**CRIMINOLOGY**

Classification of Examinations and Assessed Assignments (written) for Undergraduate Degrees: Marking Criteria

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Part One Level 4 | Part Two Level 5 | | Part Two Level 6 | |
|  | All levels | Outstanding answer, well written, highly structured & informed, showing striking personal insight and originality | | | | |
|  | Knowledge and Understanding | Full understanding of the relevant theory and issues demonstrating, for example, originality and comprehensive understanding of the knowledge base. No errors or omissions. | | Full understanding of the relevant theory and issues demonstrating, for example, originality and comprehensive understanding of the knowledge base. No errors or omissions. | | Full understanding of the relevant theory and issues demonstrating, for example, originality and comprehensive understanding of the knowledge base. No errors or omissions. Work of publishable quality. Exceptional, comprehensive, thorough in treatment. |
| First  Exceptional |  |  | |  | |  |
|  |  | |  | |  |
| 90-100 | Application, argument and critical analysis | Exceptional demonstration of the use of theory to develop sophisticated arguments. Extensive range of academically robust sources used critically in evidencing discussions, well in excess of expected requirements. | | Exceptional demonstration of the use of theory to develop sophisticated critical arguments. Extensive range of academically robust sources used critically (including insightful critique of research methodology) in evidencing discussions, well in excess of expected requirements; insightful and of outstanding quality. | | Exceptional demonstration of the use of theory to develop sophisticated, flawless and novel critical arguments. Extensive range of academically robust sources used critically (including comprehensive and insightful critique of research methodology) in evidencing discussions, well in excess of expected requirements; insightful and of outstanding quality. |
|  | Structure & Presentation | Excellently structured, focused and well-written presentation. Excellent Harvard referencing with a very well‐presented reference list (if applicable; in exams no significant missing citations and further information in reference list). Flawless use of grammar, spelling and language conventions. | | Excellently structured, focused and well-written presentation. Excellent Harvard referencing with a very well‐presented reference list (if applicable; in exams no missing citations and further information in reference list). Flawless use of grammar, spelling and language conventions. | | Flawlessly structured, focused and well-written presentation. Flawless Harvard referencing with a perfectly presented reference list (if applicable; in exams no missing citations and further accurate information in reference list). Flawless use of grammar, spelling and language conventions. |
|  | All levels | Highly thoughtful answer informed by wider reading, showing clarity of thought, personal insight and originality | | | | |
|  | Knowledge and Understanding | Thorough knowledge and in-depth understanding of theory, and related issues. No significant errors or omissions. | | Thorough knowledge and in-depth understanding of theory, and related issues, with sophisticated insight. No significant errors or omissions. | | Thorough knowledge and in-depth understanding of theory, and related issues, with some originality in content and sophisticated insight. No errors or omissions. |
| First  Outstanding  80-89 | Application, argument and critical analysis | Excellent demonstration of the use of theory to develop sophisticated arguments. Wide range of sources used and applied in a focused and critical manner. Outstanding demonstration critical thinking, with a degree of autonomy/exploration clearly exceeding recommended reading. | | Outstanding demonstration of the use of theory to develop sophisticated critical arguments. Wide range of sources used and applied in a focused and critical manner (including critique of research methodology). Outstanding demonstration critical thinking, with a degree of autonomy/exploration clearly exceeding recommended reading. | | Outstanding demonstration of the use of theory to develop sophisticated critical arguments. Wide range of sources used and applied in a focused and critical manner (including insightful critique of research methodology). Outstanding demonstration critical thinking, with a degree of autonomy/exploration clearly exceeding recommended reading. |
|  | Structure& Presentation | Clear and fluent academic writing style. Very well focused and structured. Excellent Harvard referencing with a very well‐presented reference list (if applicable; in exams all major citations included). Excellent use of grammar, spelling and language conventions. | | Very clear and fluent academic writing style. Very well focused and structured. Excellent Harvard referencing with a correctly presented reference list (if applicable; in exams no significant citations missing). Excellent use of grammar, spelling and language conventions. | | Very clear and fluent academic writing style. Very well focused and structured. Excellent Harvard referencing with a perfectly presented reference list (if applicable; in exams no significant citations missing). Excellent use of grammar, spelling and language conventions throughout. |
