely lacking in knowledge and understanding. No attempt to engage with the topic. The powers of reasoning and expression are severely deficient. The command of lexis, morphology and syntax is extremely inadequate and the work is full of errors. There is no feel for idiom at all. Very extensive improvement is required in all of these areas to secure a pass.	15
Fail	Profoundly inadequate work. No real effort has been made to provide an answer. Only a few short phrases or sentences have been attempted. Wholly unacceptable and of no merit.	5
Fail		0

5. GRADE DESCRIPTORS FOR TRANSLATION FROM ENGLISH INTO THE TARGET LANGUAGE

Class	Descriptor Incorporates the categories of •Understanding of the Source Text •Conveying Stylistic Features •Quality of Language	Mark
Upper First	Exceptional work. Understanding of the source text is flawless. The register and style of the translation reflect completely that of the source text. The quality of language is exceptional, showing perfect command of lexis, morphology and syntax. Wholly authentic use of idiom.	100
Upper First		95
Upper First		92
Mid First	Outstanding work. The translation shows an outstanding level of comprehension and accuracy in rendering the source text meaning, with no omissions. The register and style of the translation reflect extremely well that of the source text. Outstanding command of lexis, morphology and syntax. Authentic use of idiom. A few imperfections, which are amply compensated by strengths elsewhere.	88
Mid First		85
Mid First		82
Lower First	Excellent work. The translation shows a very high level of comprehension and accuracy in rendering the source text meaning, with very few omissions. The register and style of the translation reflect very well that of the source text. Mostly excellent command of lexis, morphology and syntax. Generally authentic use of idiom. A few errors, which are compensated by strengths elsewhere.	78
Lower First		75
Lower First		72
Upper 2:1	Good to very good work. The translation shows a very sound level of comprehension and accuracy in rendering the source text meaning, with few omissions. The register and style reflect well that of the source text, with very minor instances of inappropriate expression . The choice of register is generally comparable to the register of the text, despite occasional inappropriate lexical or grammatical choices. Generally very good command of lexis, morphology and syntax, despite some errors. The use of idiom is mostly authentic, though the sense may not always be fully clear and some of the phrasing is awkward.	68
Mid 2:1		65
Lower 2:1		62
Upper 2:2	Good in parts. The translation demonstrates generally good understanding of the source text but contains occasional distortions and/or omissions in rendering the basic source text meaning. The register and style reflect quite well that of the source text, despite occasional instances of inappropriate expression. Generally good command of lexis, morphology and syntax, but there are quite frequent errors. The use of idiom is uncertain. The sense is unclear in places and much of the phrasing is awkward.	58
Mid 2:2		55
Lower 2:2		52
Upper Third	Work of sufficient quality to merit a pass. The translation demonstrates fair understanding of the source text but it contains a number of misunderstandings and/or mistranslations in rendering the basic source text meaning. The register and style do not reflect adequately that of the source text. The translation contains instances of inappropriate expression that cannot be justified on the basis of stylistic choice or the demands of the target language. Command of lexis, morphology and syntax is	48
Mid Third		45
Lower Third		42

	adequate, but there are frequent errors. There is little feel for idiom.	
Compensatory Fail	Work of insufficient quality to merit a pass. The translation demonstrates poor understanding of the source text. It contains a large number of important errors and/or omissions in rendering the basic source text meaning. The register and style do not reflect that of the source text. The translation contains many instances of inappropriate expression that cannot be justified on the basis of stylistic choice or the demands of the target language. The command of lexis, morphology and syntax is inadequate and there are very frequent errors. The sense is mostly unclear and there is little or no feel for idiom.	38
Compensatory Fail		35
Compensatory Fail		32
Fail	Inadequate work. The translation demonstrates an extremely poor understanding of the source text. It contains pervasive and important errors and/or omissions in rendering the basic source text meaning. The standard of language is very poor and it is very difficult to determine any identifiable stylistic or register choices. Command of lexis, morphology and syntax is wholly inadequate and the work is full of errors. There is no feel for idiom at all.	28
Fail		25
Fail		22
Fail	Severely inadequate work. The translation demonstrates almost no understanding of the source text. It contains pervasive and very important errors and/or omissions in rendering the basic source text meaning. The standard of language is so poor that it is almost impossible to determine any identifiable stylistic or register choices. Command of lexis, morphology and syntax is virtually non-existent, and the work is full of errors. There is no feel for idiom at all.	15
Fail	Profoundly inadequate work. The translation demonstrates no understanding of the source text. The standard of language is so poor that it is impossible to determine any identifiable stylistic or register choices. Only a few short phrases or sentences have been attempted.	5
Fail		0

