

Assessment marking criteria for UEX picture questions under timed conditions

First class: 70-100

1. Demonstrates an excellent knowledge of the cultural and historical context of the object. Demonstrates the significance of that context by relating it to the visual analysis in a clear and compelling way.
2. Clear and original analysis of the nature of the object, such as artist, patronage, provenance, audience, and other material pertinent to the object's interpretation.
3. A compelling analysis of style, media, materials and/or meaning that engages closely with the specific object.
4. Relates the object to the wider themes of the course in an independent and original way. Makes pertinent and striking comparisons with other contemporary objects and/or historiographical sources.
5. The writing will be clear, fluent, and accurate. The range of vocabulary and linguistic idioms will be appropriate to the issues discussed. Ideas will be presented concisely and clearly.

Upper Second class: 60-69

1. Demonstrates a clear familiarity with the historical context of the object, and relates this to the visual analysis/description of the object. Knowledge is extensive, though might be uneven in places.
2. Comments on nature of the object, such as artist, patronage, provenance, audience, and other material pertinent to the object's interpretation, and draws out significance of this for the interpretation of the object. At the lower end of this mark-band, implications may not be fully developed.
3. Engages intelligently with the specifics of the object to analyse style, media, materials and/or meaning. At the lower end of this mark-band, ideas may not be fully developed.
4. Relates the object to the wider themes of the course with reference to the object's wider significance. In the higher range of this mark-band, answers will make reference to other contemporary objects and/or historiographical sources.
5. The writing will be clear and generally accurate, and will demonstrate an appreciation of the technical and advanced vocabulary used by art historians. Ideas will be presented clearly.

Lower Second class: 50-59

1. Demonstrates knowledge of the object's historical context but without linking this to the specific visual analysis. There may be some inaccuracy, but basic knowledge will be sound.

2. Some discussion of the nature of the object, such as artist, patronage, provenance, audience, and other material pertinent to the object's interpretation, but critical reflection will largely be lacking.
3. Some attempt to engage with the specifics of the object, but this may be a largely generalised answer about the object or the themes it deals with. May tend towards simply description rather than analysis. May contain some misunderstandings.
4. Briefly touches on the wider significance of the object but may contain irrelevance or misunderstanding.
5. The writing will be sufficiently accurate to convey the writer's meaning clearly, but it may lack fluency and command of the kinds of scholarly idioms used by professional art historians. Expression might be clumsy in places.

Third Class: 40-49

1. There will be sufficient knowledge to make some comment on the historical context of the object, but it will be limited and patchy. There may be factual inaccuracies.
2. A limited explanation of the nature of the object, such as artist, patronage, provenance, audience, and other material pertinent to the object's interpretation, but critical reflection will largely be lacking.
3. No engagement with the specifics of the object, but rather a generalised answer about the wider context or themes it deals with. A tendency towards simply description. May misunderstand the object and/or its significance.
4. Shows some awareness of the wider significance of the object, but with little critical reflection.
5. The writing will generally be grammatical, but may lack the sophistication of vocabulary or construction. In places the writing may lack clarity and felicity of expression.

Fail: 0-39

1. Shows little or no knowledge of the context of the object and may misinterpret the nature of the object.
2. Fails to discuss the nature of the object, such as artist, patronage, provenance, audience, and other material pertinent to the object's interpretation.
3. No engagement with the specifics of the object and tendency towards irrelevance.
4. Fails to identify the object's wider significance.
5. The author's meaning will be obscured due to clumsy expression and misuse of vocabulary.