Final Honour School of Human Sciences
Examination Conventions
For Candidates to be Examined in Academic Year 2019-20
Updated May 2020

1. Introduction

Examination conventions are the formal record of the specific assessment standards for the course or courses to which they apply. They set out how examined work will be marked and how the resulting marks will be used to arrive at a final result and classification of an award.

The supervisory body responsible for approving the examination conventions is the Social Sciences Board's Quality Assurance Committee.

2. Rubrics for individual papers

The FHS examination consists of 8 papers:

Paper 1: Behaviour and its Evolution

Paper 2: Human Genetics and Evolution

Paper 3: Human Ecology

Paper 4: Demography and Population

Paper 5(a): Anthropological Analysis and Interpretation *or* 5(b): Sociological Theory

Paper 6: Dissertation

Papers 7 and 8: Option papers

Details relating to the assessment for each of these papers are set out below:

Paper 1: Behaviour and its Evolution:– A four-hour open-book examination comprising twelve essay questions of which candidates must answer three.

Paper 2: Human Genetics and Evolution – A four-hour open-book examination comprising twelve essay questions of which candidates must answer three. The paper is divided into two sections and candidates must answer at least one question from each section.

Paper 3: Human Ecology – An extended essay (95%) not exceeding 5,000 words (including citations and footnotes but excluding bibliography) and a presentation (5%). The extended essay will be chosen from a list of titles published by the Examiners on Monday of Week 1 of Trinity Term of the second year. Essays should be word-processed in double-line spacing and should conform to the standards of academic presentation prescribed in the course handbook. Two copies of the essay must be delivered to the Examination Schools (addressed to the Chair of Examiners of the Final Honour School of Human Sciences, High Street, Oxford) not later than **12 noon on the Friday of Week 6 of Trinity Term of their second year of study** (the first year of the Final Honour School). Candidates will be required to give a short presentation on the topic of their extended essay in

Michaelmas Term of their final year. Students will be notified of the exact date of the presentation by Week 1 of Michaelmas Term. The presentation will be assessed for clarity and engagement and contributes 5% of the final mark for the paper.

Paper 4: Demography and Population – A four-hour open-book examination. The paper comprises two sections. Section 1 tests the candidate's knowledge of substantive trends and their explanation. Section 2 tests the candidate's ability to interpret quantitative results and methods of demographic analysis. Candidates are required to answer three questions, two from a choice of nine questions in Section 1 and one compulsory question in Section 2.

Paper 5(a): Anthropological Analysis and Interpretation *or* Paper 5(b): Sociological Theory – both papers are examined by a four-hour open-book examination comprising twelve essay questions of which candidates must answer three.

Paper 6: Dissertation – the dissertation must be not more than 10,000 words in length, including citations and footnotes and endnotes but excluding abstract, bibliography and appendices. Any dissertations exceeding this word limit will be penalized according to the scheme detailed in Section 3.7, below. Dissertations may include appendices; however, the examiners are not bound to read the appendices and they shall not be taken into consideration when marking the dissertation. Dissertations must include a bibliography or a list of sources, listing all sources cited in the main body of the text. Each dissertation must be prefaced by an abstract of not more than 350 words. All dissertations must be printed on A4 paper and be held firmly in a cover. Two copies of the dissertation must be submitted to the Chairman of Examiners, Honour School of Human Sciences, Examination Schools, Oxford, not later than **noon on Friday of the week preceding Trinity Full Term, (extended to the first week of Trinity Full Term)** of the third year of the degree (the second year of the Final Honour School).

Candidates are required to submit a form, signed by their Director of Studies and their prospective dissertation supervisor, featuring the title of their intended dissertation and an explanation of its focus of not more than 100 words, to the Academic Administrator by **noon on Friday of 2nd Week of Trinity Term** of the second year of the degree (the first year of the Final Honour School). This will normally be approved by the Chair of Teaching Committee by the end of 8th Week of Trinity Term.

Papers 7 and 8: Option Papers – Option papers are examined by means of four-hour open-book examinations. For the majority of option papers candidates must answer three questions from a choice of nine questions. For the Social Policy option candidates have a choice of three questions from twelve. There will be a word limit of 1600 words for each essay on the Social Policy paper. The Health and Disease option paper is divided into two sections. Candidates must answer one question out of two in section A and two questions out of eight in section B.

