<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad descriptor</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Attainment</th>
<th>Analytical skills</th>
<th>Cognitive and conceptual skills</th>
<th>Professional and production qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Excellent        | A+    | Outstanding and exceptional work  
Demonstrates a significantly higher level of attainment than that expected at the stage of the programme being assessed.  
The work may read like postgraduate work. | Original and sophisticated reading of literary or filmic texts.  
Evidence of a high level and breadth of research.  
Detailed engagement with textual, contextual and theoretical knowledge.  
Shows a mastery of the available critical and theoretical tools. | Outstanding strength of argument and originality of thought.  
Evidence of publishable or near-publishable conceptual strengths | Outstanding skills of planning, preparation and organization.  
Exceptional levels of presentational skill and accuracy.  
Written with accuracy, penetration and flair.  
Accurate and precise referencing and scholarly apparatus. |
|                  | A     | Exemplary range and depth of attainment of intended learning outcomes.  
Demonstrates an uncommonly strong grasp of the text and relevant issues. | Discriminating command of a comprehensive range of relevant materials and analyses.  
Wide, adventurous critical reading.  
Sensitivity to textual detail in evidence throughout, as is the ability to relate the local picture to the bigger one.  
Demonstrates a thorough and impressive understanding and handling of the available critical and theoretical tools. | Deployment of considered judgement relating to key issues, concepts and procedures.  
Clear evidence of a rigorous and stylishly expressed argument.  
Some originality of thought and argument and strong evidence of independent thinking. | Shows excellence in skills of planning, preparation and organisation.  
Written with clarity, penetration and flair.  
Very high levels of presentational skill and accuracy.  
Accurate and precise referencing and scholarly apparatus. |
|                  | A-    | Excellent range and depth of attainment of intended learning outcomes.  
A very strong grasp of the text and/or issues by means of a cogent, coherent and well- | Discriminating command of a comprehensive range of relevant materials and analyses.  
Strong and deep critical reading. The work will be perceptive in matters of | Evidence of informed critical engagement and the ability to form independent judgements in relation to literary texts, theoretical approaches and critical | Shows excellence in skills of planning, preparation and organization.  
Demonstrates very high levels of presentational skill and accuracy.  
Accurate referencing and |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Good  | B+    | • Very good attainment of virtually all intended learning outcomes.  
• The work will demonstrate a relevant and perceptive engagement with the topic under consideration.  
• Some evidence of First-level work.  
• Able to integrate or link textual, contextual and theoretical knowledge and understanding.  
• Evidence of very sound researching and reading skills, with a depth and range of reference.  
• Convincing in its relation of the particular (textual detail) to the general (thematic concerns of the argument, or broader contexts of the question).  
• Perceptive and thoughtful analyses of texts with some signs of originality of insight, or unconventional readings.  
• A strong depth of understanding.  
• Handles and synthesises a range of ideas and shows some independent or original thinking.  
• Shows good skills of planning, preparation and organization.  
• Very good presentational skill and accuracy.  
• Accurate referencing and scholarly apparatus in evidence.  
• Written with clarity and with few errors of expression. |
| B     | Conclusive attainment of virtually all intended learning outcomes.  
• A relevant and perceptive engagement with the topic under consideration.  
• A close familiarity with a wide range of supporting evidence.  
• Evidence of very sound researching and reading skills.  
• Perceptive and thoughtful interpretation. Good level of analysis and evaluation.  
• Evidence of a clear grasp of textual, contextual and theoretical knowledge.  
• A good depth of understanding.  
• Ability to handle and synthesize a range of ideas. The work will be informed by a coherent argument.  
• There may be occasional errors of expression or gaps in the argument.  
• Shows good skills of planning, preparation and organization.  
• Demonstrates good presentational skill and accuracy.  
• Accurate referencing.  
• Fluently and clearly written.  
