

HE09G – Generic Marking Criteria for Degree Programmes
Level 4-6 Undergraduate General Marking Criteria

Level 4 (Certificate)	Level 5 (Diploma)	Level 6 (Degree)
<p>90%-100% Exceptional work with presentation of a very high standard. There is coherence of ideas and demonstration of a thorough knowledge and understanding. Arguments are supported by wide reading with very effective use of source material and accurate referencing.</p>	<p>90%-100% Exceptional work with presentation of the highest standard. The work contains coherent arguments and ideas. There is a detailed understanding of subject matter and critical analysis of issues/problems. Points are made clearly and concisely, always substantiated by appropriate use of source material. There is evidence of a sound ability to critically interrelate theories with examples from practice where appropriate.</p>	<p>90%-100% Exceptional work. Presentation is logical, error-free and, where appropriate, creative. There is an in-depth understanding of issues/problems and excellent critical/deep engagement with the material and concepts involved. Very skilful interpretation of data. Arguments, ideas and, where appropriate, solutions are presented coherently and fully underpinned by thorough research and reading.</p>
<p>80%-89% Outstanding work with presentation of a very high standard. There is coherence of ideas and demonstration of a thorough knowledge and understanding. Arguments are supported by wide reading with effective use of source material and accurate referencing.</p>	<p>80%-89% Outstanding work with presentation of a very high standard. There is comprehensive understanding of key concepts and knowledge and evidence of critical analysis and insight. Accurate interpretation of data with arguments, ideas and solutions presented effectively and based on strong research and reading.</p>	<p>80%-89% Outstanding work with presentation of a very high standard. There is comprehensive understanding of key concepts and knowledge and clear evidence of critical analysis and insight. Accurate interpretation of data with arguments, ideas and solutions presented effectively and based on strong research and reading.</p>
<p>70%-79% Extremely good work with presentation of a high standard. There is coherence of ideas and demonstration of thorough knowledge and understanding. Arguments are supported by wide reading with appropriate use of source material and accurate referencing.</p>	<p>70%-79% Extremely good work with presentation of a high standard. Evidence of strong knowledge and understanding together with some critical analysis and insight. Source material is used effectively to support arguments, ideas and solutions.</p>	<p>70%-79% Extremely good work with presentation of a high standard. Demonstrates an excellent knowledge base with a clear understanding of the issues and application to practice where appropriate. There is some effective critical and analytical application of relevant research and reading.</p>

Level 4 (Certificate)	Level 5 (Diploma)	Level 6 (Degree)
<p>60%-69% The work is well presented and coherently structured. There is evidence of a sound knowledge and understanding of the issues with theory linked to practice where appropriate. Most material used has been referenced/acknowledged.</p>	<p>60%-69% Very good presentation. Sound knowledge and understanding with an emerging ability to critically engage with and apply the concepts involved linking them to practice where appropriate. Good use of source material which supports most points clearly. Content is wholly relevant and is coherently structured.</p>	<p>60%-69% The work is very good, logically structured and presented to a high standard. Demonstrates a strong knowledge base with a clear understanding of the issues and application to practice where appropriate. There is some critical and analytical application of relevant research.</p>
<p>50%-59% Presentation is acceptable but with some errors. There is knowledge and understanding of issues under discussion and some evidence of the application of knowledge and ideas where appropriate. Some use of relevant source material.</p>	<p>50%-59% Presentation is of a good standard but some shortcomings. Evidence of a sound knowledge base but limited critical and practical application of concepts and ideas. Content is largely relevant although points may not always be clear and structure may lack coherence. Contains some critical reflection and some use of source material to illustrate points.</p>	<p>50%-59% The work is clearly presented and logically structured. It shows evidence of a sound understanding of the topic and addresses major issues. The work contains some discussion and interpretation of relevant perspectives although further development of the arguments presented would be beneficial. There are examples of critical reflection and evidence of application of theory to practice.</p>
<p>40%-49% Presentation is acceptable but attention to structure and style is required. The content is relevant but largely descriptive. There is evidence of a reasonable level of knowledge and understanding but there is limited use of source material to support the arguments, proposals or solutions. Some links are made to practice where appropriate.</p>	<p>40%-49% Adequate presentation. The work is descriptive and/or lacks critical analysis where required but is relevant with limited though sufficient evidence of knowledge and understanding. There is some evidence of reading although arguments/proposals/solutions often lack coherence and may be unsubstantiated by relevant source material or partially flawed. Links to practice are made where appropriate.</p>	<p>40%-49% Adequate presentation. The work displays basic knowledge and understanding of the topic but is largely descriptive. There is an attempt to bring together different ideas and concepts although this would have been strengthened by the inclusion of further key issues. The structure of the work requires attention to its coherence and logical development of content. The link between theory and practice, where appropriate, is somewhat tenuous and its development would enhance the work considerably.</p>