The Quantitative Methods option is examined by means of a submitted assessment and a four-hour open-book exam paper. The submitted assessment consists of a number of questions, all of which must be attempted, producing a document usually 5-10 pages in length. Candidates must complete the assignment in Week 7 of Hilary Term of the final year of the degree, being given the paper on Monday of Week 7 and submitting the completed assessment to the Chair of Examiners of the Final Honour School of Human Sciences, C/o the Examination Schools, by **Friday at 12 noon of Week 7 of**

Hilary Term. The submitted assignment accounts for 25% of the overall mark for this paper and the four-hour open-book exam accounts for 75% of the overall mark for this paper.

Human Sciences candidates are required to choose their two third-year option papers from a list posted in the Institute of Human Sciences at the beginning of the first week of Hilary Full Term in the second year of the degree (the first year of the Final Honour School). These lists will also be circulated to College Tutors. They are required to submit their choices in the middle of Hilary Term, the deadline for which will be circulated at the start of Hilary Term.

3. Marking conventions

3.1 University scale for standardised expression of agreed final marks

Agreed final marks for individual papers will be expressed using the following scale:

70-100	First Class
60-69	Upper second
50-59	Lower second
40-49	Third
30-39	Pass
0-29	Fail

3.2 Qualitative criteria for different types of assessment

Qualitative criteria for the marking of the Timed Written Examinations, Submitted Essays and Dissertations, and Presentations are provided in the Appendix.

These marking criteria have been developed to offer guidance to students on the criteria examiners will be using in judging assessed work.

They are also intended to guide examiners in identifying the appropriate mark for the work being assessed.

General consideration of disruption as result of the COVD-19 pandemic will be taken into consideration at the marking stage as well as at the exam board stage (via Mitigating Circumstances Applications).

3.3 Verification and reconciliation of marks

The Examining Board will usually consist of four internal examiners and two or three external examiners. In addition, assessors are appointed for papers which require specialist knowledge where none of the Examiners is expert. Candidates are anonymous, being identified only by a candidate number. Each paper (including the Dissertation) has equal weight. All papers are double-marked.

An Examiner or Assessor, having received an anonymised script (Papers 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 8), submitted essay (Paper 3) or dissertation (Paper 6), assigns a mark to each question (or the essay or

dissertation) on the basis of the Marking Criteria detailed in the Appendix, be low. Each examiner marks independently, without knowledge of the marks or comments made by the other examiner. Usually, the marks awarded by each examiner are similar and not infrequently identical. Where the overall marks assigned by the two Examiners differ the examiners identify the reasons for the difference through discussion and agree an appropriate mark. If reconciliation is difficult, a third marker acts as arbiter in agreeing the appropriate mark, and answers that have been given particularly discrepant marks may be remarked if necessary. If the examiners cannot reach an agreement, the script is submitted to an external Examiner for "adjudication". In addition, the External Examiner may query any mark assigned to a question, even if the internal Examiners are unanimous in their judgment.

The mark for each paper (with the exception of the submitted essay and dissertation) is the mean of the agreed marks for the three questions in that paper. Fractional marks for each paper of 0.5 and above are rounded up to the nearest whole mark. Fractional marks of 0.4 and below are rounded down to the nearest whole mark.

The final mark for Paper 3 (Human Ecology) is calculated on the basis of the agreed mark for the submitted essay (weighted at 95%) and the agreed mark for the presentation (weighted at 5%). The weighted mark for the essay is calculated as follows: Essay Mark/100 x 95 = weighted mark. The presentation is marked out of 25 (see marking conventions in the Appendix, below), with the weighted mark calculated by dividing this score by 5 to give a mark out of 5.

Thus the final mark for paper 3 is calculated as follows:
(Essay Mark/100 x 95) + (Presentation Mark/5) = Final Mark.

3.4 Scaling
Not applicable.

3.5 Short-weight convention and departure from rubric
Candidates are reminded that in every paper they must observe the rubric at its head in relation to the number of questions to be answered, and to compulsory questions (as outlined for each paper in Section 2, above).

In open-book examinations a mark of zero will be awarded for any questions that should have been answered by a candidate but have not been (e.g. if two questions are answered rather than three, a mark of zero is awarded for the question not attempted, and the final mark for that paper is determined as the mean of the marks for three questions, with the mark for the third question being zero). In the case that a candidate answers more questions than is required by the rubric the first answers completed up to and including the number required by the rubric will be marked, with any subsequent answers being left unmarked.

These rationales apply in the cases of papers with sections. For example, if a candidate is required to "answer three questions with at least one from each of sections A and B" and instead answers three questions from section B, they will receive three marks, the first being a mark of zero for the (non-completed) question from section A and the second and third marks being those awarded for the

answers to the first two questions attempted from section B. The third answer submitted to a question from section B will not be marked.

