

## Marking Criteria for QV31 English & History (SEL2218 + SEL3377) INTERDISCIPLINARY ESSAYS:

As you are working across two subjects and are trained to work as historians and as literary scholars, you will be exposed to a number of common and differing approaches to sources, close-readings, critical analysis and research literatures. You are welcome to fuse the two in any given assessment, including your second-year research project and final dissertation, but you are by no means required to do so. Your work may reflect a more pronounced engagement with English or History depending on your intellectual interests, although we hope that exposure to both will inform your thinking throughout your three years.

General Description	Mark	Criteria
<b>FIRST</b> Work in this range distinguishes itself from the upper second band by its maturity, consistent display of high-level critical thinking and breadth and depth of knowledge about the subject material. It will have an elegantly structured argument, demonstrate reading beyond course material, be polished and fluent, and demonstrate a strong command over discipline-specific knowledge.	<b>90 -100</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows all the qualities of first class work, performed to an exceptional standard in most areas and is of publishable or near publishable standard.</li> <li>Redefines the terms of critical debate, develops innovative methodologies, or contributes significant new knowledge to the research field</li> <li>An authoritative and insightful argument, outstanding and comprehensive understanding, executed with a high level of skill and polish.</li> </ul>
	<b>80 – 89</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Displays qualities of postgraduate work</li> <li>Engages persuasively with critical debate and establishes a clear independent position</li> <li>An ambitious and well-supported argument, demonstrating striking critical insight written in a clear and persuasive style.</li> </ul>
	<b>70 - 79</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sophisticated understanding of the research area with a highly competent and comprehensive knowledge of the primary and secondary materials and key critical issues</li> <li>A skilfully executed argument which makes use of a wide range of evidence and displays sustained critical independence, cogent analysis, and/or advanced data analysis skills, expressed in lucid and sophisticated prose.</li> </ul>
<b>UPPER SECOND</b> Work in this range shows strong knowledge of the subject ranging beyond the module material. It will show competence in academic style and command of discipline-specific vocabulary. It will have evidence of critical thinking but will demonstrate some issues of thought, style, and/or expression. It will demonstrate breadth of knowledge but lack some depth, or vice versa. This work distinguishes itself from the lower second band by its independence and its persuasive level of competence.	<b>60 – 69</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed and secure knowledge of primary/secondary materials and key critical issues or of relevant theories and methods</li> <li>Evidence of independence of thought and an effort to engage with critical complexities, particularly in the top range of the band</li> <li>A clear, persuasive, structured argument that is effectively supported with carefully chosen evidence or data.</li> </ul>
<b>LOWER SECOND</b> Work in this range shows adequate knowledge of the subject and some ability to think beyond the module but relies substantially on module material. It will show an uneven command of academic style and discipline-specific vocabulary. Work will show some level of analytical thinking, though it will lack polish and independence and may present problems of style and expression that affect the communication of the argument. This work distinguishes itself from the third band by its degree of accuracy.	<b>50 – 59</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Basic knowledge of primary/secondary materials and key critical issues with some errors of understanding and of fact</li> <li>An identifiable argument, supported with appropriate evidence, but may be too general, unevenly developed, more descriptive than analytical, or evidence gaps in logic or reason, especially at the lower end of the band</li> <li>Work may lack independence, be too heavily reliant on module material and/or secondary sources</li> </ul>
<b>THIRD</b> Work in this range shows some basic or limited knowledge of the subject and module material. It will show a flawed or limited command of academic style and discipline-specific vocabulary. There may be some effort to present an argument. This work distinguishes itself from a marginal fail in terms of the degree of knowledge and its demonstration of a very basic level of competence.	<b>40 – 49</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partial knowledge of primary materials or theories, with highly limited or inaccurate knowledge of secondary materials and key critical issues</li> <li>An argument that may not be fully coherent, may not sustain focus on the question posed, may lack structure, or uses primary/secondary material inappropriately or inaccurately</li> <li>Work may be largely descriptive with oversimplified analysis of the material</li> </ul>
<b>MARGINAL FAIL</b> Work in this range shows insufficient or flawed knowledge of the subject and module material, falling short of basic competence. There will be many factual errors and omissions. It will show little to no command of academic style and discipline-specific vocabulary. The work distinguishes itself from a fail by showing some knowledge and effort, even if it is highly limited.	<b>35 – 39</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highly limited or partially erroneous knowledge of the primary materials with little to no sense of secondary materials or key critical issues</li> <li>A response that relies on opinion or unsupported assertion, rather than argument</li> <li>Work lacks coherence, structure, and/or focus</li> </ul>
<b>FAIL</b> Work in this range is incomplete and/or shows lack of knowledge of the subject and incompetence in handling of material. There are likely to be significant factual errors and omissions. It will show a very poor standard of academic style and will be largely incoherent	<b>0 – 34</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of understanding of primary/secondary materials and key critical issues</li> <li>Minimal effort and understanding, containing serious errors</li> <li>May violate rubrics and appropriate academic standards.</li> </ul>