

Marking Criteria for Coursework

| | Inadequate | Adequate | Fair | Good | Excellent | Outstanding | Exceptional |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| | 1-19: 5 inadequate 1-5 20-29: 4 inadequate 1-5 30-39: 3 inadequate 1-5 | 40-49: Majority of 1-5 Adequate or higher | 50-59: Majority 1-5 Fair or higher | 60-69: Majority 1-5 Good or higher | 70-79: Majority 1-5 Excellent or higher | 80-89: Majority 1-5 Outstanding or higher | 90+: Majority 1-5 Exceptional |
| 1. Response to the task set: Argument, structure & conclusions | Either no argument or argument presented is inappropriate & irrelevant. Conclusions absent or irrelevant. | An indirect response to the task set, with a gesture towards a relevant argument & conclusions. | A reasonable response with a limited sense of argument & partial conclusions. | A sound response with a reasonable argument & straightforward, logical conclusions. | A distinctive response that develops a clear argument & sensible conclusions, with evidence of nuance. | Impressive response with relevant & nuanced argument, presenting significant nuanced & insightful conclusions. | Exceptional response with a convincing, sophisticated argument with precise & subtle conclusions. |
| 2. Grasp of relevant issues | Misunderstanding of the issues under discussion. | Rudimentary, intermittent grasp of issues with confusions. | Reasonable grasp of the issues & their broader implications. | Sound understanding of issues, with insights into broader implications. | Thorough grasp of issues; some sophisticated insights. | Striking grasp of complexities & significance of issues. | Exceptional grasp of complexities & significance of issues. |
| 3. Engagement with literature | Very limited or irrelevant reading. | Significant omissions in reading with weak understanding of literature consulted. | Evidence of relevant reading & some understanding of literature consulted. | Evidence of plentiful relevant reading & sound understanding of literature consulted. | Extensive reading & thorough understanding of literature consulted. | Ambitious reading & impressive understanding of relevant literatures. | Expert-level review & innovative synthesis suitable for a journal. |
| 4. Analysis: reflection, thought, & conceptual framework | Erroneous analysis. Misunderstanding of the basic core of the taught materials. No conceptual material. | Analysis relying on the partial reproduction of ideas from taught materials. Some concepts absent or wrongly used. | Reasonable reproduction of ideas from taught materials. Rudimentary definition & use of concepts. | Evidence of student's own analysis. Concepts defined & used systematically & effectively. | Evidence of innovative analysis. Concepts deftly defined & used with some sense of theoretical context. | Impressive thought, insights & analysis. Concepts deftly defined & accurately used with a strong sense of context. | Exceptional thought & awareness of cutting edge. Sophisticated sense of conceptual framework in context. |
| 5. Empirical knowledge & use of examples | Empirics absent or irrelevant/inaccurate. No evidence to support claims made. | Empirical material identified is limited in quality & quantity. Claims rarely evidenced. | Some empirical material but limited in quality & not always effectively used to support claims. | Significant amount of quality empirical material used to support most claims. | Impressive, highly relevant & detailed empirical material used to evidence most claims. | Claims supported by impressive, detailed, distinctive empirics. Some reflection on data. | Comprehensive, precise, empirical treatment matched by critical reflection on data. |
| 6. Writing & communication | Style & word choice seriously interfere with comprehension. (-3) | Style & word choice seriously detract from conveying of ideas. (-2) | Style & word choice sometimes detract from conveying of ideas. (-1) | Style & word choice rarely detract from conveying of ideas. (0) | Style & word choice show fluency with ideas & flashes of verve. (1) | Style & word choice greatly enhances ideas & shows verve. (2) | Reads as if professionally copy edited. (3) |
| 7. Visual aspects & references¹ | Poorly formatted or inappropriate visuals; very limited references. (-3) | Formatting, visuals & referencing seriously distract from argument. (-2) | Formatting, visuals & referencing sometimes distract from argument. (-1) | Formatting, visuals & referencing rarely detract from argument. (0) | Formatting, visuals & referencing are impeccable. (1) | Formatting, visuals & referencing actively contribute to argument. (2) | Exceptional presentation impeccable format & references. (3) |

¹ Visual aspects may vary but may include formatting (font consistency, headings, page numbers, bibliography), tables (clarity, labeling), and figures (quality, appropriateness).