In the case of examination answers that are incomplete, and submitted pieces of coursework that are incomplete or which fail to adhere to the stipulated rubric, these will be marked according to the criteria that are outlined in the Appendix, which include specific criteria for marking work which is incomplete, rushed, or which departs from the stated rubric.

3.6 Penalties for late or non-submission

Late delivery of any dissertation or assessed work may incur an academic penalty and a fine.

Where a candidate submits a dissertation or other assessed work after the deadline (without having gained the Proctors' approval for an extension) the following late penalty tariff will be applied:

The scale of penalties agreed by the board of examiners in relation to late submission of assessed items is set out below. For information on penalties for late submission of open-book examination scripts, see section 3.10 below. Details of the circumstances in which such penalties might apply can be found in the *Examination Regulations* (Regulations for the Conduct of University Examinations, Part 14.)

Late submission	**Penalty**
Up to one day *(submitted on the day but after the deadline)*	-5 marks (- 5 percentage points)
Each additional day *(i.e., two days late = -6 marks, three days late = -7 marks, etc.; note that each weekend day counts as a full day for the purposes of mark deductions)*	-1 mark (- 1 percentage point)
Max. deducted marks up to 14 days late	-18 marks (- 18 percentage points)
More than 14 days after the notice of non-submission	Fail

Failure to submit a required element of assessment will result in the failure of the whole Examination.

3.7 Penalties for over-length work and departure from approved titles or subject-matter
Coursework must have the word count clearly indicated on the front cover. In all cases, word limits are deemed to apply to the text and footnotes or endnotes, but not to the bibliography, any

appendices or glossaries, or to the front matter (abstract, title page, contents page, etc., if applicable).

Where a candidate submits a dissertation or other piece of examined written coursework which exceeds the word limit prescribed by the relevant regulation, the examiners will mark the work as if submitted within the stipulated word limit. The Board of Examiners will then reduce the mark awarded according to the following tariff:

1 mark deduction for every 1% or part thereof by which the stated word limit is exceeded:

Word limit of submitted work	**Penalty of one mark per:**
5000	50 words or part thereof by which limit is exceeded
10000	100 words or part thereof by which limit is exceeded

Where the examiners wish to query the word count, they may ask for an electronic version of the coursework to be submitted.

3.8 Plagiarism

The Examination Board shall deal wholly with cases of poor academic practice where the material under review is small and does not exceed 10% of the whole.

Assessors should mark work on its academic merit with the board responsible for deducting marks for derivative or poor referencing.

Determined by the extent of poor academic practice, the board shall deduct between 1% and 10% of the marks available for cases of poor referencing where material is widely available factual information or a technical description that could not be paraphrased easily; where passage(s) draw on a variety of sources, either verbatim or derivative, in patchwork fashion (and examiners consider that this represents poor academic practice rather than an attempt to deceive); where some attempt has been made to provide references, however incomplete (e.g. footnotes but no quotation marks, Harvard-style references at the end of a paragraph, inclusion in bibliography); or where passage(s) are 'grey literature' i.e. a web source with no clear owner.

If a student has previously had marks deducted for poor academic practice or has been referred to the Proctors for suspected plagiarism the case must always be referred to the Proctors. Also, where the deduction of marks results in failure of the assessment and of the programme the case must be referred to the Proctors.

In addition, any more serious cases of poor academic practice than described above should also always be referred to the Proctors.

3.10 Penalties for late submission of open-book examinations.

Candidates should upload their submission within the time allowed for their open-book examination. Candidates who access the paper later than the published start time (and who do not have an agreed alternative start time) will still need to finish and submit their work within the originally published

timeframe or be considered to have submitted late. Candidates who access the paper on time but who submit their work after the published timeframe will also be considered to have submitted late.

Where candidates submit their examinations after the end of the specified timeframe and believe they have a good reason for doing so, they may submit a self-assessment mitigating circumstances form to explain their reasons for the late submission. The Exam Board will consider whether to waive the penalties (outlined below) for late submission.

The penalties will be applied at the paper level and are as follows:

Time	Penalty
First 16 minutes	No penalty
16 minutes – 30 minutes	5 marks or 5% of marks available (if not marked on 100 mark scale)
31 minutes – 45 minutes	10 marks or 10% of marks available (if not marked on 100 mark scale)
Up to an hour	15 marks or 15% of marks available (if not marked on 100 mark scale)
After one hour	Fail mark (0)

Penalties will only be applied after the work has been marked and the Exam Board has checked whether there are any valid reasons for late submission.

