

Class	Scale	Numerical equivalent	Descriptor
First	Excellent first	100	<b>Exceptional work; content excellent and original; writing flawlessly fluent and compelling. At final-year level, work may achieve or be close to publishable standard.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exceptionally perceptive and accurate analysis of primary and secondary material</li> <li>Exceptional grasp of all relevant contexts</li> <li>Exceptionally well structured and clearly argued</li> <li>Referencing/bibliography/filmography is comprehensive and correctly presented throughout.</li> </ul>
	High first	94	
	High 1 <sup>st</sup>	88	<b>Outstanding work; may extend existing debates; fluent and engaging; outstanding presentation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of original thought and independent research</li> <li>Extremely perceptive and accurate analysis of primary and secondary material</li> <li>Very clear grasp of all relevant contexts</li> <li>Extremely well structured and clearly argued</li> <li>Referencing/bibliography/filmography is comprehensive and correctly presented throughout</li> </ul>
	Mid 1 <sup>st</sup>	82 78	<b>Excellent work; may extend existing debates; writing fluent and engaging; excellent presentation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of original thought and independent research</li> <li>Very perceptive and accurate analysis of primary and secondary material</li> <li>Very clear grasp of all relevant contexts</li> <li>Extremely well structured and clearly argued</li> <li>Referencing/bibliography/filmography is comprehensive and correctly presented throughout</li> </ul>
	Low 1st	74	<b>High quality work; may extend existing debates; writing fluent and engaging; excellent presentation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High quality independent research, coupled with evidence of either original thought or an excellent ability to organize, synthesize and review existing debates</li> <li>Very perceptive and accurate analysis of primary and secondary material</li> <li>Very clear grasp of all relevant contexts</li> <li>Very well structured and clearly argued</li> <li>Referencing/bibliography/filmography is comprehensive and correctly presented throughout</li> </ul>
Upper second	High 2:1	68	<b>Very good work; demonstrates a refined understanding of existing debates; writing clear and engaging; very good presentation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very good quality independent research, coupled with demonstrable skills in organizing, synthesizing and reviewing a range of existing debates</li> <li>Perceptive and largely accurate analysis of primary and secondary material</li> <li>A clear and largely comprehensive grasp of relevant contexts</li> <li>Well structured and clearly argued</li> <li>Referencing/bibliography/filmography is largely comprehensive and correctly presented.</li> </ul>

	Mid 2:1	65	<p><b>Good work; demonstrates a clear understanding of existing debates; writing largely clear and engaging; good presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good quality independent research, coupled with an ability to organize, synthesize and review a range of existing debates</li> <li>• Largely accurate and insightful analysis of primary and secondary material</li> <li>• Largely comprehensive grasp of relevant contexts</li> <li>• Largely well structured and clearly argued</li> <li>• Referencing/bibliography/filmography is largely comprehensive and correctly presented</li> </ul>
	Low 2:1	62	<p><b>Mostly good work; demonstrates a largely proficient understanding of existing debates; writing largely clear; mostly good presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly good independent research skills; some ability to organize, synthesize and review a range of existing debates</li> <li>• Largely accurate analysis of primary and secondary material, but one or two minor errors may occur</li> <li>• A secure grasp of relevant contexts but there may be a slight lack of detail or nuance</li> <li>• Mostly good structure and argumentation, but there may be occasional errors in the organization of paragraphs and or in syntax</li> <li>• Referencing/bibliography/filmography is largely comprehensive and correctly presented but some minor slips occur</li> </ul>
<b>Lower second</b>	High 2:2	58	<p><b>Competent work; seeks to engage with existing debates; writing largely clear but some lack of focus; competent presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Competent independent research skills; some ability to review a range of existing debates but some inaccuracy and omissions occur</li> <li>• Competent analysis of primary and secondary material but some of the following errors occur: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Minor misunderstandings of primary source</li> <li>○ Minor misunderstandings of critical terms</li> <li>○ Some over-reliance on secondary sources</li> <li>○ Failure to engage with a key secondary resource</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Some grasp of relevant contexts but there is a lack of detail and some minor errors occur</li> <li>• Competent structure and argumentation, but there may be some errors in the organization of paragraphs and or in syntax</li> <li>• Competent referencing/bibliography/filmography but with errors</li> </ul>
	Mid 2:2	55	<p><b>Largely competent work; shows some awareness of existing debates; writing of uneven quality; focus inconsistent; uneven presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some independent research skills; engagement with existing debates evident but limited; some inaccuracy and omissions occur</li> <li>• Largely competent analysis of primary and secondary material, but some of the following errors occur: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Misunderstandings of primary source</li> <li>○ Misunderstandings of critical terms</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Over-reliance on secondary sources</li> <li>○ Failure to engage with a key secondary resource</li> <li>● Grasp of relevant contexts often limited and some errors occur</li> <li>● Structure and argumentation of uneven quality: errors in the organization of paragraphs and/or in syntax occur</li> <li>● Inconsistent referencing/bibliography/filmography with several errors</li> </ul>