Level 4 (Certificate)	Level 5 (Diploma)	Level 6 (Degree)
<p>30%-39% – Fail</p> <p>The work is poorly structured and presented. Some material may be irrelevant. Content is based largely on taught elements with very little evidence of reading around the topic and little or no reference to practice where appropriate.</p>	<p>30%-39% – Fail</p> <p>Poorly structured, incoherent and wholly descriptive work. Evidence of a weak knowledge base with some key aspects not addressed and use of irrelevant material. Flawed use of techniques. Limited evidence of appropriate reading and no evidence of critical thought. Little reference to practice where appropriate.</p>	<p>30%-39% – Fail</p> <p>The work is poorly presented and contains numerous errors, inconsistencies and omissions with limited use of source material. The work displays a weak knowledge base and a lack of sufficient understanding of the topic. There is limited evidence of the application of theory to practice where appropriate. It contains many unsupported statements with limited attempts to bring issues together and lacks critical analysis and reflection.</p>
<p>20-29% – Fail</p> <p>The work is very poorly structured and presented. Much material is irrelevant. Content is based almost entirely on taught elements with very little evidence of any purposeful reading around the topic. No effective reference to practice where appropriate. To obtain a mark of 20% the work must show evidence of a genuine attempt to engage with the assessment requirements and with the subject matter.</p>	<p>20-29% – Fail</p> <p>Very poorly structured, incoherent and wholly descriptive work. Evidence of a very weak knowledge base with many key omissions and much material irrelevant. Use of inappropriate or incorrect techniques. Very little evidence of appropriate reading and no evidence of critical thought. No links to practice where appropriate. To obtain a mark of 20% the work must show evidence of a genuine attempt to engage with the assessment requirements and with the subject matter.</p>	<p>20-29% – Fail</p> <p>The work is very poorly presented and contains numerous serious errors, inconsistencies and omissions with little use of source material. The work displays a very weak knowledge base and a lack of sufficient understanding of the topic. There is very little evidence of the application of theory to practice where appropriate. It contains many unsupported statements with very little attempt to bring issues together and there is a complete lack of critical analysis and reflection. To obtain a mark of 20% the work must show evidence of a genuine attempt to engage with the assessment requirements and with the subject matter.</p>
<p>0-19 % - Fail</p> <p>The work is extremely poorly structured and presented. It demonstrates no real knowledge or understanding of key concepts and principles. Much material is irrelevant. No effective use of supporting material. No reference to practice where appropriate. Not a genuine attempt to engage with the</p>	<p>0-19 % - Fail</p> <p>The work is extremely poorly structured and presented. It demonstrates no real knowledge or understanding of key concepts and principles. Much material is irrelevant, incorrect or omitted. No evidence of critical thought. No effective use of supporting material. No links to practice where appropriate. Not a</p>	<p>0-19 % - Fail</p> <p>The work is extremely poorly structured and presented. It demonstrates no real knowledge or understanding of key concepts and principles. Much material is irrelevant, incorrect, inconsistent or omitted. No evidence of critical analysis and reflection. No effective use of supporting material. No application of</p>

assessment requirements and/or subject matter.	genuine attempt to engage with the assessment requirements and/or subject matter.	theory to practice where appropriate. Not a genuine attempt to engage with the assessment requirements and/or subject matter.
--	---	---