4. Progression rules and classification conventions

4.1 Qualitative descriptors of classes

First Class: Demonstrates overall excellence, including sufficient depth and breadth of relevant knowledge to allow clarity of expression, construction of arguments, demonstration of critical faculties and originality.

Upper Second Class (2.i): Demonstrates overall a good standard of knowledge and understanding of material, and the ability to apply it effectively to address issues, offer interpretations and construct arguments.

Lower Second Class (2.ii): Demonstrates overall an adequate standard of knowledge and understanding of material, with some ability to apply it to addressing issues and to offering interpretations.

Third Class: Demonstrates some depth of knowledge of core material and some ability to relate it to central topics of the discipline.

Pass (without Honours): Demonstrates the ability to reproduce with some accuracy a limited selection of the core material of the discipline.

Fail: Fails overall to demonstrate a sufficient range and depth of knowledge and understanding, and/or fails to apply it appropriately.

Note that the aggregation and classification rules in some circumstances allow a stronger performance on some papers to compensate for a weaker performance on others.

4.2 Classification rules

Each paper (including the dissertation) has equal weighting in calculating the final overall mean mark that a candidate has achieved (each paper thus being weighted at 1/8, or 12.5% of the final mark). The final mean mark is thus calculated as the sum of the paper marks divided by eight.

In calculating the final mean mark, fractional final marks of 0.5 and above are rounded up to the nearest whole mark. Fractional marks of 0.4 and below are rounded down to the nearest whole mark.

Class I: Overall mean of 68 or more with 4 or more papers achieving a First class (70+) mark

Class 2.i: Overall mean of 60–67 with 4 or more papers achieving 2:1 marks or higher

Class 2.ii: Overall mean of 50–59 with 4 or more papers achieving 2:2 marks or higher

Class 3: Overall mean of 40–49 with 4 or more papers achieving 3rd class marks or higher

Pass: Overall mean of 30-39 with 4 or more papers achieving Pass marks or higher

As long as the stated required mean mark is achieved it is theoretically possible to pass the degree despite not achieving a pass mark on one or more papers.

Safety Net Policy

For the purpose of classification, and where it benefits the students' overall class, the mean mark will be calculated discounting the lowest mark achieved in Trinity Term assessments (ie the 6 open-book examinations and the dissertation).

In agreeing changes to assessment, the exam board has ensured that the learning outcomes for the programme as given in the Final Honour School of Human Sciences course handbook for 2018–20 are still met.

Borderline cases

Candidates whose final mean mark falls below a grade boundary by 1 mark or less (i.e. 67-67.4, 59-59.4, 49-49.4, 39-39.4) receive special scrutiny

4.3 Progression rules

Not applicable.

4.4 Vivas

Vivas are not used in the examination.

5 Resits

Not applicable

6 Consideration of Mitigating circumstances

A candidate's final outcome will first be considered using the classification rules/final outcome rules as described above in section 4. The exam board will then consider any further information they have on individual circumstances.

Where a candidate or candidates have made a submission, under Part 13 of the Regulations for Conduct of University Examinations, that unforeseen circumstances may have had an impact on their performance in an examination, the final board of examiners will decide whether and how to adjust a candidate's results. Further information on the procedure is provided in the *Policy and Guidance for examiners, Annex C* and information for students is provided at www.ox.ac.uk/students/academic/exams/guidance

Candidates who have indicated they wish to be considered for DDH/DDM will first be considered for a classified degree, taking into account the safety net policy and any individual MCE. If that is not possible and they meet the DDH/DDM eligibility criteria they will be awarded DDH/DDM.

7 Details of examiners and rules on communicating with examiners

The External Examiners for FHS Human Sciences for the 2019-20 academic year are:

Professor Helen Fletcher (London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine)
Dr Samuel Roberts (Liverpool John Moores University)
Dr James Staples (Brunel University)

The internal examiners are:

Professor Stanley Ulijaszek (Chair)
Dr Thomas Cousins
Mrs Naomi Freud
Dr Caroline Phillips

Questions pertaining to examination procedure should be addressed to the Examiner or Chair of Examiners.

Candidates are not under any circumstances permitted to seek to make contact with individual internal or external examiners during or after the examination process regarding specifics of the examination of their own or others' work.

Candidates who are unhappy with an aspect of their assessment may make a complaint or appeal to the Proctors via their college.