Marking Criteria for Dissertations

| | Inadequate | Adequate | Fair | Good | Excellent | Outstanding | Exceptional |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| | 1-19: 5 inadequate 1-5 20-29: 4 inadequate 1-5 30-39: 3 inadequate 1-5 | 40-49: Majority of 1-5 Adequate or higher | 50-59: Majority 1-5 Fair or higher | 60-69: Majority 1-5 Good or higher | 70-79: Majority 1-5 Excellent or higher | 80-89: Majority 1-5 Outstanding or higher | 90+: Majority 1-5 Exceptional |
| 1. Research Aims & grasp of subject area | Very limited or no grasp of area. Muddled or derivative research aims. | Limited grasp of subject area. Confused or vague research aims. | Some grasp of subject area & reasonable research aims. | Sound grasp of subject area & focused, relevant research aims. | Deep grasp of subject area & originality in main research aims. | Impressive grasp of subject area & highly significant research aims. | Exceptional grasp of subject area; research aims equivalent to journal. |
| 2. Research techniques | Very limited fieldwork or independent research. Little familiarity w/ methods or serious flaws in use. | Limited fieldwork or independent research. Basic familiarity with methods, possibly with errors in application. | Evidence of fieldwork or independent research. Familiarity with application of appropriate methods. | Significant fieldwork or independent research. Clear familiarity with application of appropriate methods. | Substantial fieldwork or independent research. High ability in selection, application & discussion of methods. | Impressive fieldwork or independent research. Innovative selection, application, & discussion of research techniques. | Exceptional form of fieldwork or independent research paired with an expert-level discussion of research techniques. |
| 3. Reading | Very limited or irrelevant reading. | Significant omissions in reading with weak grasp of literature consulted. | Evidence of relevant reading & grasp of literature consulted. | Evidence of plentiful relevant reading & sound grasp of literature. | Extensive reading & thorough grasp of literature consulted. | Impressive review & grasp of relevant literatures. | Expert-level review & innovative synthesis suitable for a journal. |
| 4. Interpretation of evidence | Primarily descriptive analysis; limited, summary discussion of findings. | Limited critical analysis & subsequent discussion of implications. | Reasonable critical analysis & subsequent discussion of implications. | Sound critical analysis & meaningful discussion of implications. | Innovative critical analysis & originality in discussion of implications. | Impressive critical analysis & highly significant discussion of findings. | Critical analysis & subsequent discussion suitable for a journal. |
| 5. Structure & development of argument | Confused, rambling or repetitive structure leading to incoherent argument. | Poor organisation seriously detracts from the development of argument. | Structure sometimes detracts from the development of argument. | Conventional structure with rare digressions occasionally marring the argument. | Logical, coherent structure that persuades of the author's argument. | Innovative structure that enhances the development of argument. | Highly original structure that adds substantially to the development of argument. |
| 6. Writing & communication | Style, grammar & word choice seriously interfere with comprehension. (-3) | Style, grammar & word choice seriously detract from conveying of ideas. (-2) | Style, grammar & word choice sometimes detract from conveying of ideas. (-1) | Style, grammar & word choice rarely detract from conveying of ideas. (0) | Style & word choice show fluency with ideas & flashes of verve. (1) | Style & word choice greatly enhances ideas & demonstrates verve. (2) | Reads as if professionally copy edited. (3) |
| 7. Presentation & references² | Poorly formatted or inappropriate visuals; very limited references. (-3) | Formatting, visuals & referencing seriously distract from argument. (-2) | Formatting, visuals & referencing satisfactory. (-1) | Formatting, visuals & referencing rarely detract from argument. (0) | Formatting, visuals & referencing are impeccable. (1) | Formatting, visuals & referencing actively contribute to argument. (2) | Exceptional presentation with impeccable format & references. (3) |

² Elements of presentation may vary but may include formatting (font consistency, headings, page numbers, bibliography), tables (clarity, labeling), and figures (quality, appropriateness).

