

**Faculty of Arts and  
Humanities**

**School of Humanities**

**Postgraduate Taught  
Programmes**

**Handbook Information**

**2019-20**

**Disclaimer**

This information is issued on the condition that it does not form part of any contract between the University of Southampton and any student. The information given has been made as accurate as possible at the time of publication, but the University reserves the right to modify or alter, without any prior notice, any of the contents advertised. It should therefore be noted that it may not be possible to offer all modules or components of a programme in each academic session.

*This handbook is available in alternative formats on request.*

## Postgraduate taught Programmes

	INDEX	PAGE
	<b>WELCOME</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1	Student offices	7
1.2	How we keep in touch with you	7
1.3	Confirmation of your student enrolment status	8
<b>2</b>	<b>SUPPORTING YOU THROUGH YOUR STUDIES</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1	Supporting students with disabilities, mental health conditions or specific learning difficulties	8
2.2	The role of your personal academic tutor and other key academic staff	8
2.3	What to do if you are ill	9
2.4	External factors affecting your attendance or performance in your studies	10
2.5	Special considerations	10
<b>3</b>	<b>YOUR SAFETY</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1	Faculty health and safety policy	11
3.2	Access to buildings	12
<b>4</b>	<b>YOUR ACADEMIC PROGRAMME</b>	<b>12</b>
4.1	The academic year and the programme structure	12
4.2	iPhD	12
4.3	Registration and amendment to optional modules	12
4.4	Attendance	13
4.5	Additional costs	13
<b>5</b>	<b>SCHOOL TEACHING AND LEARNING SKILLS</b>	<b>13</b>
5.1	Time management	13
5.2	Lectures	13
5.3	Use of electronic recording devices or mobile phones in lectures or	14
5.4	Tutorial / supervisions	14
5.5	Independent or Self-learning	14
5.6	Key skills	14
5.7	Academic Integrity – The University Policy	14
5.8	School policy on referencing	15
<b>6</b>	<b>ASSESSMENT AND EXAMINATIONS</b>	<b>15</b>
6.1	Coursework assessment and submission	15
6.2	Marking and Moderation	15
6.3	Penalties for late coursework submission	15
6.4	If for any reason you miss the deadline	15

6.5	Over length work	15
6.6	Late submission of coursework - extensions	16
6.7	Exam preparation	16
6.8	Examinations	16
6.9	Illegible exam scripts	16
6.10	Coursework and examination feedback	16
6.11	Access to coursework and examination scripts	17
6.12	Scaling of work	17
6.13	Release of results	17
6.14	Final assessment	17
<b>7</b>	<b>STAFF/STUDENT LIAISON: GETTING YOUR VOICE HEARD</b>	<b>17</b>
7.1	Module reports	17
7.2	Module survey	17
7.3	Staff Student Liaison Committees	17
7.4	Student Representation	18
<b>8</b>	<b>CAREERS AND EMPLOYABILITY</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>FURTHER STUDY OPPORTUNITIES</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>REGULATORY ISSUES</b>	<b>19</b>
10.1	Academic appeals	19
10.2	Student complaints	19
10.3	Dignity at work and study	19
10.4	Student Non-Academic Misconduct	19
<b>11</b>	<b>Marking Criteria for MA Programmes</b>	<b>20</b>
	Marking Criteria for English MA Programmes	20
	Marking Criteria for Philosophy MA Programme	27
	Marking Criteria for Modern Languages and Linguistics MA Programme	29
	Marking Criteria for Film MA Programme	34
	Marking Criteria for History MA Programme	35
	Marking Criteria for Music MMUS	40
	Marking Criteria for Archaeology MA Programme	42
	<b>APPENDIX 1 – Additional Costs</b>	<b>49</b>
	<b>APPENDIX 2 – Revision Strategy and Examination Techniques</b>	<b>53</b>
	<b>APPENDIX 3 – Over Length Work</b>	<b>56</b>

Updated September 2017

## **WELCOME**

*Dear Student*

*On behalf of myself and my colleagues, may I welcome you back to your studies or, if you are new to the University, may I welcome you very warmly to the Faculty of Arts and Humanities. To those of you who have come from overseas, we wish you a very happy stay in this country. The Faculty is made up of the School of Humanities based at Avenue Campus, and Winchester School of Art based in Winchester.*