| First  Excellent  70-79 | All levels | Thoughtful answer informed by wider reading showing clarity of thought and personal insight | | | | |
| Knowledge and Understanding | Demonstration of a thorough knowledge and understanding of relevant theory. No significant errors or omissions. | | Demonstration of a very thorough knowledge and understanding of relevant theory, with clear insight. No significant errors or omissions. | | Demonstration of an excellent and thorough knowledge and understanding of relevant theory, with clear insight. No significant errors or omissions. |
| Application, argument and critical analysis | Very good demonstration of the use of theory to develop sophisticated arguments. A comprehensive range, beyond recommended reading, of relevant literature/evidence used and applied in a focused and critical manner. Very good demonstration of critical thinking. | | Excellent demonstration of the use of theory to develop sophisticated arguments. A comprehensive range, beyond recommended reading, of relevant literature/evidence used and applied in a focused and critical manner (including some critique of research methodology). Very good demonstration of critical thinking. | | Excellent demonstration of the use of theory to develop sophisticated arguments. A comprehensive range, beyond recommended reading, of relevant literature/evidence used and applied in a focused and critical manner (including critique of research methodology). Excellent demonstration of critical thinking. |
| Structure& Presentation | Clear and logical presentation. Excellent Harvard referencing with a well‐presented reference list (if applicable; in exams major citations included). Very good use of grammar, spelling and language conventions. | | Very clear and logical presentation. Excellent Harvard referencing with a correctly presented reference list (if applicable; in exams major citations included). Very good use of grammar, spelling and language conventions. | | Very clear and logical presentation. Excellent Harvard referencing with a correctly presented reference list (if applicable; in exams major citations accurately included). Excellent use of grammar, spelling and language conventions. |
| Upper 2nd  Good  60 - 69 | All Levels | Good understanding with a coherent and logical argument | | | | |
| Knowledge and Understanding | Good knowledge and understanding of the relevant theory and related issues demonstrated. May contain minor inaccuracies, irrelevancies or omissions. | | Good knowledge and understanding of the relevant theory and related issues demonstrated. May contain one or two minor inaccuracies, irrelevancies or omissions. | | Generally very good knowledge and understanding of the relevant theory and related issues demonstrated. May contain one or two very minor inaccuracies, irrelevancies or omissions. |
| Application, argument and critical analysis | Good demonstration of the use of theory to develop persuasive arguments. Good use of relevant literature. Demonstration of some level of critical thinking, with consistent self-direction; effective use of key and recommended reading. | | Good demonstration of the use of theory to develop persuasive and critical arguments. Good use of relevant literature. Demonstration of some level of critical thinking, with consistent self-direction; effective use of key and recommended reading. | | Good demonstration of the use of theory to develop persuasive and critical arguments. Good use of relevant academically robust literature (including some critique of research methodology). Demonstration of critical thinking, with consistent self-direction; very effective use of key and recommended reading. |
| Structure& Presentation | Coherent and well-organised presentation. Good, largely accurate Harvard referencing, but reference list may be slightly disorganised or contain one or two minor errors (if applicable; in exams, most major citations included). Good use of grammar, spelling and language conventions. | | Coherent and well-organised presentation. Good, largely accurate Harvard referencing, but reference list may be slightly disorganised or contain one or two minor errors (if applicable; in exams, major citations included). Good use of grammar, spelling and language conventions. | | Coherent and well-organised presentation. Good, largely accurate Harvard referencing, but reference list may be slightly disorganised or contain one or two minor errors (if applicable; in exams, major citations included). Good use of grammar, spelling and language conventions. |
| Lower 2nd  Satisfactory  50 - 59 | All Levels | Satisfactory understanding demonstrated with some analysis | | | | |
| Knowledge and Understanding | Reasonable knowledge and understanding demonstrated of the relevant theory and related issues. Some inaccuracies, irrelevances or omissions. | | Reasonable knowledge and understanding demonstrated of the relevant theory and related issues. Some minor inaccuracies, irrelevances or omissions. | | Reasonable knowledge and understanding demonstrated of the relevant theory and related issues. Some very minor inaccuracies, irrelevances or omissions. |
