

## SCHOOL OF ARTS, LANGUAGES AND CULTURES

### UNDERGRADUATE STEPPED MARKING SCHEME AND MARKING CRITERIA (GRADE DESCRIPTORS) FOR CLASSICS AND ANCIENT HISTORY

#### 1. GRADE DESCRIPTORS FOR GREEK AND LATIN LANGUAGE WORK

Class	Descriptor	Mark
	Incorporates the categories of •Knowledge and Understanding of the ancient language •Accuracy of Translation •Style and Idiom	
Upper First	<b>Exceptional</b> work, which demonstrates absolute mastery of the Greek/Latin language. Translations from Greek/Latin to English read like a piece of original English. Translations from English into Greek/Latin read like a piece of authentic Greek/Latin. Exceptional and exemplary deployment of stylish and idiomatic language, whether translation from English to Greek/Latin or vice versa.	100
Upper First		95
Upper First		92
Mid First	<b>Outstanding</b> work, demonstrating near flawless knowledge and understanding of the ancient language. Translations into English are entirely accurate. Translations into Greek/Latin are mostly accurate, with few errors. Translations into English are polished and idiomatic. Those from English into Greek/Latin are idiomatic and stylish, but may betray traces of the original English.	88
Mid First		85
Mid First		82
Lower First	<b>Excellent</b> work, which demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the ancient language and secure (72/75) to very secure (78) grasp of nearly all grammar, syntax and vocabulary. Translations into English are entirely (75/78) or essentially accurate with only a few relatively minor errors (72). Translations into Greek/Latin are mostly or mainly accurate with few errors at the higher end of the class and little basic inaccuracy, though possibly some imprecision or gaps at the lower end of the class. Translations into English show an excellent (78) or very good (72) command of style and idiom. Translations into Greek/Latin show a good command of style and idiom, with occasional lapses or (72) some unidiomatic phrases. 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 only a few minor errors.	78
Lower First		75
Lower First		72
Upper 2:1	<b>Good to very good</b> work, which demonstrates a good understanding of the ancient language; knowledge of elements of grammar, syntax and vocabulary is largely secure, with few really basic errors. Translations into English are essentially accurate, but with some imprecision, paraphrase or gaps. Translations into Greek/Latin are mainly accurate with occasional defects in comprehensibility. Translation into English may tend towards the workmanlike or literal in style. Translations into Greek/Latin are often unidiomatic, although with more use of appropriate idiom towards the top end of the range (65/68).	68
Mid 2:1		65
Lower 2:1		62

Upper 2:2	<b>Good in parts</b> , demonstrating a basic grasp of the ancient language and of the main elements of grammar, syntax and vocabulary. Translations into English are largely accurate, but also reveal intermittent defects in comprehension. Translations into Greek/Latin make intermittent sense but contain not infrequent inaccuracies or gaps. Translations into English are often unidiomatic and/or tending towards paraphrase. Translations into Greek/Latin make intermittent sense but contain frequent inaccuracies or gaps.	58
Mid 2:2		55
Lower 2:2		52
Upper Third	Work of <b>sufficient</b> quality to merit a pass, showing some knowledge of the ancient language, but also displaying a failure to grasp key elements of grammar, syntax and vocabulary. Translations into English make only intermittent sense and show some reliance on guesswork. Translations into Greek/Latin contain some parts which make sense, but also large gaps and considerable inaccuracy in morphology and syntax. Translations from the ancient language into English and vice versa are largely literal with little attention to style or idiomatic phrasing.	48
Mid Third		45
Lower Third		42
Compensatory Fail	Work of <b>insufficient</b> quality to merit a pass, displaying very limited knowledge of the ancient language, with repeated failure to grasp grammar, syntax and vocabulary. Translations into English are frequently discontinuous and/or nonsensical, displaying little grasp of the language or meaning of the passage(s), and with little or no sensible attempt at guesswork. Translations into Greek/Latin show occasional knowledge of vocabulary but contain many errors of morphology and syntax. Due to manifest defects in understanding and accuracy, there is little or no attention to style or idiom.	38
Compensatory Fail		35
Compensatory Fail		32
Fail	<b>Inadequate</b> work, which displays seriously deficient knowledge of the ancient language and little (28) or no (25/22) knowledge or understanding of grammar, syntax and vocabulary and/or familiarity with set texts. Translations into English are entirely discontinuous and/or nonsensical, displaying little or no grasp either of the language or of the meaning of the passage(s) and with little or no sensible attempt at guesswork. Translations into Greek/Latin show occasional knowledge of vocabulary but contain many errors of morphology and syntax, more numerous and severe towards the bottom of the range. Too lacunose and/or inaccurate to display any apparent grasp of idiom or style.	28
Fail		25
Fail		22
Fail	<b>Severely inadequate</b> work, which displays little knowledge of the ancient language, with no knowledge or understanding of grammar, syntax and vocabulary and no knowledge of set texts. For the most part the script is seriously incomplete. Isolated attempts may be made to answer the question(s) but, where present, translations into English are entirely discontinuous and/or nonsensical, displaying very little or no grasp either of the language or of the meaning of the passage(s) and with little or no sensible attempt at guesswork, translations into Greek/Latin are full of errors of morphology and syntax. No sustained efforts to answer the question(s) means that there is no basis on which to judge syntax or idiom of expression.	15

