

### Assessment Marking Criteria: Level 6

Award	Percentage	Description
<b>Distinction/ 1<sup>st</sup> class</b>	<b>90 – 100%</b>	<b>An exceptional answer</b> , which is excellent in every respect, showing deep knowledge and comprehensive understanding of the subject and related theories and concepts. An excellent ability to analyse, synthesise and evaluate in the context of the question. Demonstrates insight, creativity and independent critical thinking. Compelling arguments developed demonstrating originality of thought. Very extensive range of relevant sources used, accurately following the Harvard referencing system, and applied in an insightful way. Excellent presentation, articulate and fluently written.
	<b>80 – 89%</b>	<b>An outstanding answer</b> , which is excellent in almost all respects and clearly focussed on the question. Demonstrates extensive knowledge and understanding of the subject, and related theories and concepts. Clear evidence of excellent analysis, synthesis and evaluation, drawing together ideas and perspectives. Demonstrates insight, critical thinking and some originality. Clear and thoughtful arguments developed. Evidence of extensive relevant reading and study beyond the course content and thorough discussion of sources, accurately following the Harvard referencing system. Very well written, logically structured and excellently presented.
	<b>70 – 79%</b>	<b>An excellent answer</b> in most respects, showing evidence of extensive knowledge and understanding of the subject and related theories and concepts in the context of the question. Very good analysis, synthesis and evaluation. Demonstrates insight, critical thinking and, possibly, originality. Well-structured arguments. Evidence of substantial relevant reading and study beyond the course content accurately following the Harvard referencing system. Very well written, logically structured and well presented.
<b>Merit/ 2<sup>nd</sup> class 2:1</b>	<b>60 – 69%</b>	<b>A very good answer</b> showing evidence of wide knowledge and understanding of the subject and related theories and concepts in the context of the question. Clear evidence of relevant outside reading and study, correctly following the Harvard referencing system. Good evidence of critical analysis, synthesis and evaluation. Logical arguments developed with ability to draw a balanced judgement, but lacks some of the qualities required for a distinction. May show some insight but lack originality. Well written, logically structured and well presented for the most part.
<b>2:2</b>	<b>50 – 59%</b>	<b>A good answer</b> showing sound knowledge and understanding of the subject and related theories and concepts in the context of the question. Based predominantly on the course content, but with clear evidence of relevant outside reading and study, appropriately following the Harvard referencing system. Sound evidence of developing critical analysis and evaluation, but may display weaknesses in ability to synthesise. Balanced arguments covering the majority of salient points, but not in sufficient depth. Mostly accurate, but may contain occasional errors. Competently written, logically structured and well-presented but may contain minor flaws.
<b>Pass/ 3<sup>rd</sup> class</b>	<b>40 – 49%</b>	<b>A satisfactory answer</b> showing adequate knowledge and understanding of the subject and related theories and concepts. Meets the assessment outcomes at the threshold level. Evidence of some relevant outside reading, following the Harvard referencing system, but limited in criticality, with occasional tendency to be descriptive. Some errors and omissions may be evident. Basic structure and development evident, but may show weaknesses in clarity, fluency and organisation of material, but mainly focussed on the question.

<b>Fail</b>	<b>30 – 39%</b>	<b>A marginal fail</b> showing some knowledge and understanding of the subject, but superficial in depth. Some or all assessment outcomes are not met. Likely to contain errors of understanding and fact. Limited reference to outside reading and lacking analysis and criticality. Unsubstantiated arguments descriptive in nature and some key issues missed. Lacking focus on the question in places. May be poorly expressed, loosely structured, short or incomplete. Work may contain spelling and/or grammatical errors. Unlikely to comply with Harvard referencing.
	<b>20 – 29%</b>	<b>A poor fail</b> demonstrating little knowledge and understanding of the subject, which misinterprets the question. Assessment outcomes are not met. Little reference to outside reading and largely descriptive. Poorly constructed, flawed with errors and misunderstandings. Marginal relevance to the question. Key issues missed. Inadequate presentation and disjointed structure. Unlikely to comply with Harvard referencing.
	<b>1 – 19%</b>	<b>An outright fail</b> , which misinterprets the question or bears no relevance to the question. Assessment outcomes not met. Minimal knowledge displayed with fundamental errors and misunderstandings. Very poor standard of presentation with very poor, to no structure evident. Unlikely to comply with Harvard referencing.
	<b>0</b>	<b>A fail due to a breach in academic protocol:</b> Non-submission, including late submission without relevant permission; following academic malpractice; major breach of confidentiality; following evidence of unsafe/harmful or discriminatory practice.