6. GRADE DESCRIPTORS FOR TRANSLATION FROM THE TARGET LANGUAGE INTO ENGLISH

Class	Descriptor Incorporates the categories of •Understanding of the Source Text •Conveying Stylistic Features •Quality of the English	Mark
Upper First	Exceptional work. The translation shows a flawless understanding of the source text and its meaning. The register and style reflect completely that of the source text. Perfect rendition of the material into authentic English.	100
Upper First		95
Upper First		92
Mid First	Outstanding work. The translation shows an outstanding level of comprehension and accuracy in rendering the source text meaning, with almost no omissions. The register and style of the translation reflect that of the source text extremely well. Outstanding rendition of the material into authentic English.	88
Mid First		85
Mid First		82
Lower First	Excellent work. The translation shows a very high level of comprehension and accuracy in rendering the source text meaning, with very few omissions. The register and style of the translation reflect that of the source text very well. Mostly excellent rendition of the material into authentic English, with very few minor errors.	78
Lower First		75
Lower First		72
Upper 2:1	Good to very good work. The translation shows a very sound level of comprehension and accuracy in rendering source text meaning, with few errors or omissions. The style of the translation reflects that of the source text well, with very minor instances of distortion or inappropriate expression. The choice of register is generally comparable to the register of the source text, despite occasional inappropriate lexical or grammatical choices. Generally very good rendition of the material into authentic English, with few errors, though the expression may be somewhat awkward in places.	68
Mid 2:1		65
Lower 2:1		62
Upper 2:2	Good in parts. The translation shows a generally sound understanding of the source text but contains occasional distortions and/or omissions in rendering the basic source text meaning. The register and style of the translation reflect that of the source text quite well, but there are occasional instances of inappropriate expression. Generally good rendition of the material into authentic English, though the expression is awkward in places and the translation contains some orthographic, lexical and/or grammatical errors.	58
Mid 2:2		55
Lower 2:2		52
Upper Third	Work of sufficient quality to merit a pass. The translation shows a fair understanding of the source text but it contains a number of misunderstandings and/or mistranslations in rendering the basic source text meaning. The register and style of the translation do not reflect adequately that of the source text. The translation contains instances of inappropriate expression that cannot be justified on the basis of stylistic choice or the demands of the target language. The rendition of the material into authentic English is sufficient, though the expression is awkward and/or inaccurate in places and the translation contains a number of orthographic, lexical and/or grammatical errors.	48
Mid Third		45
Lower Third		42

Compensatory Fail	Work of insufficient quality to merit a pass. The translation show poor understanding of the source text and contains a many important errors or omissions in rendering the basic source text meaning. The register and style of the translation do not reflect that of the source text. There are many instances of inappropriate expression and an insufficient rendition of the material into authentic English. Expression is markedly awkward and/or inaccurate and the translation contains many orthographic, lexical and grammatical errors.	38
Compensatory Fail		35
Compensatory Fail		32
Fail	Inadequate work. The translation shows an extremely poor understanding of the source text and contains a great many important errors or omissions in rendering the basic source text meaning. The standard of language is very poor and it is very difficult to determine any identifiable stylistic or register choices. Inadequate rendition of the material into authentic English. Expression is very awkward and/or inaccurate and the text contains very many orthographic, lexical and grammatical errors.	28
Fail		25
Fail		22
Fail	Severely inadequate work. The translation shows almost no understanding of the source text. It is punctuated throughout by important errors or omissions in rendering the basic source text meaning. The standard of language is so poor that it is almost impossible to determine any identifiable stylistic or register choices. Severely inadequate rendition of the material into authentic English. Expression is extremely awkward and/or inaccurate and the text is dominated by orthographic, lexical and grammatical errors.	15
Fail	Profoundly inadequate work. The translation shows no understanding of the source text. The standard of language is so poor that it is impossible to determine any identifiable stylistic or register choices. Only a few short phrases or sentences have been attempted.	5
Fail		0

7. GRADE DESCRIPTORS FOR LANGUAGE ORAL EXAMINATIONS

NOTE: The following grade descriptors can be applied to all languages, taking into consideration the language assessed and the level of fluency required.

