

### Marking Criteria: Essays and Exams

Criterion	1 <sup>st</sup>	2.1	2.2	3 <sup>rd</sup>	Fail
relevance to the question	precise grasp of the question or topic, addresses it directly and keeps it in focus throughout	shows a sound understanding of the question or topic and tackles it effectively	shows an adequate understanding of the question or topic and shows reasonable competence in addressing it, but prone to stray from the point or lose focus	reveals an inadequate understanding of the question or topic and proves less than competent in addressing it and keeping it in focus	shows little or no understanding of the question or topic and either fails to address it at all or provides an irrelevant answer
knowledge of the texts	displays a detailed, accurate knowledge of the texts under discussion, including apt and exact quotations	displays a solid knowledge of the texts under discussion and quotes them accurately	displays basic knowledge of the texts under discussion and can quote them, though not always aptly or accurately	displays insufficient knowledge of the texts under discussion, quoting them only occasionally and seldom accurately	displays minimal or no knowledge of the texts under discussion and every sign of not having prepared for the assignment
analysis and interpretation of texts	develops an original approach to the material by questioning established views and advancing a fresh analysis or interpretation	provides a complex account of the material, demonstrates superior powers of analysis and interpretation	delivers an acceptable account of the material which demonstrates effective powers of analysis and interpretation, but does not do justice to the complexity of the issues	delivers a rudimentary or incomplete account of the material, which betrays poorly developed powers of analysis and interpretation	betrays few signs of competence in the analysis and interpretation of texts
presentation of argument	demonstrates an ability to construct an exceptionally lucid and cogent argument, anchored in concisely adduced textual evidence	exhibits an ability to construct a clear argument backed up by relevant textual evidence	constructs arguments that fall short of full clarity and coherence and are not sufficiently supported by textual evidence	constructs arguments which tend to be muddled and incoherent, and which are rarely substantiated by textual evidence	fails to construct an organised, consecutive argument supported by appropriate textual evidence
critical engagement	Engages intelligently and questioningly with a broad range of secondary reading (critical or theoretical)	Brings relevant secondary reading (critical or theoretical) to bear on the literature under discussion	demonstrates limited evidence, understanding or questioning of relevant secondary reading (critical or theoretical)	little evidence of relevant secondary reading (critical or theoretical)	no evidence of secondary reading (critical or theoretical)
use of language	reveals an advanced command of the language by expressing ideas in clear, fluent and stylish prose, by using appropriate critical terms precisely, and by exhibiting an expert grasp of the rules of grammar, spelling and punctuation	reveals a sure command of the language by expressing ideas in lucid prose, by using appropriate critical terms properly, and by evincing a firm grasp of the rules of grammar, spelling and punctuation	reveals a fair but limited command of the language by expressing ideas with occasional clumsiness, by using appropriate critical terms imprecisely or not at all, and by evincing an imperfect grasp of the rules of grammar, spelling and punctuation	expresses ideas with habitual clumsiness and lack of clarity; uses appropriate critical terms incorrectly or not at all; and shows weak grasp of the rules of grammar, spelling and punctuation	fails to articulate ideas clearly and coherently; displays a general ignorance of critical terminology, and fails to demonstrate a basic grasp of the rules of grammar, spelling and punctuation