Marking Criteria for Exams³

| | Inadequate | Adequate | Fair | Good | Excellent | Outstanding | Exceptional |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| | 1-19: 5 inadequate 1-5 20-29: 4 inadequate 1-5 30-39: 3 inadequate 1-5 | 40-49: Majority of 1-5 Adequate or higher | 50-59: Majority 1-5 Fair or higher | 60-69: Majority 1-5 Good or higher | 70-79: Majority 1-5 Excellent or higher | 80-89: Majority 1-5 Outstanding or higher | 90+: Majority 1-5 Exceptional |
| 1. Response to the task set | Either no argument or argument is inept & irrelevant. Conclusions absent or irrelevant. | An indirect response to the task set, with gesture towards a relevant argument & conclusions. | A reasonable response with a limited sense of argument & partial conclusions. | A sound response with a reasonable argument & straightforward, logical conclusions. | A distinctive response with a clear argument & sensible conclusions; evidence of nuance. | Impressive response with nuanced argument, presenting significant & nuanced insights. | Exceptional response with very sophisticated argument ending in subtle conclusions. |
| 2. Grasp of relevant issues | General misunderstanding of issues discussed. | Rudimentary, intermittent grasp of issues with confusions. | Reasonable grasp of issues & their broader implications. | Sound understanding, with insights into broader implications. | Thorough grasp w/ some sophisticated insights. | Striking grasp of complexities & significance of issues. | Exceptional grasp of complexities & issues' significance. |
| 3. Reflection, thought, & conceptual framework | Erroneous or un-conceptual analysis. Poor understanding of basics of the taught materials. | Analysis relies on partial reproduction of taught materials. Some concepts absent or wrongly used. | Reasonable reproduction of taught materials. Rudimentary use of concepts. | Evidence of student's own analysis. Concepts effectively defined & used systematically. | Innovative analysis. Concepts deftly defined & used with some theoretical context. | Impressive thought, insights & analysis. Concepts deftly defined & used w/ strong context. | Engaged w/ cutting edge. Sophisticated conceptual framework used in context. |
| 4. Knowledge of literature & empirical topic | No evidence of, or largely inaccurate use of, conceptual literature & empirical material. | Rudimentary knowledge of required reading & empirical aspects of topic, with inaccuracies. | Limited knowledge of required reading & empirical aspects of the topic, with inaccuracies. | Sound knowledge of required reading & empirical aspects, with occasional inaccuracies. | Thorough knowledge of relevant reading & empirical aspects of the topic. | Impressive knowledge of relevant literature & empirical aspects of the topic. | Comprehensive knowledge of relevant literature & empirical aspects of the topic. |
| 5. Evidence to support claims | No effective use of evidence to support any claims made. | Evidence rarely or ineffectively used to support claims. | A few claims warranted by evidence. | The essay's most crucial claims are supported by relevant evidence. | The essay's claims are mostly supported by appropriate evidence. | The essay's claims are warranted by apt, accurate evidence. | Claims are warranted by accurate, up-to-date & detailed evidence. |
| 6. Structure & planning | Structure not discernible; minimal progression. (-3) | Structure discernible, but frequently absent. (-2) | Structure is apparent; frequent digression. (-1) | Conventional structure w/ rare digressions. (0) | Logical, coherent structure. (1) | Outstanding structure adds to overall effect. (2) | Exceptional structure crucial to argument. (3) |
| 7. Writing style⁴ | Style is consistently unclear. Inappropriate word choices. (-3) | Style & word choice lacks fluency & argument is only clear in parts. (-2) | Style generally clear but errors in use of jargon, grammar & spelling. (-1) | Style largely clear & fluent. Use of jargon is generally accurate. (0) | Style consistently clear & fluent with accurate use of terms. (1) | Style is elegant & precise with accurate use of jargon. (2) | Sophisticated style w/ impeccable spelling, grammar & jargon. (3) |

³ For an incomplete answer, apply the criteria for which any evidence has been provided (e.g., an essay plan as evidence of structure). An incomplete answer will not necessarily constitute a fail.

⁴ The clarity of handwriting is not a marking criteria, however where handwriting is illegible work may have to be transcribed at student expense.