Class	Descriptor	Mark
	Incorporates the categories of •Communication on Skills and Content •Grammatical Accuracy •Vocabulary and Register •Pronunciation and Intonation	
Upper First	Exceptionally fluent with complete linguistic rapport. Very prompt, direct responses to questions and/or comments. Very high-quality interactive atmosphere. Information content completely appropriate; no comprehension errors. Exceptional command of grammar and syntax. Exceptionally wide and highly sophisticated range of vocabulary. Highly idiomatic. Perfect use of appropriate registers. Completely convincing performance with absolute accuracy in producing the characteristic pronunciation and intonation. A flawless and natural performance, indistinguishable from the standard of an educated native speaker.	100
Upper First		95
Upper First		92
Mid First	Outstandingly fluent with very few 'natural' hesitations. Prompt, direct responses to questions and/or comments. High-quality interactive atmosphere. Information content almost completely appropriate; almost no comprehension errors, all self-corrected. Outstanding command of grammar and syntax. Impressively wide and sophisticated range of vocabulary. Highly idiomatic. Near perfect use of appropriate registers. Extremely convincing performance with near absolute accuracy in producing the characteristic pronunciation and intonation. A near flawless and natural performance, virtually indistinguishable from the standard of an educated native speaker.	88
Mid First		85
Mid First		82
Lower First	Excellent fluency with few 'natural' hesitations. Normally prompt, direct responses to questions and/or comments. Excellent information content and interactive atmosphere. Very few comprehension errors, usually self-corrected. Excellent command of grammar and syntax. Excellent range of vocabulary with much sophistication in evidence. Uses language imaginatively and idiomatically to achieve desired effect. Excellent use of appropriate registers. Very convincing performance with much accuracy in producing the characteristic pronunciation and intonation. Excellent natural performance overall, though not necessarily of native-speaker standard in every respect.	78
Lower First		75
Lower First		72
Upper 2:1	Good to very good. Generally fluent with occasional hesitations but retains the feel of 'natural' exchange. Generally prompt, direct responses to questions and/or comments, though may ask for clarification or rephrase. Very good information content and interactive atmosphere; some comprehension errors, usually self-corrected. Generally sound command of grammar and syntax. A few important errors, self-corrected, and minor errors which may be self-corrected. Very good range of vocabulary to suit a variety of linguistic situations but some limitation in evidence. Very sound use of appropriate registers. Good deal of accuracy in producing the characteristic pronunciation and intonation. Some weaknesses, errors or	68
Mid 2:1		65
Lower 2:1		62