| Application, argument and critical analysis | Satisfactory development of discussion applying theory, but largely descriptive in nature. Use of appropriate reading, with attempts made to use these to evidence discussions. | | Satisfactory development of discussion applying theory, with some basic critical content, but largely descriptive in nature. Use of appropriate reading, with attempts made to use these to evidence discussions. | | Satisfactory development of discussion applying theory, with some critical content, but largely descriptive in nature. Use of appropriate reading, with attempts made to use these to evidence discussions. |
| Structure& Presentation | Acceptable structure. Satisfactory Harvard referencing, but reference list not complete and contains errors (if applicable; in exams some major citations included). Reasonable use of grammar, spelling and language conventions, but may contain some errors and lack of fluency. | | Acceptable structure. Satisfactory Harvard referencing, but reference list not complete and contains some errors (if applicable; in exams some major citations included). Reasonably good use of grammar, spelling and language conventions, but may contain some errors and lack of fluency. | | Acceptable and logical structure. Satisfactory Harvard referencing, but reference list may be incomplete and contains some errors (if applicable; in exams some major citations included). Reasonably good use of grammar, spelling and language conventions; may contain some errors and lack of fluency. |
| Third  Basic  40 - 49 | All Levels | Basic understanding demonstrated | | | | |
| Knowledge and Understanding | Basic, often imprecise knowledge and understanding of theory demonstrated. A partial and superficial coverage of the key issues. A response demonstrating an understanding of basic points and principles sufficient to show that some of learning outcomes/assessment criteria have been achieved at a basic level. | | Basic and general level of knowledge and understanding of theory demonstrated. A partial and rather superficial coverage of the key issues. A response demonstrating an understanding of basic points and principles sufficient to show that some of learning outcomes/assessment criteria have been achieved at a basic level. | | General level of knowledge and understanding of theory demonstrated. A partial and superficial coverage of the key issues. A response demonstrating an understanding of basic points and principles sufficient to show that some of learning outcomes/assessment criteria have been achieved. |
| Application, argument and critical analysis | Sparse coverage of relevant theory and basic demonstration of attempt to use references to evidence discussions. Little to no critical thought and discussion. Low quality in a number of areas. Contains a number of significant inaccuracies, irrelevances and/or omissions. | | Sparse coverage of relevant theory and some attempt to use references to evidence discussions. Little critical thought and discussion. Low quality in a number of areas. Contains a number of significant inaccuracies, irrelevances and/or omissions. | | Sparse coverage of relevant theory and some use of referencing to evidence discussions. Little critical thought and discussion. Low quality in a number of areas. May contain a number of significant inaccuracies, irrelevances and/or omissions. |
| Structure& Presentation | Some difficulty with structure. Some disorganised sections. Poor Harvard referencing with inadequate reference list (if applicable; in exams virtually no citations). Sources could include inappropriate materials (e.g. unspecified website articles). Although still comprehensible the work displays very poor use of grammar, spelling and language conventions. | | Some difficulty with structure. Some disorganised sections. Poor Harvard referencing with inadequate reference list (if applicable; in exams, very few citations). Sources could include inappropriate materials (e.g. unspecified website articles). Although still comprehensible the work displays poor use of grammar, spelling and language conventions. | | Some lack of clarity with structure, leading to some disorganised sections. Poor Harvard referencing with inadequate reference list (if applicable; in exams, few citations). Sources could include inappropriate materials (e.g. unspecified website articles). Although still comprehensible the work displays poor use of grammar, spelling and language conventions. |
| Fail  Marginal Fail  30 – 39 | All Levels | Limited understanding demonstrated. | | | | |
| Knowledge and Understanding | Very inadequate response to the question set. Very inadequate demonstration of knowledge of theory, with significant errors in understanding. There may be a failure to address the question set, insignificant or no argument, little relevant information included, and/or errors in matters of fact and interpretation. | | Inadequate response to the question set. Inadequate demonstration of knowledge of theory, with significant errors in understanding. There may be a failure to address the question set, insignificant or no argument, little relevant information included, and/or errors in matters of fact and interpretation. | | Inadequate response to the question set. Inadequate demonstration of knowledge and understanding of theory. There may be a failure to address the question set, insignificant or no argument, little relevant information included, and/or errors in matters of fact and interpretation. |