Marking Criteria for Posters

| | Inadequate | Adequate | Fair | Good | Excellent | Outstanding | Exceptional |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| | 1-19: 5 inadequate 1-5 20-29: 4 inadequate 1-5 30-39: 3 inadequate 1-5 | 40-49: Majority of 1-5 Adequate or higher | 50-59: Majority 1-5 Fair or higher | 60-69: Majority 1-5 Good or higher | 70-79: Majority 1-5 Excellent or higher | 80-89: Majority 1-5 Outstanding or higher | 90+: Majority 1-5 Exceptional |
| 1. Understanding of the topic | General misunderstanding of the topic under discussion. | Rudimentary understanding of the topic. | Reasonable understanding of the topic & its broader implications. | Sound understanding of topic, with insights into broader implications. | Thorough understanding of topic with some sophisticated insights. | Striking understanding of complexities & significance of topic. | Exceptional understanding of complexities & significance of topic. |
| 2. Level of critical understanding | Erroneous analysis. Misunderstanding of the basic core of the taught materials. No conceptual material. | Analysis relying on the partial reproduction of ideas from taught materials. Some concepts absent or wrongly used. | Reasonable reproduction of ideas from taught materials. Rudimentary definition & use of concepts. | Evidence of student's own analysis. Concepts defined & used systematically & effectively. | Evidence of innovative analysis. Concepts deftly defined & used with some sense of theoretical context. | Impressive thought, insights & analysis. Concepts deftly defined & accurately used with a strong sense of context. | Exceptional thought & awareness of cutting edge. Sophisticated sense of conceptual framework in context. |
| 3. Clarity of poster aims | Aim of poster not obvious or requires explanation. | Aim of poster only clear after extended viewing. | Aim of poster reasonably clear from first impression. | Aim of poster effectively communicated at first impression. | Aim of poster thoroughly clear from first impression. | Nuanced, multiple aims of poster clearly communicated. | Nuanced, multiple aims of poster clear from first impression |
| 4. Clarity of design & layout of poster | Logic of layout is indiscernible & design is unclear. | Layout is discernible, but with little clarity of design. | Layout is apparent, but with frequent design flaws that distract from ideas. | Conventional layout with rare design flaws that distract from ideas. | Logical, coherent layout with clear design. | Clever, unorthodox layout contributes to overall effect of design. | Highly original layout & design is crucial to argument. |
| 5. Use of illustrative material | Poorly formatted or inappropriate visuals that muddle the argument. | Formatting & choice of visuals sometimes distract from argument. | Formatting & choice of visuals occasionally distract from argument. | Formatting & choice of visuals rarely detract from argument. | Formatting & choice of visuals are impeccable. | Formatting & choice of visuals actively contribute to argument. | Exceptional presentation with impeccable formatting & choice of visuals. |
| 6. Clarity & succinctness of text | Poster text seriously interferes with comprehension of ideas & presentation. (-3) | Poster text seriously detracts from comprehension of ideas & presentation. (-2) | Poster text sometimes detracts from comprehension of ideas & presentation. (-1) | Poster text rarely detracts from comprehension of ideas & presentation. (0) | Poster text conveys ideas & does not detract from presentation. (1) | Poster text enhances comprehension of ideas & presentation. (2) | Reads as if professionally copy edited. (3) |
| 7. Evidence of wider reading | Very limited or irrelevant reading. (-3) | Significant omissions in reading with weak grasp of literature consulted. (-2) | Evidence of relevant reading & some grasp of literature consulted. (-1) | Evidence of plentiful relevant reading & sound grasp of literature consulted. (0) | Extensive reading & thorough grasp of literature consulted. (1) | Ambitious reading & impressive grasp of relevant literatures. (2) | Expert-level review & innovative synthesis equivalent to a journal. (3) |

Marking Criteria for Blogs

| | Inadequate | Adequate | Fair | Good | Excellent | Outstanding | Exceptional |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| | 1-19: 5 inadequate 1-5 20-29: 4 inadequate 1-5 30-39: 3 inadequate 1-5 | 40-49: Majority of 1-5 Adequate or higher | 50-59: Majority 1-5 Fair or higher | 60-69: Majority 1-5 Good or higher | 70-79: Majority 1-5 Excellent or higher | 80-89: Majority 1-5 Outstanding or higher | 90+: Majority 1-5 Exceptional |
| 1. Grasp of relevant issues | General misunderstanding of the issues under discussion. | Rudimentary grasp of the issues | Reasonable grasp of the issues & their broader implications. | Sound grasp of issues, with insights into broader implications. | Thorough grasp of issues with some sophisticated insights. | Striking grasp of complexities & significance of issues. | Exceptional grasp of complexities & significance of issues. |
| 2. Engagement with literature | Very limited or irrelevant reading. | Significant omissions in reading with weak grasp of literature consulted. | Evidence of relevant reading & some grasp of literature consulted. | Evidence of plentiful relevant reading & sound grasp of literature consulted. | Extensive reading & thorough grasp of literature consulted. | Ambitious reading & impressive grasp of relevant literatures. | Expert-level review and innovative synthesis equivalent to a journal. |
| 3. Level of engagement | Posts are very sparse & very poorly spaced. | Posts are rather few & poorly spaced. | Number of posts is adequate but occur in uneven intervals. | Posts occur roughly weekly & mainly in regular intervals. | Posts occur roughly weekly & at regular intervals. | Posts are weekly & occur at regular intervals. | Posts are sometimes more than weekly & occur at highly regular intervals. |
| 4. Engagement with other digital sources such as websites, videos and blogs. | Very limited or irrelevant links to other digital sources | Some links are made but with little engagement | Relevant links & some engagement with digital sources. | Plentiful links & substantial engagement with digital sources cited. | Extensive links & deep engagement with relevant digital sources | Ambitious links & impressive engagement with relevant digital sources. | Expert-level engagement suitable for a professional blog. |
| 5. Development of blog over time | Confused, rambling or repetitive posts leading to incoherent development. | The development of the blog is weak with little self-reflection | The development of the blog shows some reflection. | Some posts are deeply reflective which progresses the blog | Self-reflection is logical & coherent & builds an overall argument. | Deep reflection, which enhances the development of an overall argument. | Deep & consistent reflection that produces an exceptional overall argument. |
| 6. Writing & communication | Style & word choice seriously interfere with comprehension. (-3) | Style & word choice seriously detract from conveying of ideas. (-2) | Style & word choice sometimes detract from conveying of ideas. (-1) | Style & word choice rarely detract from conveying of ideas. (0) | Style & word choice show fluency with ideas & flashes of verve. (1) | Style & word choice greatly enhances ideas & demonstrates verve. (2) | Reads as if professionally copy edited. (3) |
| 7. Visual aspects & references⁵ | Poorly formatted or inappropriate visuals; very limited references. (-3) | Formatting, visuals, & referencing sometimes distract from argument. (-2) | Formatting, visuals, & referencing occasionally distract from argument. (-1) | Formatting, visuals, & referencing rarely detract from argument. (0) | Formatting, visuals, & referencing are impeccable. (1) | Formatting, visuals, & referencing actively contribute to argument. (2) | Exceptional presentation with impeccable format & references. (3) |