	limitations, but candidate generally at ease in the language and in control of the dialogue. Good flow maintained.	
Upper 2:2	Good in parts. Fluent to a degree, with a fair flow of information despite some pronounced hesitations. Candidate copes satisfactorily in general and maintains dialogue, but not without difficulty and errors in a good number of instances. May be stuck for a response at times and may rely on the examiner to assist. Tends to present facts and information rather than considered views and opinions. Some important comprehension errors. The principles of grammar and syntax are and generally well applied but the level of accuracy tends to suffer in argumentative use of the target language. A number of recurring errors. Some interference of native/other languages. Able to use a rather limited range of vocabulary but some vocabulary lacking or used inappropriately. Some evidence of idiomatic use of language. May be some pre-learned phrases used appropriately. Evidence of the use of appropriate registers. Fair performance.	58
Mid 2:2		55
Lower 2:2		52
Upper Third	Sufficient. Adequate information flow, though often stuck for responses and relies on examiner to assist. Delivery patchy, including some obtrusive hesitations. Some limited ability to manipulate the language and express ideas, but performance marred by frequent failure to maintain communication and/or understand examiners' questions. A number of important comprehension errors. Some points not fully understood even after explanation from examiner. A degree of accuracy is evident but often based on pre-learned statements only. High incidence of elementary errors. Interference of native/other languages. Evidence in straightforward transactional / factual contexts of understanding some basic principles of idiomatic usage. Adequate range of vocabulary. Adequate use of appropriate registers. Candidate clearly makes an effort to pronounce sounds correctly, though not always successfully. Intonation tends to be coloured by native/other languages. Barely satisfactory performance.	48
Mid Third		45
Lower Third		42
Compensatory Fail	Insufficient. Serious errors in all or most areas, but isolated instances of basic communication. Limited information content and vocabulary. Responses generally restricted to well-rehearsed comments. Difficulty in expressing views. Numerous hesitations and comprehension errors. High incidence of interference from native/other languages. Sentences at times often left incomplete, meaning unclear. Elementary grasp of idiomatic usage of an unsatisfactory range of vocabulary. Short sentences predominate and these may be fragmented. Some evidence of the use of appropriate registers. Errors in the pronunciation of characteristic sounds cause misunderstandings. Unconvincing performance, inauthentic. Unsatisfactory overall.	38
Compensatory Fail		35
Compensatory Fail		32
Fail	Inadequate. Very unsatisfactory performance. Very hesitant with long pauses. No meaningful exchange of ideas. Very frequent misunderstandings impairing communication to a high degree. Inadequate responses with many questions unanswered. Poor grasp only of basic grammar. Frequent serious errors. Fragmented sentences. Inaccurate syntax. Only the most basic vocabulary, often used inappropriately. Very brief responses. Little evidence of the use of appropriate registers.	28
Fail		25
Fail		22

	Frequent errors in the pronunciation of characteristic sounds cause numerous misunderstandings. Very unconvincing performance.	
Fail	Severely Inadequate. Inability to conduct any dialogue. Gross errors and inadequacies in all areas. Communication extremely limited often due to lack of vocabulary. Almost total lack of communication skills. Many questions unanswered. Almost no awareness of basic grammar. Very frequent serious errors, highly fragmented sentences. Weak syntax. Sentences usually left incomplete, meaning unclear. No evidence of idiomatic usage. Lacks even the most basic vocabulary. No evidence of understanding and using appropriate register. Virtually unable to produce pronunciation and intonation, causing serious problems in communication. Very poor performance.	15
Fail	Profoundly inadequate. No effort to engage in dialogue. No intelligible statements made. Only a few disconnected utterances. Complete communication breakdown. Conveys nothing relevant to the task. All questions unanswered. No evidence of understanding linguistic principles. Strings words together randomly. Largely unintelligible. Attempt not related to pronunciation. No intelligible statements made. Totally unsatisfactory performance.	5
Fail		0

8. GRADE DESCRIPTORS FOR RECITALS

Class	Descriptor Incorporates the categories of •Technical Command •Musicianship and Communication	Mark
Upper First	An exceptional performance in most or all respects, showing flawless or near-flawless technical command and accuracy, artistry and musicianship of the highest order, a profound understanding of the music, and exceptional projection and communication.	100
Upper First		95
Upper First		92
Mid First	An outstanding performance in most or all respects, showing impressive technical command and accuracy, artistry and musicianship of a high order, sophisticated understanding of the music, and highly developed projection and communication. Performances in this class would be deemed to be of a good professional standard.	88
Mid First		85
Mid First		82
Lower First	An excellent performance, showing high levels of technical assurance and accuracy, highly sensitive artistry and musicianship, commendable understanding of the music, and strong projection and communication. The programme is performed with a high degree of fluency and accuracy, reflecting careful attention to detail (e.g. in following notated markings). The performance shows excellent command of style. The performance is well projected and engaging for the audience, with excellent presentation. The performance demonstrates a clear understanding of the music's structure and content. It is sensitive and expressive, resulting in a musically mature interpretation. Communication with and awareness of the roles of any other performers are excellent, and balance between the performers is appropriate. Any non-notated or improvised music exhibits flair and imagination, stylistic awareness, and impressive handling of musical parameters and materials.	78
Lower First		75
Lower First		72
Upper 2:1	A good to very good performance, showing good technical control, although minor flaws may be evident. The performance is mostly fluent and accurate, and notational details on the score are followed consistently, with good stylistic awareness. The performer is assured and acknowledges the audience, although projection may be lacking to some degree. Communication with and awareness of the roles of any other performers are good. The performance is well presented, and indicates good musical understanding for the most part. The player takes into account the expressive requirements of the music, and the interpretation shows promise, although it may lack sensitivity or maturity at times. Any non-notated or improvised music exhibits some imagination, stylistic awareness, and decent control of musical parameters and materials.	68
Mid 2:1		65
Lower 2:1		62
Upper 2:2	Good in parts. The performance demonstrates a reasonably sound technique overall, but there is evidence of some problems or flaws that require attention. The programme is performed accurately for the most part, but with some errors, slips, or untidy passages. Attention to notational detail such as dynamic and articulation markings may be inconsistent and lacking in places. The performance shows some awareness of stylistic considerations, but is inappropriate or inconsistent in some respects and suggests some deficiencies in musical understanding.	58
Mid 2:2		55
Lower 2:2		52

