|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student****Name:** |  | **Course code:(e.g. HS2125)**  |  |
| **Grading ( 🗸 )** | **I** | **IIi** | **IIii** | **III**  | **F** |
| **Research** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Evidence** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Argument** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Structure** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Writing** |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **First Marker’s Feedback** |
|  |
| **Areas of Strength** |  |
| **Areas for Development** |  |
| **Final Mark (%)****(Where necessary, this mark reflects agreement between the First and Second Marker.)** |  | **Deductions****(Where penalty deductions have been applied due to late or over length work, they will be detailed here.)** |  |
| **Tutor** |  | **Date** |  |

History Department Essay Marking Criteria

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **(A) Lower to Good 1st (70-85)** |  **(B) Upper 2nd Class****(60-69)**  | **(C) Lower 2nd Class****(50-59)**  | **(D) Third Class****(40-49)**  |  |
| Demonstration of Reading & **Research** | **Outstanding 1st** (86-100) – See Student Handbook for guidance | Good at **accounting for** differences & similarities in the scholarly literature; gives a perceptive account of what is at stake in scholarly debates. | Offers a clear account of the state of key scholarly questions, with attention to evaluating **contrasting views** in the scholarly literature where applicable.  | Shows **awareness of scholarly literature** but tends to lean on a particular author or to use writers for ‘information’ rather than seeing them as offering competing interpretations. | Shows some knowledge of the material but gives evidence of difficulty engaging with key problems & questions.  | **Fail** (1-39) – See Student Handbook for guidance |
| Analysis & Evaluation of **Evidence** | **Illuminating**: Analyses evidence **in depth**; offers **original** insights; sees **connections** between aspects of a problem. | **Insightful**: Shows awareness of contrasting voices where they are found in the evidence; shows strong command of **detail.** Evidence is interrogated. | **Thoughtful**: points are grounded in the evidence, but not always reflecting careful interpretation. | **Partial**: Discussion of evidence is **limited.**  |
| Strength & Originality of **Argument** | **Perceptive** argument, articulated with rigour and clarity. | Argues a clearly defined position **systematically** (with a clear statement of position in the intro); **develops** insights rather than repeating them. | An **orderly** series of points, but not adding up to a cumulative argument that is more than the sum of its parts. Offers ideas but little **development**. May misunderstand or fail to address a key problem or set question. | **Explores** the topic but the line of argument is tenous or missing. |
| Organisation & **Structure** | Fluent and sustained development of argument, which builds momentum throughout. | Structure is broken down into clear logical steps. | Substance is present but logical steps are weak. | Fragmented and difficult to follow; it may also be difficult to be sure of intended meaning. |
| **Writing** Style, Grammar & Spelling, Presentation, Referencing | Incisive and fluent style, with no significant errors. | Fluent style with few errors or inconsistencies. | Straightforward and clear but not without noticeable error. | Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation, presentation, and/or referencing. |