⁵ Visual aspects may vary but may include formatting (font consistency, headings, bibliography), tables (clarity, labeling), and figures (quality, appropriateness).

Marking Criteria for Oral Presentations

| | Inadequate | Adequate | Fair | Good | Excellent | Outstanding | Exceptional |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| | 1-19: 5 inadequate 1-5 20-29: 4 inadequate 1-5 30-39: 3 inadequate 1-5 | 40-49: Majority of 1-5 Adequate or higher | 50-59: Majority 1-5 Fair or higher | 60-69: Majority 1-5 Good or higher | 70-79: Majority 1-5 Excellent or higher | 80-89: Majority 1-5 Outstanding or higher | 90+: Majority 1-5 Exceptional |
| 1. Focus on the task set | Either no response to task or presentation is inappropriate & irrelevant. | An indirect response to the task set, with a gesture towards a relevant argument. | A reasonable response with a limited sense of argument & partial conclusions. | A sound response with a reasonable argument & straightforward, logical conclusions. | A distinctive response developing a clear argument & sensible conclusions, with evidence of nuance. | Impressive response with relevant & nuanced argument, presenting significant nuanced & insightful conclusions. | Exceptional response with a convincing, very sophisticated argument that has precise & subtle conclusions. |
| 2. Grasp of relevant issues | General misunderstanding of the issues under discussion. | Rudimentary, intermittent grasp of the issues, with confusions. | Reasonable grasp of the issues & their broader implications. | Sound grasp of issues, with insights into broader implications. | Thorough grasp of issues with some sophisticated insights. | Striking grasp of complexities & significance of issues. | Exceptional grasp of complexities & significance of issues. |
| 3. Detail of contextual knowledge | Contextual knowledge absent or irrelevant/inaccurate. | Contextual knowledge identified is limited in quality & quantity. | Some contextual material but limited in quality. | Significant amount of quality contextual material. | Impressive, highly relevant & detailed contextual material. | Impressive, detailed, distinctive context. Some critical reflexivity on context. | Comprehensive, precise, treatment of context matched by critical reflection on context. |
| 3. Evidence of wider reading | Very limited or irrelevant reading. | Significant omissions in reading with weak understanding of literature consulted. | Evidence of relevant reading & some understanding of literature consulted. | Evidence of plentiful relevant reading & sound understanding of literature consulted. | Extensive reading & thorough understanding of literature consulted. | Ambitious reading & impressive understanding of relevant literatures. | Expert-level review & innovative synthesis equivalent to a journal. |
| 5. Use of visual materials⁶ | Poorly formatted or inappropriate visuals. | Formatting & visuals seriously detract from presentation. | Formatting & visuals sometimes detract from presentation. | Formatting & visuals rarely detract from presentation. | Formatting & visuals are impeccable. | Formatting & visuals actively contribute to argument. | Exceptional presentation impeccable formatting & visuals. |
| 6. Body language & audience engagement | Body language & presentation style seriously interfere with comprehension. (-3) | Body language & presentation style seriously detract from conveying of ideas. (-2) | Body language & presentation style sometimes detract from conveying of ideas. (-1) | Body language & presentation style rarely detract from conveying of ideas. (0) | Body language & presentation style show confidence & flashes of verve. (1) | Body language & presentation style show confidence & verve. (2) | Physical & verbal performance is of professional quality. (3) |
| 7. Pacing & timing | Presentation vastly over or under length; time terribly misallocated among all topics. (-3) | Presentation significantly over or under length; time misallocated among all topics. (-2) | Presentation noticeably over or under length; some topics not given appropriate time. (-1) | Presentation slightly over or under length; most topics allocated appropriate time. (0) | Presentation generally appropriate length; topics all allocated appropriate time. (1) | Pacing & timing of presentation are precise. (2) | Performance of pacing & timing adds a dimension to the presentation content. (3) |