*You are part of a vibrant research led Faculty which is committed to the highest standards of teaching by internationally renowned scholars. All the programmes that the Faculty provide offer you the opportunity for a period of intensive study in subject areas chosen by you. The academic community aims to inspire you to develop your knowledge and skills remembering that the outcome of your studies depends greatly on your own personal commitment and independent capacity to learn. We look forward to working with you and trust that you will strive for the highest standard of work while participating fully in the academic life of the Faculty.*

*This handbook provides a convenient source of information for students enrolled within the Faculty of Arts and Humanities during the current academic year. Please take the time to read it carefully and consult it often during the year.*

*For now I wish you the very best for an enjoyable, stimulating, and rewarding time here at the University of Southampton.*



***Professor Paul Whittaker***  
***Dean***

***Faculty of Arts and Humanities***

## 1 GENERAL INFORMATION

### Disclaimer

This information is issued on the condition that it does not form part of any contract between the University of Southampton and any student. The information given has been made as accurate as possible at the time of publication, but the University reserves the right to modify or alter, without any prior notice, any of the contents advertised. It should therefore be noted that it may not be possible to offer all modules or components of a programme in each academic session. *This handbook is available in alternative formats on request.*

### Additional University information online 2019-20

For further information on the services and support facilities available to students at the University of Southampton, please access these via [SUSSED](#) and clicking on the **Students** tab.

### School resource available to help you

The information contained within your programme handbook is designed to provide key information applicable to you and your programme during the 2019/20 academic year. It will complement the University's Student Online and Discipline Handbooks. You can access the University's Student Handbook by logging on to [SUSSED](#), using your user name and password, and clicking on the **Students** tab in the top navigation bar. It is important that you make use of these resources as they support the regulations relating to your obligations and that of the University while you are registered with us. It also provides helpful information on matters such as housing, finance, leisure, healthcare and support facilities.

Resource	Web link
Faculty website	<a href="#">Faculty of Arts and Humanities Website</a>
School website	<a href="#">School of Humanities Website</a>
Faculty staff information	<a href="#">Faculty of Arts and Humanities Website</a>
School staff information	<a href="#">School Staff Contact Information</a>
School Hub	<a href="#">Faculty of Arts and Humanities Student Hub</a>
Programme and module descriptions	<p>Your programme structure (i.e. which modules make up your programme) is available in your programme specification and via the on-line programme catalogue: <a href="#">Programme and Module Information</a></p> <p>To find links to broad generic descriptions of the programmes and modules, follow links to your programme via the link below: <a href="#">Humanities Postgraduate Programme Information</a></p>
Academic Integrity	<a href="#">Academic Integrity Information</a> <a href="#">Academic Integrity Regulations</a>
Blackboard	<a href="#">Blackboard</a>
Library	<a href="#">Library Website</a>
Programme regulations	<a href="#">University of Southampton Programme Regulations</a>
Educational support services	<a href="#">Educational Support Services Website</a>
Study skills support	<a href="#">Study Skills Website</a>

## Glossary of Common Terms

<b>Academic Integrity</b>	The regulations governing academic issues such as cheating or plagiarism. The regulations can be found online at <a href="http://www.calendar.soton.ac.uk/sectionIV/academic-integrity-regs.html">http://www.calendar.soton.ac.uk/sectionIV/academic-integrity-regs.html</a>
<b>Assessment Weightings</b>	A module can be made up of several elements of assessment, each contributing a percentage to your mark for the module (i.e. coursework at 40% and exam at 60%). This will vary by module and will be clearly indicated in the module information provided to you.
<b>Blackboard</b>	The portal for students to access module materials and lecture information. Blackboard is a kind of virtual learning environment and each module you take will have its own Blackboard site.
<b>Compulsory Module</b>	A module which you are required to take
<b>Core Module</b>	A module which you are required to pass
<b>Deferral</b>	Normally offered to students who have Special Considerations, you may be permitted to defer an exam to the referral period in the summer or to the following year
<b>Module Code</b>	The code assigned to a module i.e. HIST1010
<b>Optional Module</b>	A module of your choice, identified within your programme structure.
<b>Pass Mark</b>	The pass mark for all postgraduate modules is 50, unless specified differently in the programme specification.
<b>Programme Title</b>	The title of your degree programme, e.g. MMus
<b>Progression</b>	To be able to progress from one level of study to the next: this means meeting all the progression requirements. Progression regulations can be found at; <a href="#">Progression Regulations</a> <a href="#">Stand Alone Masters Regulations</a>
<b>Referral</b>	Within the constraints of the University's progression regulations, if you fail a module that prevents you progressing to the next year of study, you will be referred in that module, which means that you will undergo some kind of re-assessment. Referral assessments take place in late August/early September (often known as the Supplementary period).
<b>Repeat</b>	If you fail at the referral stage and still cannot progress to the next year of study, you may repeat (normally) the whole year. All of your previous marks are deleted and only your new marks are recorded.
<b>Special Considerations</b>	If your studies have been affected by illness or other personal matters, a Special Considerations form should be submitted to the Student Office. Submitting the form alerts us to any problems you are having, so you need to do so as soon as you can.
<b>Fail</b>	Any mark below 35. Even if a module is an option and, therefore, not a module you are strictly required to pass, you will be referred if your mark is below 35.

