| Undergraduate degree class | Scale | Descriptor | Numerical equivalent | Range of marks for work marked using all points on 0-100 scale | Letter equivalent (for indication only) | MSc mark range (please note it's not exactly the same as UG) | MSc level dectriptor |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| First | | Work of original and exceptional quality which in the examiners' judgement merits special recognition by the award of the highest possible mark. | 100 | 100 | A | 80% and over | (High Distinction) Work which, over and above possessing the qualities of the 70-79% descriptor, demonstrates excellence – the nature of which will vary according to the assignment but may include: comprehensive answers, complete and correct proofs or calculations, project work that extends the original brief, deep and critical analysis, originality, and advance in scholarship, a highly professional approach. |
| | Excellent 1st | Exceptional work of the highest quality, demonstrating excellent knowledge and understanding, analysis, organisation, accuracy, relevance, presentation and appropriate skills. At final-year level: work may achieve or be close to publishable standard. | 94 | 93-99 | | | |
| | High 1st | Very high quality work demonstrating excellent knowledge and understanding, analysis, organisation, accuracy, relevance, presentation and appropriate skills. Work which may extend existing debates or interpretations. | 88 | 85-92 | | | |
| | Upper Mid 1st | | 82 | 80-84 | | | |
| | Lower Mid 1st | | 78 | 77-79 | | 70%-79% | (Distinction) The work demonstrates mastery of the subject matter, methodologies, and, where appropriate, laboratory techniques. It also provides evidence of near complete conceptual understanding, high level technical competence, and depth of analysis or mathematical understanding. Where applicable, the statement and proof |
| | Low 1st | | 74 | 70-76 | | | |
| Upper Second (2.1) | High 2.1 | High quality work demonstrating good knowledge and understanding, analysis, organisation, accuracy, relevance, presentation and appropriate skills. | 68 | 67-69 | B | 60%-69% | (Merit) The work demonstrates a sound and thorough grasp of subject matter and methodologies. Conceptual or mathematical understanding and technical competence are solid, but applications, arguments, or data analysis may contain minor flaws. Examined work will be well organised and structured, while good presentation and a logical approach to the material will be evident in projects or dissertations. Overall, the work reveals a high level of effort and commitment, but lacks |
| | Mid 2.1 | | 65 | 64-66 | | | |
| | Low 2.1 | | 62 | 60-63 | | | |
| Lower Second | High 2.2 | Competent work, demonstrating reasonable knowledge and understanding, some analysis, organisation, accuracy, relevance, presentation and appropriate skills. | 58 | 57-59 | C | 50%-59% | (Pass) The work reveals an underlying grasp of the subject matter, but with areas of confusion or some gaps in conceptual/mathematical understanding or methodology. Answers are fairly well structured but may tend towards the factual or derivative. In project or dissertation work, general conclusions or outcomes are reasonable, but there is room for substantial improvement in the individual's ability to apply theorems, analyse problems or execute technical skills. |
| | Mid 2.2 | | 55 | 54-56 | | | |
| | Low 2.2 | | 52 | 50-53 | | | |
| Third | High 3rd | Work of limited quality, demonstrating some relevant knowledge and understanding. | 48 | 47-49 | D | 40-49% | (Fail) Though it reveals some familiarity with the subject matter, and a basic grasp of factual and conceptual material, there are frequent and important gaps and/or misconceptions. Some effort has been made to reflect on and analyse questions or problems, or to apply theorems, but with little evidence of organisation or insight. Technical competence is poorly developed and general conclusions are unreliable or unsubstantiated. |
| | Mid 3rd | | 45 | 44-46 | | | |
| | Low 3rd | | 42 | 40-43 | | | |
| Fail | High Fail (sub Honours) | Work does not meet standards required for the appropriate stage of an Honours degree. Evidence of study and demonstrates some knowledge and some basic understanding of relevant concepts and techniques, but subject to significant omissions and errors. | 38 | 35-39 | E/F | 20%-39% | (Fail) The work is insufficient to demonstrate a basic grasp either of factual or conceptual subject matter. Technical competence is at a very low level and, if appropriate, laboratory work has required constant supervision. Data used in project work may be both inaccurate and irrelevant. Overall, answers and arguments reveal little effort towards analysis or conceptualisation. Important issues may have been ignored or seriously misconstrued. There is little evidence of an individual contribution to the material. |
| | Fail | Work is significantly below the standard required for the appropriate stage of an Honours degree. Some evidence of study and some knowledge and evidence of understanding but subject to very serious omissions and errors. | 32 | 30-34 | | | |
| | | Poor quality work well below the standards required for the appropriate stage of an Honours degree. | 25 | 19-29 | | | |
| | Low Fail | | 12 | 1-18 | | Less than 20% | (Fail) Inadequate work: poorly argued, written and presented; conceptual confusion throughout; demonstrates little or no knowledge of the field. Failure to address the issues raised by the question. Project work contains little or no data. Sparse or no evidence for technical competence or individual contributions. |
| Zero | Zero | Work of no merit OR Absent, work not submitted, penalty in some misconduct cases | 0 | 0 | | | |