⁶ Visual materials will vary, or indeed not be present, but might include PowerPoints (formatting, fonts, design), tables (clarity, labeling), and figures (quality, appropriateness).

Marking Criteria for Fieldwork and Lab Reports

| | Inadequate | Adequate | Fair | Good | Excellent | Outstanding | Exceptional |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | 1-19: 5 inadequate 1-5 20-29: 4 inadequate 1-5 30-39: 3 inadequate 1-5 | 40-49: Majority of 1-5 Adequate or higher | 50-59: Majority 1-5 Fair or higher | 60-69: Majority 1-5 Good or higher | 70-79: Majority 1-5 Excellent or higher | 80-89: Majority 1-5 Outstanding or higher | 90+: Majority 1-5 Exceptional |
| 1. Clarity of aims and objectives | Aims and objectives not obvious or require further explanation. | Aims and objectives reasonably clear but require multiple readings. | Aims and objectives reasonably clear from first impression. | Aims and objectives effectively communicated. | Aims and objectives thoroughly clear from first impression. | Nuanced, multiple aims and objectives clearly communicated. | Nuanced, multiple aims and objectives clear from first impression. |
| 2. Quantity and quality of data | Very limited data collection, and/or poor quality. | Data collection limited, but serviceable quality. | Data is sufficient to meet objectives and is of reasonable quality. | Data allows objective to be met. | Substantial, high quality data collection. | An impressive amount of, and quality of, data collected. | Exceptional, comprehensive, expert-level data collection. |
| 3. Clarity and appropriateness of methodology | Little familiarity with methods or serious errors in application. | Basic expression of familiarity with methods, possibly with errors in application. | Familiarity with application of appropriate methods. | Clear familiarity with application of appropriate methods. | High ability in the selection, application, & discussion of methods | Innovative selection, application, & discussion of research techniques | An expert-level discussion of research techniques. |
| 4. Use of illustrative materials | Poorly formatted or inappropriate visuals that muddle the report. | Formatting and choice of visuals often distract from report. | Formatting and choice of visuals occasionally distract from report. | Formatting and choice of visuals rarely detract from the report. | Formatting and choice of visuals are impeccable. | Formatting and choice of visuals actively contribute to the report. | Exceptional presentation with impeccable formatting and choice of visuals. |
| 5. Level of detailed knowledge | No evidence of, or largely inaccurate use of empirical data | Rudimentary knowledge of empirical aspects of topic, with inaccuracies. | Limited knowledge of empirical aspects of topic, with inaccuracies. | Sound knowledge of empirical aspects, with occasional inaccuracies. | Thorough knowledge of empirical aspects of the topic. | Impressive knowledge of empirical aspects of the topic. | Comprehensive knowledge of empirical aspects of the topic. |
| 6. Structure and presentation | Confused, rambling or repetitive structure. Poor formatting. (-3) | Structure or formatting seriously detracts from the development of argument. (-2) | Structure or formatting sometimes detracts from the development of argument. (-1) | Conventional structure; rare digressions or formatting errors occasionally mar the argument. (0) | Logical, coherent structure persuades of the author's argument. Impeccable formatting. (1) | Innovative structure and/or formatting enhances the development of argument. (2) | Highly original structure that adds substantially to the development of argument. Exceptional presentation and formatting. (3) |
| 7. Evidence of wider reading | Very limited or irrelevant reading. (-3) | Significant omissions in reading with weak grasp of literature consulted. (-2) | Evidence of relevant reading & grasp of literature consulted. (-1) | Evidence of plentiful relevant reading & sound grasp of literature. (0) | Extensive reading & thorough grasp of literature consulted. (1) | Impressive review & grasp of relevant literatures. (2) | Expert-level review & innovative synthesis suitable for a journal. (3) |