Level 7 (Postgraduate) Generic Marking Criteria

Band	Generic Criteria
90-100%	<p>An excellent critical and complete demonstration of understanding in all key areas of knowledge relevant to the work and demonstrating an innovative and creative approach. Evidence throughout the work of a sustained ability to synthesise and interpret complex concepts, to make inferences and to provide an original and/or compelling argument and discussion. Excellent structure and immaculate presentation, with cogent use of academic language and grounded in a pertinent and substantial selection of source materials. Excellent use of appropriate analytical and research methods and addresses ethical considerations in an informed and perceptive manner. Exceptional ability to link and critically analyse theory and practice where appropriate.</p>
80-89%	<p>An excellent, critical and systematic demonstration of understanding in all key areas of knowledge relevant to the work. Evidence throughout of the ability to synthesise and interpret complex concepts to provide a compelling argument and discussion. Very good structure and presentation, with confident use of academic language and grounded in a relevant and extensive selection of source materials. Excellent use of appropriate analytical and research methods and fully addresses ethical considerations. Excellent ability to link and critically analyse theory and practice where appropriate.</p>
70-79%	<p>An excellent, critical and organised demonstration of understanding in all key areas of knowledge relevant to the work. Evidence throughout of the ability to synthesise and interpret diverse concepts to provide a sound argument and discussion. Good structure and presentation, with fluent use of academic language and grounded in an appropriate and comprehensive selection of source materials. Very effective use of appropriate analytical and research methods and consideration of ethical implications. Very good ability to link and critically analyse theory and practice where appropriate.</p>
60-69%	<p>A proficient, clearly stated and analytical demonstration of understanding in all key areas of knowledge relevant to the work. Evidence of the ability to integrate and analyse diverse concepts in a rational and logical argument and discussion. Well structured and clearly presented work, with fluent use of academic language and utilising a relevant and extensive range of source materials. Effective use of appropriate analytical and research methods and consideration of ethical issues. Good ability to link and critically analyse theory and practice where appropriate.</p>
50-59%	<p>An acceptable and substantiated demonstration of understanding in all key areas of knowledge relevant to the work. Evidence of the ability to integrate and analyse diverse concepts in a reasoned and valid argument and discussion. Adequately structured and presented work, with clear use of academic language and reference to a sufficient range of relevant source materials. Adequate use of appropriate analytical and research methods and does address ethical considerations. Effective linking of theory and practice where appropriate.</p>

Band	Generic Criteria
40-49%	A limited, insufficient and/or inaccurate understanding in key areas of knowledge relevant to the work. Insufficient evidence of ability to integrate and analyse concepts to provide a valid discussion. Unacceptably structured and presented work, with insufficient use of academic language and conventions. A limited range of source materials is used. Limited or ineffective use of analytical and research methods and limited coverage of ethical considerations. Inadequate linking of theory and practice where applicable.
30-39%	A descriptive and/or narrative account, with little critical and/or flawed understanding of key areas of knowledge relevant to the work. Insufficient evidence of ability to discuss fundamental concepts. Unclear and and/or unevidenced argument and discussion. Poorly structured and presented work, with little use of academic language and conventions. A narrow and/or inappropriate range of source materials and analytical and research methods is used. Failure to identify ethical considerations and to link theory and practice where applicable.
20-29%	A weakly descriptive and/or narrative account, with no analytical content and/or significant inaccuracies in understanding of key areas of knowledge relevant to the work. Little or no evidence of research and the ability to discuss fundamental concepts. No awareness of ethical issues. Unclear and unsourced arguments and discussion. Flawed structure and presentation, with negligible attention to academic language or conventions. Some or all source materials are unreferenced and/or irrelevant. Failure to link theory and practice where applicable. To obtain a mark of 20% the work must show evidence of a genuine attempt to demonstrate some knowledge of the subject.
0-19%	The work is almost entirely derivative and therefore lacks analysis or reflection, and shows little or no knowledge or understanding of key areas relevant to the work. No evidence of research and the ability to discuss fundamental concepts. The presentation and referencing does not conform to the standards required.