Appendix

HUMAN SCIENCES MARKING CRITERIA FOR EXAMINATION PAPERS

The numerical ranges (% score) for each mark band are indicated and markers are expected to use the indicative descriptions in making their judgments on which mark to award.

Positive attributes are formatted to the left (the 'achievements' to be accumulated), and the negative points are to the right (those which are holding the candidate back from achieving a higher mark).

The criteria should be viewed in a cumulative manner, and the majority of positive criteria within a mark band (and those below it) should be satisfied in order for a mark in that band to be awarded.

Placement within a mark band will be determined by the extent to which the stated criteria for that band are fulfilled by the examined work; marks in the upper part of a given band may include a limited number of positive characteristics from the band above.

Class	Mark Band	Indicative description: Examination answers
Fail	Lower 0-14	Fails to answer the question or completely misunderstands the question● A very short answer● No understanding of basic course material demonstrated● No clear logical structure● Poorly-written, lacking general structure● No attempt made to link information directly to the question●
	Upper 15-29	●Contains some superficially relevant information and/or ●Progresses no further than introductory section (even if this is of good quality) and/or ●Information presented only in note form No evidence of structure in the answer● Information conveyed is largely irrelevant and superficial● Very little connection to the question set●
Pass	30-39	●Shows only minimal evidence of having understood the question ●Provides adequate relevant content to avoid outright failure Fails to directly address the question● No evidence of reading of relevant literature● Multiple factual/conceptual inaccuracies● Poorly written throughout● Very limited evidence of structure in the answer● Lacking in any organized argument● Contains uncritical and unsubstantiated assertions●
3rd	Lower 40-44	●Demonstrates a limited understanding of what the question demands ●Exhibits some basic knowledge/understanding of some core lecture material Fails to address significant portions of the question● No evidence of reading of relevant literature● Some significant factual/conceptual inaccuracies● Significant errors of interpretation● Poorly organised and written throughout● Lacking in substantial organized argument● Contains unsubstantiated assertions●
	Upper 45-49	●Exhibits competent knowledge/understanding of some core lecture material ●Link between the arguments and the question set is present (but tenuous) ●Some attempt is made to organize material in to a coherent argument Very little sign of reading or deeper thought● Contains errors of fact or interpretation but which do not invalidate arguments● Lines of argument are under-developed and/or ill-focused● Generally poorly organised and written● Conclusions indicate evidence of poor judgement●
2ii	Lower 50-54	●Answer is relevant in broad terms to the question set ●Successfully uses some aspects of relevant core lecture material in constructing arguments

		●Exhibits some basic knowledge of relevant material beyond the core lectures ●Contains several valid arguments ●OR, a well-constructed essay covering broadly relevant material, but failing to address the specific question being asked Occasional errors of fact, which do not invalidate the main arguments● Large parts of the answer lack focus● Several sections are poorly written ● Arguments used lack adequate depth or support●
	Upper 55-59	●Reasonably well-focused on the question ●Some well-argued points/perspectives, with some balanced discussion ●The majority of relevant core lecture material is adequately used ●Exhibits knowledge of relevant material beyond the core lectures ●Demonstrates a reasonably good understanding of the main points ●Some reference to core (directed) literature/examples included Not all aspects of the question are adequately addressed● Some signs of confusion and/or small factual errors● The answer lists references and/or examples but fails to relate them to each other analytically● Occasional sections may be badly written, or might not support the main argument● Some lines of argument are individually incomplete or rather pedestrian● OR: An otherwise very good answer which is significantly unfinished●
2i	**Lower 60-64**	●Sound, well-presented and clearly structured ●Addresses all aspects of the question directly ●Clear understanding of core subject material demonstrated ●Significant body of core subject literature well represented and referenced ●Evidence presented within a logical framework ●Accurate but basic use of examples and case studies Not all sections are well-focused on the question● Occasional but significant gaps in background material and/or literature cited● Conclusions lack clarity●
	Upper 65-69	●Good breadth of knowledge demonstrated ●Evidence of wider reading ●Uses attributed examples to support the ideas advanced ●Very good degree of clarity of explanation ●Cautious and accurate interpretation of information Minor gaps in background material and/or literature cited● Minor deviation in focus●
1st	**Lower 70-79**	●Well-balanced and comprehensive answer to the question ●Arguments are clear, analytical, sustained, structured ●A good range and depth of material to support arguments ●No significant errors of fact or misunderstandings of concepts ●Demonstrates a clear awareness and understanding of current literature ●Evidence of original thinking or insight based on an evaluation of the evidence ●Well-written, orderly, convincing and interesting to read
	Middle 80-89	●Incisive elucidation of theory or models ●Highly organised evidence-based original arguments ●Critical synthesis of a substantial body of evidence ●Penetrating analysis of existing ideas, supporting perceptive conclusions
	Upper 90-100	●A truly outstanding answer ●Evidence of novel ideas and originality of approach ●Exceptionally deep critical understanding of the issues ●Synthesizes and makes expert use of wide-ranging relevant material ●Thought-provoking and challenging

