

COMMON GRADING SCHEME (Research Projects)

The Common Grading Scheme (CGS) applies to all courses, except where published Assessment & Award Regulations incorporate the 10-point scheme.

This is the marking scheme for individual pieces of work and not the degree classification scheme. The latter is calculated through the aggregation of marks from the full range of assessments undertaken by a candidate.

Each mark has a short descriptor and a full definition of what is to be expected of an answer that is assigned that mark. For the more commonly used grades, there is a core descriptor of the essential grade (e.g. upper second) and enhancer/detractor points which would place the mark in the 'high' or 'low' range of the 'class'. Only those percentages that appear with descriptors in the marking scheme are to be used; percentages that fall between these **must not** be used.

Application of the Scheme

The descriptors indicate how marks should be allocated according to the standard of a piece of work in three different categories; "selection and coverage of material", "understanding" and "structure, clarity and presentation". Where an answer comprises entirely or almost entirely incorrect information, no credit will be given for Structure, Clarity and Presentation.

If you are giving borderline pass/fail mark (35 or 42 for BSc, 48 or 52 for BVM/ VN/ MSc/ CertAVP), you must give a clear definition, or a descriptor must be provided. The definition or descriptor should also be appropriate for the question, and it should be justified via feedback.

Descriptor	Research Project Reports	Mark	BSc Class	BVM/VN/MSc/ CertAVP Grade
No Answer	<p>Selection & Coverage of Material Nothing presented and/or completely incorrect information and/or containing nothing at all of relevance.</p> <p>and / or</p> <p>Understanding None evident.</p> <p>and / or</p> <p>Structure, Clarity & Presentation None or extremely poor.</p>	0	Fail	Fail
Extremely Poor Answer	<p>Selection & Coverage of Material Hardly any information or information that is almost entirely incorrect and/or irrelevant.</p> <p>and / or</p> <p>Understanding No or almost no understanding evident.</p> <p>and / or</p> <p>Structure, Clarity & Presentation None or very poor.</p>	15	Fail	Fail
Very Poor Answer	<p>Selection & Coverage of Material Very limited amount of information that is correct and relevant.</p> <p>and / or</p> <p>Understanding If any, extremely limited evidence of understanding.</p> <p>and / or</p> <p>Structure, Clarity & Presentation Very poor.</p>	27	Fail	Fail
Poor Answer	<p>Selection & Coverage of Material Incomplete and/or inaccurate account of task with inadequate description of aims and methods of practical work and containing significant, and/or a large number of, errors.</p> <p>and / or</p> <p>Understanding If any, very limited evidence of understanding with many unexplained observations and/or assertions likely. Little or no evidence of original/innovative thinking. Very limited reference to published work from authoritative sources.</p> <p>and / or</p> <p>Structure, Clarity & Presentation Poor.</p>	35	Fail	Fail
Clearly Deficient Answer	<p><i>As for 45 but with a greater number, and/or more significant, omissions/inaccuracies/errors, flaws in understanding, interpretation, presentation and/or communication of information.</i></p>	42	Third	Fail

Descriptor	Research Project Reports	Mark	BSc Class	BVM/VN/MSc/ CertAVP Grade
Deficient Answer	<p>Selection & Coverage of Material Superficial coverage with incomplete record of aims and methods of practical work and flawed by errors and/or omissions. Little comment on most observations.</p> <p>and / or</p> <p>Understanding Likely to be inaccuracies in data analysis and/or interpretation and unexplained observations or assertions. Little or no evidence of original/innovative thought. Very limited reference to published work from authoritative sources.</p> <p>and / or</p> <p>Structure, Clarity & Presentation Adequate, although may not be entirely systematic.</p>	45	Third	Fail
Marginally Deficient Answer	<i>As for 45 but with fewer, and/or less significant, omissions/inaccuracies/errors, flaws in understanding, interpretation, presentation and/or communication of information.</i>	48	Third	Fail
Adequate Answer	<i>As for 55 but with more numerous, and/or more significant, omissions/inaccuracies/errors, flaws in understanding, interpretation, presentation and/or communication of information.</i>	52	2:ii	Pass
Sound Answer	<p>Selection & Coverage of Material Systematic account of task with adequate record of aims and methods of practical work and no significant errors, omissions or inaccuracies. Appropriate speculation, if present, is likely to be unsubstantiated.</p> <p>Understanding Limited evidence of original/innovative thought. Sufficient reference to published work from authoritative sources. Data are largely accurate but there may be some unexplained observations or assertions.</p> <p>Structure, Clarity & Presentation Reasonably well-organised and logically presented with adequate clarity of expression.</p>	55	2:ii	Pass
Very Sound Answer	<i>As for 55 but with fewer, and/or less significant, omissions/inaccuracies/errors and more evidence of critical ability and/or powers of argument and clarity of expression.</i>	58	2:ii	Pass
Quite Good Answer	<i>As for 65 but with less evidence of critical judgement and more, or more important, omissions/ inaccuracies/errors. There is likely to be less evidence of wider reading through reference to published work from authoritative sources.</i>	62	2:i	Pass

Descriptor	Research Project Reports	Mark	BSc Class	BVM/VN/MSc/ CertAVP Grade
Good Answer	<p>Selection & Coverage of Material Systematic and accurate account of task with full record of aims and methods of practical work and no significant errors or omissions. Some speculation, where appropriate, but may not be fully supported.</p> <p>Understanding Thorough grasp of concepts with reasonable comment on all observations with few unexplained findings or assertions. Some evidence of original/innovative thinking. Appropriate reference to published work from authoritative sources. Data manipulated and analysed correctly.</p> <p>Structure, Clarity & Presentation Logical and well-organised account with clarity of expression.</p>	65	2:i	Merit
Very Good Answer	<i>As for 65 but with more evidence of critical judgement and fewer and/or less significant omissions/inaccuracies/errors. There is likely to be more evidence of wider reading through reference to published work from authoritative sources.</i>	68	2:i	Merit
Extremely Good Answer	<p>Selection & Coverage of Material Full and accurate account of task, aims and methods of practical work with few errors and/or omissions and none of significance. Where appropriate, sensible speculation, supported by evidence.</p> <p>Understanding Thorough grasp of concepts with some critical and/or comparative comment on all observations. Clear evidence of original/innovative thinking. Published work from authoritative sources used extensively and appropriately. Data manipulated and analysed correctly.</p> <p>Structure, Clarity & Presentation Very well-organised.</p>	75	First	Distinction
Excellent Answer	<i>As for 75 but demonstrating an authoritative grasp of concepts with sustained powers of argument, frequent insights and much evidence of original/innovative thinking. Virtually no errors or omissions and none of significance.</i>	82	First	Distinction
Outstanding Answer	<i>As for 82 but with strong evidence of original/innovative thinking throughout and no omissions or factual errors. Would be of publishable standard with only minor modifications to content.</i>	90	First	Distinction
Exceptional Answer	<p>Selection & Coverage of Material Exceptional depth of coverage with no identifiable errors or omissions.</p> <p>Understanding Exceptional powers of analysis, argument, synthesis and insight.</p> <p>Structure, Clarity & Presentation Flawless. Of publishable standard with only amendments in style/formatting required.</p>	100	First	Distinction