Marking Criteria for GEOG3054/4054 Independent Study Report

| | Inadequate | Adequate | Fair | Good | Excellent | Outstanding | Exceptional |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| | 1-19: 5 inadequate 1-5 20-29: 4 inadequate 1-5 30-39: 3 inadequate 1-5 | 40-49: Majority of 1-5 Adequate or higher | 50-59: Majority 1-5 Fair or higher | 60-69: Majority 1-5 Good or higher | 70-79: Majority 1-5 Excellent or higher | 80-89: Majority 1-5 Outstanding or higher | 90+: Majority 1-5 Exceptional |
| 1. Research aims & grasp of subject area | Very limited or no grasp of area. Muddled or derivative research aims. | Limited grasp of subject area. Confused or vague research aims. | Some grasp of subject area & reasonable research aims. | Sound grasp of subject area & focused, relevant research aims. | Deep grasp of subject area & originality in main research aims. | Impressive grasp of subject area & highly significant research aims. | Exceptional grasp of subject area; research aims equivalent to journal. |
| 2. Grasp of relevant issues | Misunderstanding of the issues under discussion. | Rudimentary, intermittent grasp of issues with confusions. | Reasonable grasp of the issues & their broader implications. | Sound understanding of issues, with insights into broader implications. | Thorough grasp of issues; some sophisticated insights. | Striking grasp of complexities & significance of issues. | Exceptional grasp of complexities & significance of issues. |
| 3. Reading | Very limited or irrelevant reading. | Significant omissions in reading with weak grasp of literature consulted. | Evidence of relevant reading & grasp of literature consulted. | Evidence of plentiful relevant reading & sound grasp thereof. | Extensive reading & thorough grasp of literature consulted. | Impressive review & grasp of relevant literatures. | Expert-level review & innovative synthesis suitable for a journal. |
| 4. Analysis: reflection, thought, & conceptual framework | Erroneous analysis. Misunderstanding of the basic core of materials. No conceptual material. | Basic analysis of ideas. Some concepts absent or wrongly used. | Reasonable reproduction of basic ideas. Rudimentary definition & use of concepts. | Evidence of student's own analysis. Concepts defined & used systematically & effectively. | Evidence of innovative analysis. Concepts deftly defined & used with some sense of theoretical context. | Impressive thought, insights & analysis. Concepts deftly defined & accurately used with a strong sense of context. | Exceptional thought & awareness of cutting edge. Sophisticated sense of conceptual framework in context. |
| 5. Structure & development of argument | Confused, rambling or repetitive structure leading to incoherent argument. | Poor organisation seriously detracts from the development of argument. | Structure sometimes detracts from the development of argument. | Conventional structure with rare digressions occasionally marring the argument. | Logical, coherent structure that persuades of the author's argument. | Innovative structure that enhances the development of argument. | Highly original structure that adds substantially to the development of argument. |
| 6. Writing & communication | Style & word choice seriously interfere with comprehension. (-3) | Style & word choice seriously detract from conveying of ideas. (-2) | Style & word choice sometimes detract from conveying of ideas. (-1) | Style & word choice rarely detract from conveying of ideas. (0) | Style & word choice show fluency with ideas & flashes of verve. (1) | Style & word choice enhances ideas & demonstrates verve. (2) | Reads as if professionally copy edited. (3) |
| 7. Visual aspects & references⁷ | Poorly formatted or inappropriate visuals; very limited references. (-3) | Formatting, visuals & referencing seriously distract from argument. (-2) | Formatting, visuals & referencing sometimes distract from argument. (-1) | Formatting, visuals & referencing rarely detract from argument. (0) | Formatting, visuals & referencing are impeccable. (1) | Formatting, visuals & referencing actively contribute to argument. (2) | Exceptional presentation impeccable format & references. (3) |

⁷ Visual aspects may vary but may include formatting (font consistency, headings, page numbers, bibliography), tables (clarity, labeling), and figures (quality, appropriateness).