	Low 2:2	52	<p><b>Insecure; shows limited awareness of existing debates; writing of uneven quality; very inconsistent focus; very uneven presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Engagement with existing debates evident but limited and often inaccurate</li> <li>● Treatment of primary and secondary material contains some of the following errors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Significant misunderstandings of primary source</li> <li>○ Significant misunderstandings of critical terms</li> <li>○ Significant over-reliance on secondary sources</li> <li>○ Failure to engage with meaningful secondary resources</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Grasp of relevant contexts frequently limited and error prone</li> <li>● Structure and argumentation unclear: errors in the organization of paragraphs and/or in syntax occur</li> <li>● Referencing/bibliography/filmography contains significant errors and/or some omissions</li> </ul>
<b>Third</b>	High 3rd	48	<p><b>Weak work; shows very limited understanding of existing debates; writing of limited quality; lack of focus; largely inaccurate presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Engagement with existing debates superficial and/or inaccurate</li> <li>● Treatment of the material, both primary and secondary contains many of the following errors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lack of knowledge of the primary source</li> <li>○ Significant misunderstandings of primary source</li> <li>○ Significant misunderstandings of critical terms</li> <li>○ Significant over-reliance on secondary sources</li> <li>○ Failure to engage with meaningful secondary sources</li> </ul> </li> <li>● There is very little grasp of relevant context</li> <li>● Structure and argumentation are very unclear; errors in the organization of paragraphs and/or in syntax frequently occur</li> <li>● Referencing/bibliography/filmography largely inaccurate or absent</li> </ul>
	Mid 3 <sup>rd</sup> to Low 3 <sup>rd</sup>	45 42	<p><b>Extremely weak work; very limited understanding in all areas. writing of poor quality; absence of focus; presentation very poor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Engagement with existing debates extremely superficial, flawed, and may be non-existent</li> <li>● Treatment of primary and secondary material characterized by extensive errors and omissions. Many of the following errors occur: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lack of knowledge of the primary source</li> <li>○ Significant misunderstandings of primary source</li> <li>○ Significant misunderstandings of critical terms</li> <li>○ Significant over-reliance on secondary sources</li> <li>○ Failure to engage with meaningful secondary sources</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Very little grasp of relevant context</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structure and argumentation extremely unclear; errors in the organization of paragraphs and/or in syntax systematically occur</li> <li>• Referencing/bibliography/filmography largely inaccurate or absent</li> </ul>
<b>Fail</b>	High Fail (sub honours)	38	<p><b>Inadequate work; shows extremely limited understanding in all areas; does not meet the standards required for the appropriate stage of the degree; writing of extremely poor quality; no focus; presentation extremely poor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No meaningful engagement with existing debates</li> <li>• Treatment of primary and secondary material characterized by extensive errors and omissions. Many of the following errors occur: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lack of knowledge of the primary source</li> <li>○ Little or no understanding of primary source</li> <li>○ Major misunderstandings of critical terms</li> <li>○ Significant over-reliance on secondary sources that are poorly understood</li> <li>○ Failure to engage with meaningful secondary sources</li> </ul> </li> <li>• No real grasp of relevant context</li> <li>• Structure and argumentation extremely unclear to the point of hindering communication; errors in the organization of paragraphs and/or in syntax systematically occur</li> </ul> <p>Referencing/bibliography/filmography largely inaccurate or absent</p>
	Fail	32	<p><b>Wholly inadequate work; does not meet the standards required for the appropriate stage of the degree.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No meaningful engagement with existing debates</li> <li>• Treatment of primary and secondary material wholly inadequate. Many of the following errors occur: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lack of knowledge of the primary source</li> <li>○ No real understanding of primary source</li> <li>○ Major misunderstandings of critical terms</li> <li>○ Significant over-reliance on secondary sources that are almost entirely misunderstood</li> <li>○ Failure to engage with meaningful secondary sources</li> </ul> </li> <li>• No grasp of relevant context</li> <li>• Structure and argumentation are extremely unclear to the point of hindering communication; frequent inability to form coherent paragraphs or sentences shown</li> <li>• Referencing/bibliography/filmography largely inaccurate or absent</li> </ul>
		25	Poor quality work well below the standards required for the appropriate stage of an Honours degree
	Low fail	12	
<b>Zero</b>	Zero	0	Work of no merit OR Absent, work not submitted, penalty in some misconduct cases