Fail	<b>Profoundly inadequate</b> work, which shows no little knowledge of the ancient language, with no knowledge or understanding of grammar, syntax and vocabulary and no knowledge of set texts. Translations into English are entirely discontinuous and/or nonsensical, displaying absolutely no grasp either of the language or of the meaning of the passage(s) and with absolutely no sensible attempt at guesswork, translations into Greek/Latin contain very many errors of morphology and syntax. There is no basis on which to judge syntax or idiom of expression.	5
Fail		0

## 2. 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 Incorporates the categories of •Structure and Argument •Knowledge and Understanding •Use of Sources and Data •Style and Presentation	Mark
Upper First	<p><b>Exceptional</b> 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.</p>	100
Upper First		95
Upper First		92
Mid First	<p><b>Outstanding</b> 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, 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.</p>	88
Mid First		85
Mid First		82

Lower First	<p><b>Excellent</b> 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.</p>	78
Lower First		75
Lower First		72
Upper 2:1	<p><b>Good to very good</b> 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.</p>	68
Mid 2:1		65
Lower 2:1		62
Upper 2:2	<p>The work is <b>good in parts</b> 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 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</p>	58
Mid 2:2		55
Lower 2:2		52

	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 <b>sufficient</b> 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 <b>insufficient</b> 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 <b>inadequate</b> knowledge, understanding and skills in the specific topic and does not merit a pass mark. It does not demonstrate 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.	28
Fail		25
Fail		22

	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.	
Fail	The work demonstrates <b>severely inadequate</b> 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 <b>profoundly inadequate</b> 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

### 3. 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 <b>exceptional</b> 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 <b>outstanding</b> 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 <b>excellent</b> 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	<b>Good to very good.</b> 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 <b>good in parts</b> 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 <b>sufficient</b> 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 <b>insufficient</b> 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 <b>inadequate</b> 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 <b>severely inadequate</b> 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 <b>profoundly inadequate</b> 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

#### 4. 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 <b>exceptional</b> 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 <b>outstanding</b> 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.
Mid First		85
Mid First		82
Lower First	Work of <b>excellent</b> 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

	<p>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.</p>	
Upper 2:1	<p>Work of <b>good to very good</b> 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.</p>	68
Mid 2:1		65
Lower 2:1		62
Upper 2:2	<p>The work is <b>good in parts</b>. 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</p>	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 <b>sufficient</b> 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 <b>insufficient</b> 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 <b>inadequate</b> 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 <b>severely inadequate</b> 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 <b>profoundly inadequate</b> . 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