	The performer makes some attempt to communicate with the audience, and with any other performers, but projection may be problematic and there may be some inconsistencies with ensemble and balance. Presentation is adequate, and the performer mostly follows expression markings in the notation, but the interpretation is not well developed and lacks sensitivity or maturity. Any non-notated or improvised music exhibits some stylistic awareness and modest control of musical parameters and materials.	
Upper Third	The performance is of sufficient quality to warrant a pass, but indicates technical weaknesses that are sufficient to hinder the fluency of the playing/singing and/or communication of the music. It includes numerous inaccuracies that may lead the player/singer to break down. The performer pays little attention to notational details such as dynamic and articulation markings, and may demonstrate inaccurate realisation of other aspects of notation. The performance indicates poor musical understanding and insensitive interpretation, with little or no expressiveness. It is stylistically inappropriate and/or shows ignorance of the need for stylistic differentiation between pieces in the programme. The performer makes little or no attempt to communicate with the audience or with any other performers, and may play as if merely practising. There may also be notable problems with ensemble or balance. Presentation is problematic, and may include long and/or inappropriate gaps between pieces, or excessive time spent setting up or tuning. Any non-notated or improvised music exhibits only basic stylistic awareness and very limited control of musical parameters and materials.	48
Mid Third		45
Lower Third		42
Compensatory Fail	The performance is of insufficient quality to warrant a basic pass. It is severely impaired by major technical weaknesses. The programme is inadequately prepared, resulting in a very inaccurate performance, with numerous or serious breakdowns. The notation is realised very inaccurately and with little or no attention to details such as dynamic and articulation markings. The performance is highly inappropriate stylistically. The performer does not acknowledge the presence of the audience. Presentation is unacceptable. The performance indicates no understanding of the music and is entirely inexpressive. Communication with any other performers is poor, resulting in major problems with ensemble. Any non-notated or improvised music exhibits insufficient stylistic awareness and poor control of musical parameters and materials	38
Compensatory Fail		35
Compensatory Fail		32
Fail	The performance is of inadequate quality. It seriously fails to fulfil the criteria for a pass mark at the appropriate level, and contains very serious technical weakness, entirely inadequate preparation, significant errors and breakdowns, a lack of musicianship, and/or unacceptably poor communication and projection. The performer shows little sign of understanding the requirements of the assessment. Extensive improvement is required in all of these areas to secure a pass.	28
Fail		25
Fail		22
Fail	A severely inadequate performance, well short of the required length, with very serious technical weakness, entirely inadequate preparation, very significant errors and breakdowns, a complete lack of musicianship, and unacceptably poor communication and projection. The performer	15

	shows no sign of understanding the requirements of the assessment. Very extensive improvement is required in all of these areas to secure a pass.	
Fail	A profoundly inadequate performance, which is extremely short of the required length, with only a few short passages or pieces attempted, or is wholly without merit and shows no command of the instrument.	5
Fail		0