HUMAN SCIENCES MARKING CRITERIA FOR SUBMITTED ESSAYS

The numerical ranges (% score) for each mark band are indicated and markers are expected to use the indicative descriptions in making their judgments on which mark to award.

Positive attributes are formatted to the left (the 'achievements' to be accumulated), and the negative points are to the right (those which are holding the candidate back from achieving a higher mark).

The criteria should be viewed in a cumulative manner, and the majority of positive criteria within a mark band (and those below it) should be satisfied in order for a mark in that band to be awarded.

Placement within a mark band will be determined by the extent to which the stated criteria for that band are fulfilled by the examined work; marks in the upper part of a given band may include a limited number of positive characteristics from the band above.

Class	Mark Band	Indicative description: Submitted Essays
Fail	**Lower 0-14**	Fails to address the chosen topic or question● A very short piece of work, demonstrating little commitment● Very little understanding of basic topic demonstrated● No clear logically structured argument● Poorly-written, containing many mistakes● Lacking the required structure● No attempt made to link information directly to the chosen topic or question●
	Upper 15-29	●Contains some superficially relevant information ●Includes some sense of a coherent structure ●Information presented only in reduced (e.g. note) form Very limited evidence of structured/focused work● Information conveyed is largely irrelevant and superficial● Very little connection to the topic literature●
Pass	**30-39**	●Addresses the specified question in a highly rudimentary but coherent manner ●Demonstrates some minimal effort in gathering data ●Provides adequate interpretation to avoid outright failure Shows only minimal evidence of having understood the topic● Little attempt at articulating conclusions●
3rd	**Lower 40-44**	●Achieves a very limited understanding of the topic area ●Demonstrates some basic knowledge/understanding of background material ●Simple descriptive discussion is present ●Conclusions are attempted Fails to directly address the topic● Multiple inaccuracies in language● No evidence of significant engagement with literature● Significant errors of interpretation● Generally poorly written● Ineffective information gathering● Lacking in substantial analysis● Conclusions are weak or ill-founded●
	Upper 45-49	●Achieves a minimal overview of the chosen topic or question ●Reveals some basic understanding of the topic ●Literature review includes some relevant material ●Some attempt is made to organize material in to a coherent argument ●Conclusions based on the gathered material are attempted Poorly organised and written● Little sign of deeper engagement with the material● Contains errors of fact or interpretation but which do not invalidate arguments● Much of the argument is under-developed and/or ill-focused● Conclusions indicate some evidence of poor judgement●
2ii	**Lower 50-54**	●Demonstrates engagement with a reasonable range of source material ●Successfully uses some aspects of the material in constructing competent arguments ●Contains at least some structured discussion

