|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | FAIL | | PASS | 3H | 2H2 | 2H1 | 1H | |
| 0–25 | 25–39 | 40–44 | 45–49 | 50–59 | 60–69 | 70–79 | 80–100 |
| Argument and analysis | Irrelevant or almost irrelevant to the question and/or fundamental misunderstanding of key concepts; extremely poor textual and contextual comprehension  **Or**: Extensive plagiarism  and/or collusion | Largely irrelevant to the question and/or considerable misunderstanding of key concepts; failure to synthesise ideas; very limited textual analysis; no argument or incoherent argument | Some basic understanding of the question and of key concepts but lacking in synthesis of ideas; largely descriptive rather than analytical | Limited understanding of question/key concepts; lacking in synthesis of ideas; tendency to description rather than analysis | Fair understanding of key concepts; maintains focus on topics addressed but there may be some lapses; some weaknesses of understanding and knowledge | Good synthesis of ideas; goodunderstanding of key concepts; sound analysis of the material, with some awareness of the complexity of the issues discussed; argument is clear and focused | Coherent and original synthesis of ideas; fresh approach to the material; critical and thorough understanding of key concepts; well-developed analysis; argument is clear, focused and scholarly | Advances an outstandingly bold analysis or interpretation; argument is clear, focused and scholarly; presents a fresh and original approach to the material that questions established views |
| Knowledge and research | Very limited to no awareness of relevant contexts; no use of sources beyond direct paraphrase of lectures. | Little evidence of independent reading; no relevant critical examples | Very limited use of primary and secondary reading; inadequate awareness of relevant contexts; poor textual comprehension | Restricted range of sources consulted; only basic understanding of relevant contexts | Some use of secondary reading; some awareness of relevant contexts; some careful assessment of evidence | Well selected range of sources consulted; generally careful assessment of evidence; good understanding of contexts and good use of examples | A wide range of sources consulted; sources used with discrimination; sound analysis of evidence; clear understanding of contexts | A very wide range of sources consulted, demonstrating excellent to outstanding research and analytical skills; sources used with discrimination; independence of judgement |
| Writing and presentation | Writing that is poorly structured and organised, with inadequate expression and frequent errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation;no citations; no relevant bibliography | Poor presentation; significant grammatical errors; highly restricted vocabulary; little or no citation and incomplete bibliography | Poor presentation; basic vocabulary; some errors in spelling and punctuation; faulty paragraph structure | Poor typography and layout; considerable number of grammatical errors; limited vocabulary; inaccurate citation and bibliography with significant omissions | Fair expression with few serious errors of grammar; inconsistent citation and bibliography with significant omissions | Good expression with few errors of grammar; some structural inconsistencies; accurate and full citation and bibliography | Lucid expression; wide and well-deployed vocabulary; very few to no errors of grammar; excellent citation practice according to guidelines | Elegance in expression, including sophisticated vocabulary; structured appropriately to the purposes of the assignment; exemplary citation and bibliography according to guidelines |

**Please note that honours are not formally awarded to first- and second-year students, and that grade bandings for these students are intended as a guide only.**