## Enrolment

This takes place online (for new and continuing students) and you will have received information about this prior to your arrival at the University for the new academic year.

**The enrolment tab can be accessed** by logging on to [SUSSED](#) using your username and password, then clicking onto the Students tab.

You may also find it helpful to look at the [School of Humanities](#) website which provides a range of information for incoming students.

### 1.1 Student Offices

#### The Humanities Student Office

(Avenue campus,) is located at the end of the south corridor in room 1121

Telephone – 023 8059 2206 (Internal 22206)

Student Office Email – [hums-studentoffice@soton.ac.uk](mailto:hums-studentoffice@soton.ac.uk)

Modern Languages- [modlang@soton.ac.uk](mailto:modlang@soton.ac.uk)

Archaeology and History- [archhist@soton.ac.uk](mailto:archhist@soton.ac.uk)

Film and Philosophy- [efphums@soton.ac.uk](mailto:efphums@soton.ac.uk)

English- [englhums@soton.ac.uk](mailto:englhums@soton.ac.uk)

#### The Humanities Student Office – Building 2 (Music)

(Highfield Campus), is located in room 2/2011

Telephone – 023 8059 5872

Office Opening Hours (both) - Monday to Thursday 9am to 5pm, Friday, 9am to 4.30pm

General Email Address – [musicbox@soton.ac.uk](mailto:musicbox@soton.ac.uk)

For all students, these offices are your first port of call for most of your administrative queries or problems. Staff will try to answer any queries you may have, including questions about fees and accommodation, but the role of these offices is primarily to do with academic issues and questions relating specifically to the School of Humanities (including submission of medical certificates and evidence of extenuating circumstances). These offices process assessed work, and deal with transcripts, exam results, bank letters and other letters to confirm student status.

All staff will be able to help you with most of your enquires; however if you have specific queries about your degree programme you should be directed in the first instance to your module advisor, your tutor or the Director of Programmes for your discipline.

#### Essential dates

You can find a full list of the [academic term dates](#) and [key dates](#) for 2019-20 through these links.

### 1.2 How we keep in touch with you

#### Email

We will use your University email account to contact you when necessary. We will **not** use any other email accounts or social networking sites. Check your University email account regularly and do not let your inbox exceed your storage limit. Notification that you are due to exceed your storage limit will be sent to your University email account and you should take immediate action as you will be unable to receive further emails once your storage limit has been exceeded.

Please note that in some disciplines the use of module mailing lists is also undertaken in addition to Blackboard, which will be used by tutors and students to communicate, and should be treated as an open forum to discuss ideas about the module. As members of your discipline staff are on every list, they will be monitored for misuse (such as abusive language or “flaming”), and any perpetrators will be removed from the list. You are bound by University regulations regarding use and misuse of computing facilities.

### **Written Correspondence**

Formal correspondence regarding your programme of study (e.g. suspension, transfer or withdrawal from programme, academic performance (including progression/referral information), issues of academic integrity, student complaints and academic appeals) will be sent to your term-time (TT) or permanent (PM) address listed as active on your student record. You are responsible for advising the University if you change your permanent or term-time address. Neither the University nor the School/Faculty will be held accountable if you receive important information late because you failed to update your student record.

### **Use of Social Networking Sites**

We understand that students are increasingly using social networking sites to interact with members of their student community. You should note that any behaviour that affects other members of the University community or members of the general public in ways which might damage the standing and reputation of the University may be subject to disciplinary action within the scope of the University's Regulations.

