| Descriptor | Grade Band | Mark Range | Typical Mark | Description |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Outstanding (85-100) | Distinction – Highest | 93-100 | 93 or 100 | Outstanding attainment of module and/or course learning outcomes. Work in this category clearly and consistently surpasses normal expectations, in terms of scholarship, for the relevant level of study. Work in this category typically meets the expectations of 'excellent' work and also: demonstrates  original ideas and insights; is comprehensive (relative to the level of study) in its identification of relevant (in terms of breadth or depth) literature; is uniquely perceptive at evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of its sources; draws on an exceptional range (or depth) of detailed examples or case studies integrates the student's own approach within wider scholarly frameworks; is exceptionally well written; is referenced to a professional standard. Quantitative work is clearly presented, with all arguments correct and conclusions accurately and fluently expressed. |
| | Distinction – Outstanding | 85-92 | 88 | |
| Excellent (70-84) | Distinction – High | 80-84 | 82 | Excellent attainment of module and/or course learning outcomes. Work in this category typically: has excellent direct focus on the question; engages directly and in-depth with relevant themes from the module/course; has excellent structure and organisation of material; reflects superior knowledge and understanding , analytical and reasoning skills; makes a clear and convincing argument of the student's own; identifies and accurately discusses the most relevant literature; convincingly evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of its sources; makes excellent use of appropriate, fully referenced and detailed examples or case studies; contains very few referencing errors; follows all presentation requirements; is clearly and fluently written. Quantitative work is clearly presented, with most or all arguments correct and conclusions accurately expressed. |
| | Distinction – Mid | 75-79 | 77 | |
| | Distinction – Low | 70-74 | 72 | |
| Good to Very Good (60-69) | Merit – High | 67-69 | 68 | Good to very good attainment of module and/or course learning outcomes. Work in this category typically:  has good direct focus on the question; good levels of understanding and knowledge; engages directly with relevant themes from the module/course; has good structure and organisation of material; reflects good analytical and reasoning skills; makes a clear argument of the student's own; identifies and accurately discusses a good range of relevant literature and appropriately applies ideas drawn from this literature; successfully evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of its sources; arguments are illustrated with reference to well documented, detailed and relevant examples or case studies; contains few referencing errors; follows all presentation requirements; is written clearly in a comprehensible way. Quantitative work is clearly presented, with most arguments correct and conclusions accurately expressed. |
| | Merit – Mid | 64-66 | 65 | |
| | Merit – Low | 60-63 | 62 | |
| Satisfactory (50-59) | Pass – High | 57-59 | 58 | Satisfactory attainment of module and/or course learning outcomes. Work in this category typically: engages directly with the question; reflects adequate knowledge and understanding  of relevant themes from the module/course; makes an attempt to structure and organise the material (which may be more effective at the higher end of the grade band and less effective at the lower end); directly or indirectly suggests an argument; contains satisfactory analysis and reasoning; contains accurate discussion of some relevant sources, which may or may not include reflection on strengths and weaknesses; identifies some appropriate examples or case studies, but these may not be fully documented or detailed; shows knowledge of appropriate referencing practice but this may be inconsistently applied; follows most presentation requirements; is written in a generally comprehensible way, though may contain writing errors. Quantitative work demonstrates the logical steps leading to the answers obtained and conclusions reached. |
| | Pass – Mid | 54-56 | 55 | |
| | Pass – Low | 50-53 | 52 | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Weak (45-49) | Fail – Borderline | 45-49 | 47 | Weak attainment of module and/or course learning outcomes. Work in this category typically: engages directly or indirectly with the question; reflects limited knowledge of relevant themes from the module/course; has weak structure and organisation of material; does not build a clear argument in a successful way; contains weak analysis and reasoning; identifies some relevant literature/sources, though there may be errors in accuracy; is limited in its evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of sources; identifies examples or case studies, which may have limited relevance and/or be weakly developed; shows some knowledge of appropriate referencing practice; follows some presentation requirements; may be unclearly written. Quantitative work demonstrates some of the logical steps necessary to reach the answers and conclusions. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor (20-44) | Fail – High | 40-44 | 42 | Poor attainment of module and/or course learning outcomes. Work in this category typically: does not engage with the question, though it may attempt to answer a different question; reflects very limited knowledge of relevant themes from the module/course; is poorly structured and organised; does not build a clear argument; contains poor (or little) analysis and reasoning; shows little awareness of relevant examples; identifies and discusses few relevant sources (and/or contains significant errors in accuracy and understanding); may contain a significant amount of irrelevant material; may show limited knowledge of appropriate referencing practice; may be deficient in length against the word count to an extent that noticeably undermines its scholarly quality; may be extremely unclearly written and/or presented. Quantitative work does not demonstrate the logical steps taken, may contain significant errors and incorrect conclusions. |
| | Fail – Mid | 30-39 | 35 | |
| | Fail – Low | 20-29 | 25 | |
| Very Poor (1-19) | Bad Fail | 1-19 | 15 | Very poor attainment of module and/or course learning outcomes. Work in this category typically: does not engage with a clear question; reflects almost no knowledge of relevant themes from the module/course; is very poorly structured and organised; contains no argumentation, analysis or reasoning; shows very poor awareness of relevant examples; identifies and discusses no relevant sources (and/or contains no significant evidence of accuracy and understanding); may contain a significant amount of irrelevant material; may show very limited knowledge of appropriate referencing practice; may be deficient in length against the word count to an extent that significantly undermines its scholarly quality; may be extremely unclearly written and/or presented. Quantitative work does not demonstrate the logical steps taken, and/or contains significant errors and incorrect conclusions. |
| Absence of Positive Qualities (0) | Zero | 0 | 0 | No demonstrable attainment of module and/or course learning outcomes. Work in this category typically: has not been submitted; is not the coursework that has been assigned; has been submitted after the late-penalty period has elapsed; and/or has had a penalty applied for major academic misconduct. |