

School of Geography generic marking criteria

Mark	Typical Criteria
80+	<p>Content, research and reading: An outstanding answer, showing both breadth and depth of original research into material that may be difficult and challenging.</p> <p>Structure and argument: A clearly structured, original and often incisive argument built on a sophisticated level of critical engagement.</p> <p>Writing, presentation and referencing: Excellent presentation and expression of ideas, with accurate citations and references.</p>
75 - 79	<p>Content, research and reading: An excellent answer, showing extensive research and engaging with a wide range of challenging material.</p> <p>Structure and argument: A clear structure throughout, revealing an often original and insightful argument and showing a consistently high level of critical engagement.</p> <p>Writing, presentation and referencing: Fluently written and accurately presented, both with citations and reference list.</p>
70 - 74	<p>Content, research and reading: A very good answer showing insight and engaging with a wide range of material. Well researched and showing broad knowledge with a wide range of literature well understood and incorporated.</p> <p>Structure and argument: A clear structure throughout supporting consistently strong critical engagement and an at times original argument.</p> <p>Writing, presentation and referencing: Well written and presented throughout, with full and accurate citations and reference list.</p>
65 - 69	<p>Content, research and reading: A strong answer but probably notable for comprehensive content rather than the level of originality and understanding required for a First Class mark. Based on independent and broad reading of appropriate sources.</p> <p>Structure and argument: Well structured with clear delineations, introduction and conclusion. Clear but not always deep or original argument, with a significant level of analysis and critical engagement.</p> <p>Writing, presentation and referencing: Well presented with a clear competent writing style. A generally accurate citation style and reference list.</p>
60 - 64	<p>Content, research and reading: A satisfactory answer that engages with some if not all main themes/ issues, showing a largely correct level of understanding. Based on a reasonable but less than complete selection of sources.</p> <p>Structure and argument: A reasonable attempt at a clear structure, but not fully successful. Shows evidence of analysis and critical engagement to build an argument, but in parts is overly descriptive and not clear throughout.</p> <p>Writing, presentation and referencing: Mainly well written and presented but with a few weaknesses. Citation and reference style broadly accurate but with some mistakes.</p>
55 - 59	<p>Content, research and reading: A patchy answer based on a fair if limited understanding of the task; while there is clear evidence of research, this is partial and incomplete; the reading may rely on textbooks and lecture handouts.</p> <p>Structure and argument: The work has a structure, but this is neither consistently clear nor consistently executed. There is an overall sense of an argument, but this is sometimes hard to detect, and there is a pronounced tendency to be overly descriptive, with only intermittent critical engagement.</p> <p>Writing, presentation and referencing: The writing style is of uneven quality. Presentation is confused in parts. Citation and referencing contain a number of errors.</p>
50 - 54	<p>Content, research and reading: A limited answer that engages only partly with the task set and shows insufficient levels of research and reading. Characterised by a number of errors and confused understanding.</p> <p>Structure and argument: While an attempt has been clearly made to structure the work, this is hard to discern in many places. There are significant levels of confusion and little sense of an argument and critical engagement.</p> <p>Writing, presentation and referencing: The writing style, while occasionally clear, is generally clumsy. Presentation is muddled. Citation and referencing are error-strewn.</p>
45 - 49	<p>Content, research and reading: A poor answer that exhibits some but little engagement with the task set and is based on only rudimentary levels of research and reading, often of non-academic or otherwise inappropriate work; betrays a significant level of confusion and inaccuracy.</p> <p>Structure and argument: Shows little evidence of an attempt to create a structure and there is no sense of a thought-out argument.</p> <p>Writing, presentation and referencing: The writing style is clumsy and disjointed in many places. There is a failure to cite accurately, or citations are missing. The few references are inaccurately listed.</p>
40 - 44	<p>Content, research and reading: A very poor answer that shows a failure to grasp many aspects of the task set, and suggests only a minimal level of research, much of it into non-academic or otherwise inappropriate work; contains significant levels of confusion and errors.</p> <p>Structure and argument: There is no clear sense of an argument being presented; the structure of the work is characterised by high levels of confusion.</p> <p>Writing, presentation and referencing: The work is poorly written and messily presented, with poor or absent citations and referencing.</p>
0 – 39	See separate sheet.