## **1.3 Confirmation of your student enrolment status**

The Student Office can provide you with a certificate to confirm your status as a student (e.g. for bank account opening purposes). Please ensure that you give at least 48 hours' notice of your requirements (longer at peak times such as at enrolment or during the examination periods). Your award certificate will be produced using the legal name data you have provided within your student record. Please make any necessary amendments to your record immediately a change occurs to ensure that your certificate contains accurate information.

In accordance with policy, a scale of fees exists for the provision of certificates, transcripts and award certificates. Please see point 11 '*Transcripts, Certificates and Award Letters*' within the [fees section](#) of the University Calendar for a list. .

Your award certificate will be produced using the legal name data you have provided within your student record. Please make any necessary amendments to your record immediately a change occurs to ensure that your certificate contains accurate information. Changes are made via Banner Self Service.

## **2 SUPPORTING YOU THROUGH YOUR STUDIES**

### **2.1 Supporting students with disabilities, mental health conditions or specific learning difficulties**

[Enabling Services](#) provides a wide variety of support for students who have disabilities, mental health problems or specific learning difficulties. Our expert team can provide advice and support relating to your studies, both while you are preparing for University and throughout your time here.

Contact details can be found here: <http://www.southampton.ac.uk/edusupport/contact.page>?

### **2.2 The role of your personal academic tutor (PAT) and other key academic staff**

A member of academic staff in your programme team will be assigned to act as your PAT. He/she can offer general academic guidance, such as help to improve your study skills.

Your personal academic tutor will not necessarily be involved in lectures or seminars that you will attend but he/she will oversee your scheme of work and may be asked to report on your work and progress. You should consult your personal academic tutor for advice and information on all matters connected both with your programme of study (e.g. module selection, study methods, and with University life generally).

Your personal academic tutor's role is primarily an academic one, to provide advice on choice of modules and on your examination performance, and so on. If you are experiencing any difficulties that you feel may affect your academic performance you should raise these with your PAT as soon as they occur. It is vital that you do not wait until after examination results have been announced to raise any difficulties you are experiencing.

Normally you would expect to have the same PAT throughout your programme of study. Your PAT will normally be the person who writes you a reference at the end of your degree programme, so it is in your interests to see him/her at key points in the academic year. Your PAT will advise you on the best method to make an appointment.



If you have questions about specific module material, you should consult the module co-ordinator.

### **Provision of academic references**

Your PAT will be able to provide a reference for you. However, it is important to ask their permission before giving his/her name as a referee. You may find it helpful, therefore, to provide your potential referee with some detailed information about yourself in the form of a CV or a personal information sheet.

### **Discipline pastoral support**

If you experience significant difficulties with your work, lapses in attendance or personal/health problems during your course you may be referred by your PAT or seminar tutor to the Departmental and/or School Senior Tutor.

<b>Discipline</b>	<b>Contact</b>	<b>Email Address</b>
Archaeology	Dr Yvonne Marshall	<a href="mailto:ymm@soton.ac.uk">ymm@soton.ac.uk</a>
English	Dr Ranka Primorac	<a href="mailto:R.Primorac@soton.ac.uk">R.Primorac@soton.ac.uk</a>
Film	Dr Louis Bayman	<a href="mailto:L.D.Bayman@soton.ac.uk">L.D.Bayman@soton.ac.uk</a>
History	Dr John McAleer (S2)	<a href="mailto:J.Mcaleer@soton.ac.uk">J.Mcaleer@soton.ac.uk</a>
Modern Languages	Dr Sonia Moran Panero	<a href="mailto:S.Moran-Panero@soton.ac.uk">S.Moran-Panero@soton.ac.uk</a>
Music	Professor Andrew Pinnock	<a href="mailto:A.J.Pinnock@soton.ac.uk">A.J.Pinnock@soton.ac.uk</a>
Philosophy	Dr William McNeill	<a href="mailto:will.mcneill@soton.ac.uk">will.mcneill@soton.ac.uk</a>

You should also seek their advice if your other tutor(s) are not available and any crisis occurs, especially at the time of coursework deadlines. They work closely with the Senior Tutor, Mrs Julia Kelly, to support students who need to apply for special considerations and can explain the policy to you if you have any questions or concerns about it. They will, with the support of the Student Office, be present for monitoring the late form process. Along with the personal academic tutors, they can point you in the direction of support that is available at the University if you experience any problems during your course.