• There may be occasional, but not recurrent, presentational or spelling errors. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Clear attainment of most of the intended learning outcomes. A mainly sound and competent response to the question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>A circumscribed range of evidence. Less assurance in substantiating general argument by textual detail. Some sound readings of texts but may lack penetration. Less effective handling of textual, contextual and theoretical knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An appreciable depth of understanding. Some ability to handle and synthesise a range of ideas. The work will be structured by a clear argument. There may be some errors of expression or flaws in the argument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing good skills of planning, preparation and organisation. Demonstrating good presentational skill and accuracy. Accurate referencing. Written with clarity. There may be occasional, perhaps recurrent, presentational or spelling errors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>Solid attainment of virtually all intended learning outcomes. Sound and thorough engagement with the topic under consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound and thoughtful interpretation. Evidence of very sound researching and reading skills. Good level of analysis and evaluation. Some evidence of a grasp of textual, contextual and theoretical knowledge. The connections between textual detail and the broader contexts may be less apparent or less deftly handled.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An appreciable depth of understanding. Some ability to handle and synthesise a range of ideas. The work will be structured by a clear argument. There may be some errors of expression or flaws in the argument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing good skills of planning, preparation and organisation. Demonstrating good presentational skill and accuracy. Accurate referencing. Written with clarity. There may be occasional, perhaps recurrent, presentational or spelling errors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the theoretical knowledge. Convincing in its relation of the particular (textual detail) to the general (thematic concerns of the argument, or broader contexts of the question).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| C     | Clear attainment of most of the intended learning outcomes.  
The work consists of a satisfactory and competent response to the question.  
A circumscribed range of evidence.  
Less assurance in substantiating general argument by textual detail.  
Approach to the texts may mix the descriptive and analytical. Readings of texts tend to be conventional.  
A variable depth of understanding of conceptual or theoretical material in evidence.  
There may be some looseness in organising material or in sustaining a coherent argument.  
Shows reasonable planning, preparation and organisation.  
Basic presentational accuracy.  
Some evidence of researching and reading skills.  
Recurrent spelling or presentational errors.  
Inconsistent or erroneous referencing may be in evidence.  
Writing tends to be pedestrian. |
| C-    | Satisfactory attainment of most of the intended learning outcomes.  
A schematic, unadventurous or less complex response to the question.  
Struggles to substantiate general argument by textual detail.  
Approach to the texts may be more descriptive than analytical.  
Readings of texts tend to be conventional or derivative.  
The work struggles to achieve an integrated discussion.  
The work assembles relevant details without fully articulating their relevance.  
Weak or implausible argument.  
Showing some deficiencies in planning, preparation and organisation.  
Demonstrating a basic presentational accuracy but with recurrent evidence of spelling errors, lack of proofing, erroneous referencing.  
Range of reference is limited.  
Weak writing style, unclear expression. |
| Weak  | Acceptable attainment of intended learning outcomes.  
Evidence of some familiarity with the relevant primary material.  
Limited ability to apply available skills and techniques.  
A willingness to attempt the analysis of texts, albeit in a weak or conventional manner.  
Limited competence  
An attempt to grasp analytical issues and concepts, but often understanding is incomplete or erroneous.  
Weak or unclear argument.  
Some signs of planning, preparation and organization.  
Some presentational accuracy.  
Evidence of limited researching and reading skills.  
Very narrow range of |
| D+    | Limited ability to apply available skills and techniques.  
A willingness to attempt the analysis of texts, albeit in a weak or conventional manner.  
Limited competence  
An attempt to grasp analytical issues and concepts, but often understanding is incomplete or erroneous.  
Weak or unclear argument.  
Some signs of planning, preparation and organization.  
Some presentational accuracy.  
Evidence of limited researching and reading skills.  