Marking Criteria for GEOG2001 Dissertation Proposal

Ethics, risk assessment, timeline and laboratory/equipment budgets are mandatory but un-assessed.

| | Inadequate | Adequate | Fair | Good | Excellent | Outstanding | Exceptional |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| | 1-19: 5 inadequate 1-5 20-29: 4 inadequate 1-5 30-39: 3 inadequate 1-5 | 40-49: Majority of 1-5 Adequate or higher | 50-59: Majority 1-5 Fair or higher | 60-69: Majority 1-5 Good or higher | 70-79: Majority 1-5 Excellent or higher | 80-89: Majority 1-5 Outstanding or higher | 90+: Majority 1-5 Exceptional |
| 1. Intro, context and rationale for dissertation | Either no intro or intro is irrelevant/inappropriate. Significance of research is absent/irrelevant. Unrelated to Geography. | Indirect intro with an implicit or confused explanation of the significance of the project and its relation to Geography. | Reasonable intro with a basic explanation of the significance of the project and its relation to Geography. | Sound intro with an effective explanation of the significance of the project and its relation to Geography. | Highly effective intro with elements of nuance, and a convincing explanation of the significance and its relation to Geography. | Impressive intro, both nuanced and clear/concise. A compelling case for the significance of the project in relation to Geography. | Intro is highly sophisticated whilst also clear/concise. A compelling case for the significance the project in relation to Geography. |
| 2. Aims, objectives & research questions | Either no aims, objectives, research questions or they are inarticulate, inappropriate and/or irrelevant. | Aims, objectives & questions are present but show some unsystematic, illogical or unclear elements. They are not fully connected. | Aim, objectives & questions are present, but may be partial, unconnected or confused in places. | Aims, objectives & questions are sound (substantive, clear, logical, feasible and effectively connected). | Aim, objectives & questions are highly effective (sound, nuanced, thorough, ambitious). | Aim, objectives & questions show an outstanding set of ideas, marked by greater understanding of issue's complexity. | Aim, objectives & questions show an exceptional set of ideas, marked by greater understanding of the research's significance for Geography. |
| 3. Engagement with literature | Very limited or irrelevant reading. Either no attempt to assert a case for the distinctiveness or an entirely unconvincing claim for distinctiveness | Significant omissions in reading with weak understanding of literature consulted. A basic attempt made to articulate the distinctiveness of the project. | Evidence of relevant reading & some understanding of literature consulted. A plausible claim for the distinctiveness of the project. | Evidence of plentiful relevant reading & sound understanding of literature consulted. An effective claim for the distinctiveness of the project. | Extensive reading & thorough understanding of literature consulted. A convincing claim for the distinctiveness of the project within its field. | Ambitious reading & impressive understanding of literatures. Compelling case for genuinely innovative addition to an existing theme of Geography. | Expert-level review & innovative synthesis suitable for a journal. Compelling case for a genuinely original & significant contribution to Geography. |
| 4. Research design, data collection and data analysis | Fundamentally flawed (or no) research plan. Evidence of a failure to understand the concept of research. | Basic research design and plan but with some omissions or flaws that could be remedied. | Reasonable research design and plan, but with some minor omissions or flaws. | Sound research design and plan with some evidence of critical analysis of theory of method. | Effective research design and thorough plan with clear evidence of critical analysis of theory of method. | Effective design & feasible, yet distinctive & ambitious plan. Clear evidence of adv. understanding of theory of method. | Innovative research design & plan, that is also thorough & feasible, with potential to contribute to the evolution of theory of method. |
| 5. Empirical knowledge | Empirical material absent or irrelevant/inaccurate. No evidence to support claims made. | Empirical material identified is limited in quality & quantity. Claims rarely evidenced. | Some empirical material but limited in quality; not always effectively used to support claims. | Significant amount of quality empirical material used to support most claims. | Impressive, highly relevant & detailed empirical material used to evidence most claims. | Claims supported by impressive, detailed, distinctive empirics. Some reflection on data. | Comprehensive, precise, empirical treatment matched by critical reflection on data. |
| 6. Writing & communication | Style & word choice seriously interfere with comprehension. (-3) | Style & word choice seriously detract from conveying of ideas. (-2) | Style & word choice sometimes detract from conveying of ideas. (-1) | Style & word choice rarely detract from conveying of ideas. (0) | Style & word choice show fluency with ideas & flashes of verve. (1) | Style & word choice greatly enhances ideas & demonstrates verve. (2) | Reads as if professionally copy edited. (3) |
| 7. Visual aspects & references⁸ | Poorly formatted or inappropriate visuals; very limited references. (-3) | Formatting, visuals & referencing seriously distract from argument. (-2) | Formatting, visuals & referencing sometimes distract from argument. (-1) | Formatting, visuals & referencing rarely detract from argument. (0) | Formatting, visuals & referencing are impeccable. (1) | Formatting, visuals & referencing actively contribute to argument. (2) | Exceptional presentation impeccable format & references. (3) |

⁸ Visual aspects may vary but may include formatting (font consistency, headings, page numbers, bibliography), tables (clarity, labeling), and figures (quality, appropriateness).