### **The role of the senior tutors**

The School of Humanities has one School Senior Tutors who is responsible for coordinating the pastoral support available to students (undergraduate and postgraduate) and liaising with the services provided by the central university. Julia Kelly is based in office 3046 on the Avenue Campus. She can be contacted by emailing [hst19@soton.ac.uk](mailto:hst19@soton.ac.uk) or telephoning extension 23942 (023 8059 3942 if calling externally).

You can make an appointment directly with the senior tutor if you would like to speak to someone confidentially regarding any difficulties you may be experiencing that are impacting on your studies. They can inform you about the various support services that the university has available and make appropriate referrals.

The School Senior Tutor is supported in departments by departmental Senior Tutors and Personal Academic Tutors, who may also recommend that you contact the School Senior Tutor to make them aware of any serious problems affecting your course. The Senior Tutor work closely with Enabling Services to support students with pre-existing medical conditions or specific learning difficulties. You should speak to the Senior Tutor if you are considering suspending your studies for any reason and you will be expected to meet with them following any extended period of absence from the university. Mrs Kelly can advise you on the procedures and regulations regarding special considerations for the School if you are thinking of applying for them and will oversee the process at the exam boards.

### **2.3 What to do if you are ill**

It is important that your doctor (as well as your advisor) is immediately informed of any illness that is likely to affect your studies. If appropriate your GP may inform your Personal Academic Tutor that you are experiencing some health difficulties that may affect your academic performance. This will be done with your

consent and you may wish the details of your illness to be withheld from your advisor, although you should think carefully about this (your advisor will, in any case, respect your privacy). More information can be found in the General Regulations - [Attendance and Completion of Programme Requirements](#).

On the first day of illness you should email or telephone the Student Office to advise them of your absence, see part one for contact details.

If you believe that illness or other circumstances have adversely affected your academic performance, this is known as Special Considerations. If you wish for this to be considered by the School you must complete a Special Considerations form. It is important that you submit this to your School in a timely manner and prior to the Board of Examiners. All claims must be substantiated by written documentary evidence, for example a medical certificate or GP/consultant letter, self-certification or a statement from your tutor. The purpose of asking for supporting documentation is for you to be able to corroborate the facts of your submission.

All claims will be reviewed by the Special Considerations Board which meets at the end of each semester and just prior to the referral examination board. The Student Office will contact you via your University email account to let you know once approval has been made.

Full details of the University's policy on Special Considerations can be found at:  
[Special Considerations](#)

## **2.4 External factors affecting your attendance or performance in your studies**

We expect you to take responsibility for your studies to ensure that your full academic potential can be realised. However, sometimes difficulties can arise that can affect you.

If you are absent from an examination or other assessment or have other grounds for believing that your studies have been affected by external factors you must bring this to the attention of your tutor or to the Student Office immediately. Whilst we recognise that students can sometimes be reluctant to discuss cultural, sensitive or personal issues, it is essential that you bring problems affecting you to our attention immediately so that we can determine how best to help you.

A special considerations process is in place to ensure that you are not penalised for genuine difficulties affecting you. Submitting such a request, together with supporting documentation, will enable the Exam Board to consider the issue and its effect on your studies and performance. Guidance on the special considerations policy and the procedures to follow are available from the Student Office.

## **Student Support Review**

The [Student Support Review Regulations](#) are in place to support students if concerns are raised about their health, wellbeing or behaviour which may be impacting on their academic progress and/or general management of life at University or on placement. The regulations seek to be both supportive and to actively engage with students prior to decisions made about their fitness to study. The regulations and supporting documents identify the procedure and support available to both students and staff when a student becomes unwell and/or presents a risk to self and/or others.

## **Suspending your studies**

Should you feel that you need to take some time out from your studies, known as [suspending your studies](#), you should first discuss this with your tutor. A Suspension Request form should be obtained, completed and returned to the Student Office. Please note that, if you wish, you can suspend your studies in order to undertake an internship or period of industrial training outside of normal vacation time.