Very narrow range of |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| D     | Acceptable attainment of intended learning outcomes.  
       | Evidence of some familiarity with the relevant primary material.  
       | Misunderstanding of the question or the work wanders significantly away from it.  
       | Answer may be significantly under-length. |
| D-    | Barely acceptable attainment of intended learning outcomes.  
       | Evidence of limited familiarity with the relevant primary material.  
       | The question is misunderstood or the work wanders |
|       | A qualified familiarity with a minimally sufficient range of relevant materials.  
       | A high degree of generalisation and insufficient evidence.  
       | Description predominates.  
       | Little in the way of secondary material or reference to broader contexts. |
|       | The level of analysis is basic and may be partly erroneous, with a marked preference for plot summary.  
       | Rudimentary grasp of the text and relevant issues and contexts. |
|       | A grasp of the analytical issues and concepts which is generally reasonable, albeit insecure.  
       | Serious deficiencies in the organisation of material, weak argument and with recurrent and serious errors of expression. |
|       | Little or no reference to secondary material and only a very partial grasp of the intellectual contents of the course. |
|       | Little or no reference to evidence.  
       | Scant sign of planning, preparation and organisation.  
       | Very limited presentational accuracy.  
       | Evidence of very limited researching and reading skills.  
       | Little or no secondary reading in evidence.  
       | Little, partial or no scholarly apparatus (referencing, bibliography) in evidence.  
       | Multiple and recurrent spelling and presentational errors.  
<pre><code>   | Unscholarly writing, often lacking in clarity. |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Attainment deficient in respect of specific intended learning outcomes.  
- Seriously deficient in terms of length and quality. | - Mixed evidence as to the depth of knowledge and weak deployment of argument.  
- Demonstrates a very simplistic or erroneous grasp of the text and relevant contexts.  
- Often inaccurate in matters of fact and description.  
- Poor interpretation.  
- Little evidence of analysis and evaluation. | - The student seems not to have read the primary material, nor to have engaged with the course as a whole.  
- Evidence of unclear and illogical thinking.  
- Inadequate range of ideas.  
- Unable to develop relevant lines of argument. |
| - Attainment of intended learning outcomes appreciably deficient in critical respects.  
- The work is very short, simplistic and erroneous in whole or substantial parts. | - Lacking secure basis in relevant factual and analytical dimensions. | - Barely any evidence of genuine engagement with the material in question and the course as a whole.  
- No obvious skills of argument. |
| - Reading in evidence.  
- Little, partial or no scholarly apparatus (referencing, bibliography).  
- Multiple and recurrent spelling and presentational errors.  
- Writing may be unclear or confused. | - Very limited signs of planning, preparation and organisation.  
- Little presentational accuracy.  
- Evidence of very limited researching and reading skills.  
- Multiple and recurrent spelling and presentational errors.  
- Writing unclear or confused. | - Very limited signs of planning, preparation and organisation.  
- Little presentational accuracy.  
- Evidence of very limited researching and reading skills.  
- Multiple and recurrent spelling and presentational errors.  
- Writing unclear or confused. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attainment of intended learning outcomes appreciably deficient in respect of nearly all intended learning outcomes.</td>
<td>Irrelevant use of materials and incomplete and flawed explanation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Showing no grasp of the subject.</td>
<td>Regularly inaccurate in matters of fact and description.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hardly any evidence of a grasp of textual, or other knowledge.</td>
<td>Completely incompetent interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poorly written and often inaccurate.</td>
<td>Unclear, confused, illogical and incoherent thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No convincing signs of planning, preparation or organisation.</td>
<td>Very basic ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No obvious researching or reading skills.</td>
<td>No skills of argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very poorly written and largely inaccurate.</td>
<td>No convincing signs of planning, preparation and organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>No convincing evidence of attainment of any intended learning outcomes.</td>
<td>Treatment of the subject is directionless and fragmentary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No grasp of the requirements of undergraduate study.</td>
<td>No evidence of analysis and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No obvious researching or reading skills.</td>
<td>Completely or mostly irrelevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very poorly written and mainly inaccurate.</td>
<td>No skills of argument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>