		●Attempts at directly linking conclusions to the question are made ●A well-constructed essay, but fails to adequately address the specified question Treatment of the topic is rather superficial or unfocused in places● May be too narrow in scope● There may be too high a degree of description, without adequate analysis and interpretation● Arguments lack adequate depth or support● Occasional errors of fact, which do not invalidate the main arguments● Several sections are poorly written●
	Upper 55-59	●Reasonably well-focused on the specified question ●Demonstrates a reasonably good understanding of the topic area ●A broad body of relevant literature is adequately used ●Some well-argued points/perspectives, with some balanced discussion ●Attempts are made to link discussions to the literature The analysis of the literature is lacking in depth● Some arguments and/or analyses are individually incomplete or rather pedestrian● Not all aspects of the specified question are adequately addressed● Some signs of confusion and/or small factual or analytical errors● Occasional sections may be badly written, or might not be relevant to the main argument●
2i	**Lower 60-64**	●Sound, well-presented and clearly structured ●Addresses all aspects of the chosen topic or question directly ●Clear understanding of subject material and relevant theoretical frameworks ●Significant body of literature is well represented and referenced ●Arguments are sustained and presented within a logical framework ●Discussion is solid and well-supported by the literature ●Conclusions are generally well-focused, showing good level of engagement with the material Occasional gaps in background material and/or literature cited● Not all sections are well-focused on the question● Discussions/conclusions contain small degree of ambiguity●
	Upper 65-69	●Clear signs of well-directed effort, and in particular evidence of deeper engagement with literature, including novel insight ●Good breadth of knowledge demonstrated ●Points of discussion are well-supported ●High degree of clarity of explanation ●Cautious and accurate analysis and interpretation of relevant material ●Presentation is careful with few linguistic or other errors Minor gaps in background material and/or literature cited● Minor deviation in focus●
1st	**Lower 70-79**	●Well-balanced and comprehensive treatment of the chosen topic or question ●Arguments are clear, analytical, sustained, structured ●A good range and depth of material to support arguments ●No significant errors of fact, analysis, or misunderstandings of concepts ●Demonstrates a clear awareness and understanding of current literature ●Evidence of original thinking or insight based on an evaluation of the evidence ●May feature novel analyses of existing data or generation and analysis of relevant new data ●Well-written, orderly, convincing and interesting to read
	Middle 80-89	●An excellent essay which may, in principle, be of publishable standard ●Incisive elucidation of theory or models ●Highly organised evidence-based original arguments ●Critical synthesis of a substantial body of evidence ●Penetrating analysis of existing ideas and/or data and/or new data, supporting perceptive conclusions
	Upper 90-100	●A truly outstanding essay which may, in principle, be of publishable standard ●Evidence of novel ideas and originality of approach ●Exceptionally deep critical understanding of the issues ●Synthesizes and makes expert use of wide-ranging relevant material ●Thought-provoking and challenging

HUMAN SCIENCES MARKING CRITERIA FOR DISSERTATIONS

The numerical ranges (% score) for each mark band are indicated and markers are expected to use the indicative descriptions in making their judgments on which mark to award.

Positive attributes are formatted to the left (the 'achievements' to be accumulated), and the negative points are to the right (those which are holding the candidate back from achieving a higher mark).

The criteria should be viewed in a cumulative manner, and the majority of positive criteria within a mark band (and those below it) should be satisfied in order for a mark in that band to be awarded.

Placement within a mark band will be determined by the extent to which the stated criteria for that band are fulfilled by the examined work; marks in the upper part of a given band may include a limited number of positive characteristics from the band above.

Class	Mark Band	Indicative description: Dissertations
Fail	Lower 0-14	Fails to address the chosen topic or question● A very short piece of work, demonstrating little commitment● Very little understanding of basic topic demonstrated● No clear logically structured argument● Poorly-written, containing many mistakes● Lacking the required structure● No attempt made to link information directly to the chosen topic or question●
	Upper 15-29	●Contains some superficially relevant information ●Includes some sense of a coherent structure ●Information presented only in reduced (e.g. note) form Very limited evidence of structured/focused work● Information conveyed is largely irrelevant and superficial● Very little connection to the topic literature●
Pass	30-39	●Addresses the specified question in a highly rudimentary but coherent manner ●Demonstrates some minimal effort in gathering relevant information ●Provides adequate interpretation to avoid outright failure Shows only minimal evidence of having understood the topic● Little attempt at articulating conclusions●
3rd	Lower 40-44	●Achieves a very limited understanding of the topic area ●Demonstrates some basic knowledge/understanding of background material ●Simple descriptive discussion is present ●Conclusions are attempted Fails to directly address the topic● Multiple inaccuracies in language● No evidence of significant engagement with literature● Significant errors of interpretation● Generally poorly written● Superficial information gathering● Lacking in substantial analysis● Conclusions are weak or ill-founded●
	Upper 45-49	●Achieves a minimal overview of the chosen topic or question ●Reveals some basic understanding of the topic ●Literature review includes some relevant material ●Some attempt is made to organize material in to a coherent argument ●Conclusions based on the gathered material are attempted Poorly organised and written● Little sign of deeper engagement with the material● Contains errors of fact or interpretation but which do not invalidate arguments● Much of the argument is under-developed and/or ill-focused● May fail to integrate material from more than one discipline● Conclusions indicate some evidence of poor judgement●
2ii	Lower 50-54	●Demonstrates engagement with a reasonable range of source material ●Successfully uses some aspects of the material in constructing competent arguments