## **Withdrawing from your programme**

If you no longer wish to continue with your studies, a Withdrawal Notification form should be obtained, completed and returned to the Student Office. You are also advised to discuss your decision with your Tutor or Director of Programmes. Further information can be found in the [General Regulations - Transfer, Suspension, Withdrawal and Termination](#)

## **2.5 Special Considerations**

The School follows the University regulations for [special considerations](#).

### 3 YOUR SAFETY

#### 3.1 Faculty health and safety policy

The policy of this Faculty is to provide and maintain safe and healthy working conditions, equipment and systems of work for all its staff and students. To this end information, training and supervision is provided as necessary.

It is also your responsibility as an individual that you work in a safe manner to ensure not only your own safety but to ensure the safety of others in the Faculty and University.

Full details of the University's Health and Safety Policy can be found [here](#).

*Observe good health and safety practice at all times. For example, do not congregate on the stairs and cause an obstruction, do not leave bags blocking corridors, do not use laptops in a way where their wires can cause a trip hazard, and do not smoke while on the premises, including e-cigarettes.*

#### Fire alarm testing

The fire alarm test day at Avenue campus is on a Monday afternoon and in Building 2 on a Tuesday morning, if the fire alarm sounds for longer than 20 seconds at any time you should leave the building immediately using the nearest emergency exit point.

#### Action in the event of a fire

In the event of the fire alarm being raised persons should exit the building as quickly as possible and assemble at the far corner of the car park to the South-East of Avenue campus buildings (opposite side from the road), or for other campuses, as indicated on notices in your particular work area. Do not spend time collecting personal belongings such as coats and bags – ensure that you leave the building as quickly as possible. Do not use lifts and do not return to the building unless you are told to do so.

The person raising the alarm should ensure that the Fire Brigade are summoned by either reporting to someone in authority or asking them to do so, or by dialling 91-999 from an internal telephone remote from where the alarms are sounding. Following this, the University Central Control Centre (CCR) should be alerted by dialling 3311 – from an internal phone or 02380 593311 from a mobile.

**Floor plans of all sites** indicating fire alarm call points, fire exits and fire extinguishers are available for inspection from the Faculty Safety Officer at Avenue campus.

Fire extinguishing equipment is provided in all buildings but should only be used by those trained in its use. Members of staff and PhD students are encouraged to attend a training session in the use of fire extinguishing equipment (organised by the University Safety Office) at least once every three years.

#### Accidents

In the event of illness or an accident causing injury, you should contact a First Aider in the Faculty and the First Aider will decide on appropriate treatment and further action, if necessary. Names of current First Aiders in the Faculty are displayed in all public areas of the Faculty at all sites.

All incidents (work-related injury, dangerous occurrence, near miss or ill health) should be recorded online which can be accessed through the first aid icon on the home page of [SUSSED](#). It is important that all incidents are recorded, especially so that action can be taken to prevent future incidents.

#### Personal safety on campus

Please refer to the University's [security website](#) if you are concerned about your personal safety on campus. Crimes can be reported to the 24 Hour Control Centre at all times by dialling 3311 – from an internal phone or 02380 593311 from a mobile. Or directly to Security on extension tel. 22828 during normal working hours.

## 3.2 Access to buildings

### *Avenue and Building 2 (Music)*

Access to Avenue campus and building 2 is linked to the University Access Control system, whereby entry and exit to buildings 65, 65a, 65b and 2 is by means of a current ID card. Access is restricted to users with the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, the only exceptions being those named individuals for who authorisation has been obtained the access card system starts at 6pm and run through the night until 8am in the morning and is working all weekends and bank holidays

### **Out of hour's policy**

The purpose of the policy is to ensure the safety and security of individuals who need to work outside of normal working hours. In order to achieve this, anyone in a University building between 11 pm and 6 am must have permission from the Head of School of Humanities, (11 pm and 7.30 am Avenue campus). The permission must be properly registered with the University's Central Control Centre beforehand. In giving permission, it will be the responsibility of the Head of School to assess whether the safety and security risks for the individual are properly covered. It is expected that the granting of access will only be made in very exceptional circumstances.

Further information on the out of hour's policy can be found at [Out of Hours](#) Policy

### **Children**

The Faculty buildings have not been designed to be a safe environment for unsupervised children and for this reason, children under 16 must be under the immediate and close supervision of a responsible adult at all times. Special care should be taken on, and adjacent to, stairs, and on balconies.

