Classical and Archaeological Studies Written Assignment Marking Criteria

Categorical Mark Range	High First (82/85/88+)	First (72/75/78)	2.1 (62/65/68)	2.2 (52/55/58)	3 (42/45/48)	Fail (32/35/38)	Low Fail (0-28)
Division Descriptor	**Exceptional** N.B. Marks at this level are rare and would be considered impressive work at the next level of study.	**Excellent**	**Good - Very Good**	**Satisfactory**	**Adequate**	**Fail**	**Fail**
Content	Demonstrates…	Demonstrates…	Demonstrates…	Demonstrates…	Demonstrates…	Demonstrates…	Demonstrates…
Module Knowledge	Exceptional knowledge and analysis of key concepts and evidence presented in the module.	Excellent knowledge and analysis of key concepts and evidence presented in the module.	Good knowledge and analysis of key concepts and evidence presented in the module.	Satisfactory knowledge and analysis of key concepts and evidence presented in the module but tends toward the superficial.	An adequate response to the assignment but shows limited knowledge of key concepts and evidence presented in the module.	Poor or incomplete knowledge of key concepts and evidence presented in the module.	Little or no awareness of key concepts and evidence presented in the module.
Critical Engagement	Exceptional understanding of, and critical engagement with, the arguments of others.	Excellent understanding of, and critical engagement with, the arguments of others.	Good understanding of, and some critical engagement with, the arguments of others.	Satisfactory understanding of the arguments of others but tends to summarise rather than engage with them.	Limited awareness of the arguments of others or the wider topic.	No awareness of the arguments of others or the wider topic.	No awareness of the arguments of others or the topic.
Independence and Creativity	Original thinking throughout that forms a meaningful contribution to current debates.	Independent or creative thinking throughout that engages with current debates.	Some independent or creative thinking that engages with the assignment.	Thinking that sometimes relies too heavily on module material, problematic sources, or the work of others.	Thinking that relies too heavily on module materials or problematic sources, or the work of others.	Thinking that relies entirely on module materials, problematic sources, or the work of others.	Thinking that demonstrates little or no awareness of module materials or the work of others.
Reasoning and Credibility	A full and integrated response that places the reasoning and credibility demonstrated in the argument beyond reproach.	A full and integrated response that enhances the reasoning and credibility of the argument.	A competent response that demonstrates good reasoning and ensures the argument's credibility.	A satisfactory response, but with some errors or confusions in reasoning that undercut the argument's credibility.	A limited response, with errors or confusions in reasoning that damage the argument's credibility.	An inappropriate response, signalling a lack of reasoning and credibility.	Little or no understanding of the assignment.
Limits of evidence	Nuanced awareness of and reflection on the limits of our evidence and how we can use it.	Awareness of and reflection on the limits of our evidence and how we can use it.	Awareness of the limits of our evidence and how we can use it.	Some awareness of the limits of our evidence and how we can use it.	Little awareness of the limits of our evidence and how we can use it.	Little awareness of the limits of our evidence.	No awareness of the limits of our evidence.

Organization	Offers…	Offers…	Offers…	Offers…	Offers…	Offers…	Offers…	Offers…
Focus	A single thesis or topic that is clearly and effectively sustained throughout the assignment.	A single thesis or topic that is sustained throughout the assignment.	A single thesis or topic that unifies the assignment.	A single thesis or topic that unifies the assignment, although parts may wander from the main idea.	Ideas, but no single thesis or topic unifies the entire assignment.	Ideas, but no workable thesis or topic related to the assignment.	No attempt to provide a thesis or present a topic related to the assignment.	
Argument Development	A thesis or topic that is skilfully and systematically developed with rich supporting evidence and substantial examples.	A thesis or topic that is well-developed, with significant supporting evidence and detailed examples.	A thesis or topic that is appropriately developed with clear supporting evidence and good examples.	A thesis or topic that is simplistically developed, with some supporting evidence and examples.	Attempts to develop a thesis or topic, but with evidence and examples that are disjointed, unrelated, or repetitive.	Ideas with no thesis or topic relevant to the assignment; evidence and examples are lacking.	No recognisable thesis or topic; no evidence or examples support the claims being made.	
Conclusion	Conclusions that skilfully address the wider implications of the thesis or topic.	Conclusions that address the wider implications of the thesis or topic.	Conclusions that acknowledge some implications of the thesis or topic.	Conclusions that follow from the thesis or topic, but do not acknowledge its implications.	Conclusions that merely summarises the ideas presented.	Conclusions that are inadequate or do not follow from the ideas presented.	Conclusions are irrelevant to the assignment or missing.	
Clarity for intended audience	A clear, persuasive, and compelling approach to the topic that encourages the intended audience to see the topic in a different light.	A clear, logical, and well-constructed approach to the topic that engages the intelligence and sophistication of the intended audience.	A clear, coherent approach to the topic that thoughtfully engages with the intended audience.	An approach to the topic that communicates effectively with the intended audience, but occasionally lacks clarity and logical coherence.	An approach to the topic that communicates with the intended audience but lacks clarity and contains errors.	An approach to the topic that contains errors, impeding effective communication with the intended audience.	An approach to the topic that contains serious errors, limiting communication with or misleading the intended audience.	
Presentation								
Format	Format meticulously adheres to the guidelines, is correct, consistent, and free from error.	Format adheres to the guidelines, is correct and consistent.	Format adheres to the guidelines, is correct, and usually consistent.	Format disregards some aspects of the guidelines but is appropriate to the assignment.	Format disregards many aspects of the guidelines but is appropriate to the assignment. Significantly under or over the word limit.	Format fails to conform to the guidelines or is inappropriate to the assignment. Substantially under the word limit.	Format completely fails to conform to the guidelines and is inappropriate to the assignment. Very substantially under the word limit.	
References	References are precise, consistent, and exhaustive.	References are precise, consistent, and complete.	References are largely precise, consistent, and complete.	References are sparse, and occasionally inconsistent or incomplete.	References are sporadic, inconsistent, or incomplete throughout.	References are inadequate.	References are missing.	