

US

**UNIVERSITY
OF SUSSEX**

**History Department
Assessment Criteria – Primary Source
Analysis**

First (70 and above) NB: the criteria in italics included in this category describe work that falls in the upper end of the first class band (80+)	Upper Second (60-69)	Lower Second (50 - 59)	Third (40 - 49)	Fail (39 and below)
ARGUMENT and STRUCTURE				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Student engages closely with source; shows sophisticated appreciation of its wider implications. <i>Student challenges or extends understanding of source's implications.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Student displays understanding of source, shows appreciation of some of its wider implications, and makes serious attempt to engage with it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Student displays some understanding of source, but may lack sustained focus or may show only modest understanding of the source's wider implications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Student displays little understanding of source, and tends to write indiscriminately around it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Student fails to engage with source in any meaningful way.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer presents compelling analysis of language and/or meaning that engages closely with the specific extract. <i>Innovative approach to language and/or meaning of source.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer engages intelligently with the specifics of the extract to analyse language and/or meaning. Towards lower end of mark band, ideas may not be fully developed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer makes some attempt to engage with specifics of extract, but this may be largely generalisations about document or themes it deals with. Tends towards paraphrasing rather than analysis. May contain some misunderstandings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer provides little engagement with specifics of extract, but rather a generalised answer about wider document or themes it deals with. Tendency towards paraphrasing. May misunderstand extract. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer provides no engagement with specifics of extract. Paraphrasing instead of analysis. Extract misunderstood.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Student moves fluently between generalization and detailed analysis of source; student able to synthesize as well as particularize. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Student moves between generalization and detailed analysis of source, although may tend towards either an over-generalized or an over-particularized response. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Student prone to mere description of source; may display knowledge without reference to the precise requirements of the analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Student merely describes source; any analysis underpinned by bald assertion rather than informed generalizations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Student fails to present an analysis.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer presents clear and original analysis, drawing on elements such as authorship, provenance, audience, and other material pertinent to the extract's interpretation. <i>Intellectual independence of interpretation, grounded in a mature consideration of available information about source.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer comments on authorship, and other material pertinent to the source's context, and draws out significance for interpretation of extract. Towards lower end of mark band, implications may not be fully developed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer provides some discussion of source, such as authorship, provenance, audience, and other material pertinent to extract's interpretation, but independent reflection largely lacking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer provides limited explanation of source, such as authorship, provenance, audience, and other material pertinent to the extract's interpretation. Independent reflection lacking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer provides no explanation of source, such as authorship, provenance, audience, and other material pertinent to the extract's interpretation. No independent reflection.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer relates the extract to the wider historical themes in an independent and original way. Makes pertinent and striking comparisons with other contemporary or historiographical sources. <i>Analysis presents student's own historiographical interventions.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer relates the extract to the wider historical themes with reference to the extract's wider significance. Towards higher range of mark band, makes reference to other contemporary or historiographical sources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer briefly touches on the wider significance of the extract but may contain irrelevance or misunderstanding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer shows some awareness of wider significance of extract, but with little critical reflection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer shows no awareness of wider significance of extract, and presents no critical reflection.
WRITING and STYLE				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Writing clear, fluent, and accurate. Range of vocabulary, technical and linguistic idioms appropriate to the analysis. <i>A personal style that enhances the clarity and effectiveness of the analysis.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Writing clear and generally accurate: will demonstrate appreciation of technical and advanced vocabulary used by historians. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Writing sufficiently accurate to convey meaning clearly, but may lack fluency and command of scholarly idioms used by historians. Clumsy expression in places. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Writing generally grammatical, but lacks sophistication of vocabulary or construction. In places, the writing may lack clarity/felicity of expression. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Writing characterised by poor grammar and syntax; writing lacks appropriate vocabulary for historical argument; writing lacks clarity.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Writing exhibits excellent grammar, syntax and spelling, with a rich and advanced vocabulary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Command of grammar, syntax and spelling is competent and allows student to express meaning clearly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Student's command of basic grammar, syntax and spelling is sufficient to make their meaning clear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Student's command of basic grammar, syntax and spelling is not sufficient to make their meaning clear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Contains frequent and serious errors in basic grammar, syntax and spelling.

First (70 and above) NB: the criteria in italics included in this category describe work that falls in the upper end of the first class band (80+)	Upper Second (60-69)	Lower Second (50 - 59)	Third (40 - 49)	Fail (39 and below)
KNOWLEDGE and RESEARCH				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Demonstrates excellent knowledge of historical context of source. Demonstrates significance of that context by relating it to contents of extract in a clear and compelling way. <i>Innovative and autonomous research into source.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Demonstrates clear familiarity with historical context of source, and relates this to the contents of extract. Knowledge is extensive, though might be uneven in places. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Demonstrates knowledge of source's historical context but without linking this to specific contents of extract under consideration. May be some inaccuracy, but basic knowledge sound. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Demonstrates sufficient knowledge to make some comment on historical context of extract, but it will be limited and patchy. May be factual inaccuracies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Knowledge insufficient to frame analysis of source.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer demonstrates clear sense of the nature and complexity of historical causality highlighted by the source. <i>Student offers their own causal account of the issues raised by the source.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer demonstrates sense of the nature of historical causality highlighted by the source. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer shows some limited awareness of historical causality highlighted by the source. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer shows some understanding of historical causality highlighted by the source, but underdeveloped. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer shows no understanding of historical causality highlighted by the source.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Student shows ability to evaluate nature and status of source. Where necessary identifies contradiction and attempts resolution. <i>Student successfully develops their own critical analysis of the source.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Student reflects on nature and status of source, and seeks to use it critically. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Student uses source rather uncritically, without serious attempts to evaluate its status and significance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Student provides sufficient understanding of source to launch answer, but not to sustain complete response. Source used uncritically as if self-explanatory. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Student provides insufficient understanding of source to launch answer.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer demonstrates informed and secure understanding of historical period(s) under discussion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer demonstrates secure understanding of the historical period(s) under discussion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer demonstrates some appreciation of historical period(s) under discussion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer demonstrates only rudimentary appreciation of historical period(s) under discussion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Answer demonstrates no appreciation of historical period(s) under discussion.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Wider information deployed in order to support and develop analysis; vigorous sense of relevance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Wider information deployed relevantly. Towards lower end of mark band, full implications for analysis not always brought out. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Wider information deployed, but not necessarily with critical reflection on its relevance for analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Wider information deployed, but without critical reflection on its relevance for analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No wider information deployed.