## 4 YOUR ACADEMIC PROGRAMME

### **4.1 The academic year and the programme structure**

The structure and modular content provided within the programme specification is specific to your own programme. You can view your programme specification via [SUSSED](#)

The taught components of the programme are delivered in modular form and run over two semesters. The teaching weeks are followed by a two to three week examination period. The semesters overlap the traditional three term structure which still determines the pattern of vacations at Christmas and Easter.

For any given programme a module is either core, compulsory or optional. The definitions of the first two are provided in the General Regulations- [Regulations and Definitions Applying to Progression for all Credit-Bearing Programmes](#). Your student record will automatically record core and compulsory modules and these must be completed in accordance with the requirements applicable to your programme. Most programmes will have a number of optional modules. If applicable you will need to select a certain number of optional modules to complete your portfolio of modules and fulfil the credit points as required for the programme.

### **4.2 iPhD**

This programme comprises a taught element in years 1,2 and 3. The Graduate School Handbook should be referred to for the research part of your iPhD only. Further information on the regulations of the iPhD can be found in the [University Calendar](#).

### **4.3 Registration and amendment to optional modules**

When choosing your options, you are strongly advised to ensure that you have a similar total number of modules in Semester 1 and Semester 2, to maintain a balanced work load throughout the year. Once you have registered your options, it is possible for you make changes but there are restrictions. The substitution of modules is not allowed (i.e. you cannot take an extra module in semester 2 to replace a semester 1 module in which you failed to perform well).

You may request a change to your optional module choice up to the **end of week 2** in each semester. You should complete a Change of Module form to specify your request (forms can be obtained from the Student Office). If your optional module choices clash in your timetable, then you will need to amend your optional choice accordingly by contacting the Student Office immediately.

You should regularly check your online student record for details of your registered modules. This is particularly important after you have made any changes and will help to maintain the accuracy of your student record. It will also save time and confusion during the examination period.

#### **4.4 Attendance**

All full-time students are required to attend University for the duration of their programme each year, and to attend for such additional periods of study as may be required by the regulations of the programme of study that you are enrolled. The [University Attendance Regulations](#) are available from the University Calendar.

The School's regulation on attendance is as follows:

1. If you have to miss a lecture or seminar for a good reason, such as a job interview, let your tutor(s) know in advance if possible, and find out about the necessary preparation for the following week. If you miss a class through illness, please let your tutor know as soon as you are able (**see section 2.4 on reporting illness**).
2. Module tutors will report all repeated absences to the Director of Programmes and Student Office. If you have missed more than one class in any module without offering an adequate explanation for your absence, you will receive a formal written warning, and will be required to meet the Director of Programmes or your Tutor to discuss your unsatisfactory attendance record.

#### **4.5 Additional Costs**

General programme costs are located in the programme specification. Students are responsible for meeting the cost of essential textbooks, and of producing such essays, assignments, reports and dissertations as are required to fulfil the academic requirements for each programme of study. Costs that students registered for programmes typically have to pay for are included in Appendix 1.

In some cases you'll be able to choose modules (which may have different costs associated with that module) which will change the overall cost of a programme to you. Please also ensure you read the section on additional costs in the [University's Fees, Charges and Expenses Regulations](#) in the University Calendar.

### **5 SCHOOL TEACHING AND LEARNING SKILLS**

#### **Teaching Environment**

Teaching and learning are informed through a culture of investigation and enquiry, and sustained by continuous familiarity with original research. On this basis the School has taken steps to provide a suitable environment that allows undergraduate students to build skills.

#### **5.1 Time management**

It is your responsibility to manage your time in order to ensure that you keep up to date with the material presented and with the requirements of the programme. Deadlines for work submission should be adhered to; otherwise marks will be deducted via the imposition of a late submission penalty. However, the framework of when lectures and classes occur and deadlines for submission of work will be made available to you well in advance, but if you are unclear about any aspect of your module you should talk this through with your module co-ordinator or programme director. This knowledge will allow you to plan your life based on how you know you work best. Effective use of your time will allow you to perform well on your course and to enjoy student life. One of the work-place skills you should aim to acquire at University is the ability to manage multiple priorities. If you have problems in this area please discuss them with your personal advisor.