| Application, argument and critical analysis | Very poor levels of discussions, which might be of such a surface level that no depth is demonstrated. No critical thinking demonstrated at all. No use of referencing. | | Very poor levels of discussions, which might be of such a surface level that little to no depth is demonstrated. No critical thinking demonstrated. Virtually no use of referencing. | | Very poor levels of discussions, which might be of such a surface level that little to no depth is demonstrated. No critical thinking demonstrated. Virtually no accurate or relevant use of referencing. |
| Structure & Presentation | Disorganised/unclear structure. Lacks any logical order, structure not apparent. Work is barely comprehensible due to very poor phraseology, and use of grammar, spelling and language conventions. No Harvard referencing. | | Disorganised/unclear structure. Lacks logical order, structure not apparent. Work is barely comprehensible due to very poor phraseology, and use of grammar, spelling and language conventions. Virtually no (or extremely poor) Harvard referencing (where applicable; in exams, no citations used, or those used were erroneous). | | Disorganised/unclear structure. Lacks logical order, structure not apparent. Work is barely comprehensible due to very poor phraseology, and use of grammar, spelling and language conventions. Virtually no (or extremely poor) Harvard referencing (where applicable; in exams, no citations used, or those used were either erroneous or irrelevant). |
| Fail  Clear Fail  1- 29 | All Levels | Little, inadequate understanding demonstrated | | | | |
| Understanding | No demonstration of any relevant knowledge or understanding. Work is mainly inaccurate or meaning is very unclear. No meaningful response to the question. Contains no relevant information. Work may be so short as to be insufficient to demonstrate enough knowledge. | | Work is mainly inaccurate or meaning is unclear. No meaningful response to the question. Contains no relevant information. Work may be so short as to be insufficient to demonstrate enough knowledge. | | Work is mainly inaccurate or meaning is unclear. No meaningful response to the question. Contains virtually no relevant information. Work may be so short as to be insufficient to demonstrate enough knowledge. |
| Application, argument and critical analysis | No relevant or comprehensible arguments created. No critical insight at all. No serious attempt to carry out the task assigned. No use of any external sources (complete lack of referencing). | | No relevant or comprehensible arguments created. No critical insight at all. No serious attempt to carry out the task assigned. No use of any external sources (complete lack of referencing). | | No relevant or comprehensible arguments created. No critical insight at all. No serious attempt to carry out the task assigned. No use of any external sources (complete lack of referencing). |
| Structure & Presentation | Has no structure at all. Impossible to understand due to poor use of language, spelling and language conventions. No Harvard referencing (where applicable). | | Has a weak structure/no structure at all. Very hard/impossible to understand due to poor use of language, spelling and language conventions. No Harvard referencing (where applicable). | | Has a weak or illogical structure. Very hard/impossible to understand due to poor use of language, spelling and language conventions. No Harvard referencing (where applicable). |
| Fail  Clear Fail  Fail 0 | All Levels |  | | | | |
| Procedures and Policies | A mark of zero may for example be awarded in accordance with penalties for late submission for which no special dispensation has been made or where submitted work is deemed to be of no academic merit, as a penalty in some misconduct cases. | | A mark of zero may for example be awarded in accordance with penalties for late submission for which no special dispensation has been made or where submitted work is deemed to be of no academic merit, as a penalty in some misconduct cases. | | A mark of zero may for example be awarded in accordance with penalties for late submission for which no special dispensation has been made or where submitted work is deemed to be of no academic merit, as a penalty in some misconduct cases. |

EXAM

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ASSESSMENT CRITERION. | WEIGHT |
| Knowledge and Understanding | 50 |
| Application, argument and critical analysis | 40 |
| Structure | 10 |

ESSAY

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ASSESSMENT CRITERION. | WEIGHT |
| Knowledge and Understanding | 40 |
| Application, argument and critical analysis | 40 |
| Structure | 20 |

|  |
| --- |
| CITING SOURCES IN EXAMS  You are not expected to remember information to accurately populate a reference list, but you must demonstrate that you understand how to evidence your arguments from the literature, so citations will be expected (author, date). These should be accurate and relevant. If you cannot remember the date of the source, then use the author’s name to show that you know that the argument needs to be evidenced, and where that evidence can be found. *Significant* missing citations will reduce your marks. |