**Marking Criteria: Assessed Presentations**

Criterion	1 <sup>st</sup>	2.1	2.2	3 <sup>rd</sup>	Fail
Relevance to Topic	Topic addressed directly, with originality and/ or creativity;	Topic addressed clearly and comprehensively	topic addressed adequately, but may lose focus or stray off-topic	Topic not addressed clearly, or presentation irrelevant in places	Fails to address topic
Content and evidence of research	develops an original approach to the material by questioning established views and advancing a fresh analysis or interpretation	Demonstrates a thorough and competent knowledge, but may synthesise rather than question established views (lack of originality)	Delivers an acceptable account of the material, but may be descriptive, rather than critical	Rudimentary or incomplete, insufficiently supported by evidence	Delivers an incoherent presentation or fails to demonstrate research or knowledge of subject
Structure and Timing	Original and creative structure that is clearly signposted and easy to follow; Within allocated time; well-paced and balanced	structure clearly signposted and easy to follow; Within allocated time; well-paced and balanced	structure may lose focus in places; may be slightly over or under time (within 10%) or may have problems with the pacing and/or balance	structure loses focus; evidence of timing problems, or serious problems with the pacing and/or balance of material	Structure lacking; presentation more than 10% over time limit; and/or complete lack of balance
Audibility, use of voice, body language	Excellent audibility, tone, fluency, and enunciation; speaker has rapport with audience; and works effortlessly with with script or audio-visual aids.	Very good audibility, tone, fluency, and enunciation; speaker has attention of audience; and works well with with script or audio-visual aids.	Adequate audibility, tone, fluency, and enunciation; speaker may lose audience attention in places; and may have some problems with with script or audio-visual aids.	Poor audibility; monotone delivery, lack of fluency, and/or failure of eye contact; speaker loses the audience's attention; problems with with script or audio-visual aids.	Inaudible and/or incomprehensible; audience clearly disengaged; serious problems with with script or audio-visual aids.
Use of audio-visual aids	Creative and engaging; instructive and thorough; properly formatted	Appropriate, instructive and thorough; properly formatted	Largely relevant and properly formatted	Poorly constructed, not always relevant, and/or hard to follow	Required materials absent, incomprehensible or plagiarised

**Marking Criteria: Creative Writing**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Class</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>	<b>Fail</b>
<b>Creativity &amp; Originality</b>	High quality of creativity and originality	Shows creativity and originality	Effort has gone into developing a set of creative ideas	May demonstrate an incomplete grasp of the task and will show only intermittent signs of originality and creative intelligence; no overall sense of creative coherence	Shows very limited ability to recognise the issues represented by the brief; shows a clear inability or unwillingness to make the required effort
<b>Medium &amp; Form/ Contextualisation</b>	Demonstrates a clear understanding of the medium and form in which it is working. Situates itself confidently and clearly alongside other work in the same form/style and may engage that work and that form/style in creative dialogue	Work has a clear relation to other work in the same form, style or genre	The form, style and mode of language have been chosen intelligently and with sensitivity; however, the work may seem uncertainly located among other work in a similar style, form, or genre	Signs that the writer is not familiar with much other work in the same form and style.	Demonstrates little or no understanding of other work in the same form, style or genre.
<b>Use of Language</b>	Use of language is precise, sophisticated and imaginatively rich	Evidence of insight into language, even if those insights are not consistently translated into creative achievements	Moments of confidence and power in the language use, even if this is not consistently achieved throughout the work	Shows signs of having been rushed hindering consideration of language	Shows little sign that the language has been chosen and organized with thought and care
<b>Audience</b>	Demonstrates sophisticated and sustained understanding of audience and readership	Audience for piece will be clearly identified	Consideration of audience may falter or is not pursued with sufficient rigour	Audience not considered with sufficient depth or subtlety	Audience considered inadequately or not at all
<b>Emotional &amp; Intellectual Complexity</b>	Shows evidence of emotional and intellectual complexity	Shows richness in the ideas and/or emotionality of the work. It may demonstrate a high level of ambition, though this may not be fully realized; alternatively, the work may achieve an impressive technical level though the imaginative reach may be limited	Signs of emotional richness, and the ideas will have a level of complexity, though this may be intermittent and not tied securely in the structure of the work	Demonstrates an inappropriately low level of ambition and the ideas and emotional texture may be superficial	Ideas will be incoherent and the emotional level of the work may be disorganized and empty
<b>Writing Style</b>	Displays a distinctive personal style, handled with confidence and control	Demonstrates clear signs of the writer's individual style	Shows little evidence of an individual style, but is free from technical error and reveals some skill or insight	May show some or all of the following: clear technical errors; evidence of being rushed; poor engagement with advice and feedback; errors of proofreading	Displays considerable errors of presentation, signs of the work being incomplete or produced in haste; advice and feedback ignored.