		●Contains at least some structured discussion ●Attempts at directly linking conclusions to the question are made ●A well-constructed dissertation, but fails to adequately address the specified question Treatment of the topic is rather superficial or unfocused in places● May be too narrow in scope● May feature only minimal use of a second discipline, or the relevance of this may not be clear● There may be too high a degree of description, without adequate analysis and interpretation● Arguments lack adequate depth or support● Occasional errors of fact, which do not invalidate the main arguments● Several sections are poorly written●
	Upper 55-59	●Reasonably well-focused on the specified question ●Demonstrates a reasonably good understanding of the topic area ●A broad body of relevant literature from more than one discipline is adequately used ●Some well-argued points/perspectives, with some balanced discussion ●Attempts are made to link discussions to the literature The analysis of the literature is lacking in depth● Some arguments and/or analyses are individually incomplete or rather pedestrian● Not all aspects of the specified question are adequately addressed● Opportunities may have been missed to integrate material from the different disciplines used● Some signs of confusion and/or small factual or analytical errors● Occasional sections may be badly written, or might not be relevant to the main argument●
2i	**Lower 60-64**	●Sound, well-presented and clearly structured ●Addresses all aspects of the chosen topic or question directly ●Clear understanding of subject material and relevant theoretical frameworks ●Significant body of literature is well represented and referenced, including integrating together some material from at least two disciplines ●Arguments are sustained and presented within a logical framework ●Discussion is solid and well-supported by the literature Conclusions are generally well-focused, showing good level of engagement with the material Occasional gaps in background material and/or literature cited● Not all sections are well-focused on the question● Discussions/conclusions contain small degree of ambiguity●
	Upper 65-69	●Clear signs of well-directed effort, and in particular evidence of deeper engagement with literature, including integration of material from at least two disciplines to generate novel insight ●Good breadth of knowledge demonstrated ●Points of discussion are well-supported ●High degree of clarity of explanation ●Cautious and accurate analysis and interpretation of relevant material ●Presentation is careful with few linguistic or other errors Minor gaps in background material and/or literature cited● Minor deviation in focus●
1st	**Lower 70-79**	●Well-balanced and comprehensive treatment of the chosen topic or question ●Arguments are clear, analytical, sustained, structured ●A good range and depth of material to support arguments ●No significant errors of fact, analysis, or misunderstandings of concepts ●Demonstrates a clear awareness and understanding of current literature ●Evidence of original thinking or insight based on an evaluation of the evidence ●May feature novel analyses of existing data or generation and analysis of relevant new data ●Well-written, orderly, convincing and interesting to read
	Middle 80-89	●An excellent dissertation which may, in principle, be of publishable standard ●Incisive elucidation of theory or models ●Highly organised evidence-based original arguments ●Critical synthesis of a substantial body of evidence ●Penetrating analysis of existing ideas and/or data and/or new data, supporting perceptive conclusions
	Upper	●A truly outstanding dissertation which may, in principle, be of publishable standard ●Evidence of novel ideas and originality of approach

	90-100	●Exceptionally deep critical understanding of the issues ●Synthesizes and makes expert use of wide-ranging relevant material ●Thought-provoking and challenging

HUMAN SCIENCES MARKING CRITERIA FOR PRESENTATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of the presentation is to demonstrate an ability to convey information about a topic – ideas, facts and conclusions – to others in a meaningful, clear and interesting fashion within seven minutes. The aim is to enhance students' ability to communicate verbally to others in a clear and engaging manner using transferable skills appropriate for an academic audience, the workplace and for other audiences.

Criteria for the assessment of the presentation:

a. Did the student provide a clear and concise presentation of the topic in a meaningful and interesting fashion?

b. Did the student use an appropriate range of materials to engage the audience?

c. Did the student persuade the audience of their argument with appropriate use of information that was readily absorbed and understood?

d. Was the student able to provide appropriate and considered answers to questions from the audience following the presentation?

The presentation will be marked according to the following scheme:

ASSESSMENT:

1. Relevance and appropriateness of content and conclusions - 5 possible marks
2. Clarity and appropriateness of level of detail - 5 possible marks
3. Enthusiasm and engagement with audience - 5 possible marks
4. Effectiveness and appropriateness of medium of presentation - 5 possible marks
5. Persuasiveness of argument and conclusions - 5 possible marks

MARKS:

5 - outstanding
4 - excellent
3 - good
2 - satisfactory
1 - poor
0 - very poor

The final mark for the presentation is calculated as the above total (of a possible 25) divided by 5, giving a final mark out of 5.

The presentation is worth 5% of the marks for Paper 3 (the essay constituting 95% of the mark) with the final mark for the paper calculated as outlined in **Section 3.3**, above. The examiners will not know the candidate's essay score when they are marking the presentations. No examiner will assess their own students' work.