#### **5.2 Lectures**

A single lecture slot lasts 45 minutes. It is therefore vital that you arrive promptly in order to gain maximum benefit from the time. Each lecturer will present material using either handouts or require you to make your own notes. Taking notes in lectures in a form that you find most useful is an important part of the learning process. Lectures provide a framework and starting point for you to develop your own understanding through extensive further reading and / or practice. It is essential that you use the recommended reading and the assistance of teaching staff during tutorials to gain further understanding. It is your responsibility to develop your ability in a given subject. How well you have acquired that ability and the associated knowledge is gauged by the examination and coursework assessment process. Lectures are provided for your benefit and you should take full advantage by ensuring you attend all of the lectures in a given course module. If, for any reason, you are unable to attend, ensure that you get hold of a copy of the notes or handouts from your

module co-ordinator. Please note that academic staff is not obliged to make the texts of their lectures available to students.

### **5.3 Use of electronic recording devices or mobile phones in lectures or classes**

Out of courtesy to staff and other students, please ensure that mobile phones are switched off in lectures and seminars. You are advised that lectures are the copyright property of the lecturer and permission to audio-record a lecture must be personally sought from the lecturer before proceeding.

If you wish to use a lap-top computer to take notes in a lecture, you should do so in a way that does not cause disruption to those sitting near you.

*If you have a health condition for which additional support is needed, you may, following assessment by the University's educational support services, make appropriate arrangements with staff for recording lectures.*

### **5.4 Tutorial/Supervisions**

Group tutorials/supervisory sessions are timetabled for some modules. These sessions are intended for you to develop your problem solving skills as well as for you to discuss further with an experienced member of staff any particular lecture material you are finding difficult to understand. It is essential that you come well prepared for these sessions. These sessions are one of the most effective ways of reinforcing the lecture material.

### **5.5 Independent or Self-learning**

Independent study or self-directed learning involves using libraries, data retrieval systems, internet, etc., or in a group working on coursework, reading the lecture material or reading around the subject. This should also develop your investigative and problem solving skills in furthering understanding of the subject, creating links with other modules - past and present - and providing a broadening of your educational experiences and knowledge base.

Self-learning is your personal responsibility and your commitment to the programme. It requires discipline, motivation and focussing on achieving individually set targets. It enables you to reach your full potential academically, develops your personal skills and helps establish a successful professional career.

### **5.6 Key skills**

Key skills are those skills which can be applied to other disciplines and fields of work. Employers are increasingly seeking to employ individuals with well-developed key skills. More can be found on the [Academic Skills](#) pages of the Library website.

### **5.7 Academic Integrity: the University Policy**

As a member of a 'learning community' you will be expected to maintain high standards of academic conduct and professional relationships based on courtesy, honesty and mutual respect (with both university staff and fellow students) throughout your degree. Developing skills in presenting well supported and referenced work is a significant part of students' work at University. As a student, working in accordance with standards of academic integrity means you are open, honest and must give due regard and recognition to the sources and resources which have informed the development of your learning as you progress through your degree programme and achieve success in your studies. You will be given support and advice by your course tutors and from your tutor about standards of good academic practice: from referencing conventions, through feedback on written work and advice on copyright. You are expected to take responsibility for the honesty and integrity of your academic work and will have to declare that you are aware of the requirements for good academic practice and the potential penalties for any breach when you submit your coursework. The University takes any breaches of academic integrity (such as plagiarism, cheating, recycling of your or another students work, or falsification of research) extremely seriously and any evidence of such can result in the termination of your programme.

We take academic integrity very seriously. You must familiarise yourself with the [University's Academic Integrity Regulations](#)

Which include the [Academic Integrity Statement](#) by which all students are bound.

We are aware that students may have experienced differing standards at other non UK institutions but it is essential that you take steps to ensure your full understanding of the standards expected at Southampton as significant penalties can be imposed if these are breached.



If it is suspected that you have not worked with academic integrity an investigation will be conducted within the University's defined [procedures](#).

If you are found to have followed one of these practices there are a range of penalties which may be applied. These penalties will always affect the mark you receive for the piece of work in question, and the most serious cases could lead to a reduction in degree classification or even termination of programme. Any breaches may also impact on any future references we may be asked to provide.

**You are strongly advised to read these regulations before you submit your first assignment.**

### **5.8 School policy on referencing**

You should consult your discipline handbooks for full details on the method of referencing you should use in your work, further details can also be found through the [University Library Information Skills](#).

## **6 ASSESSMENT AND EXAMINATIONS**

### **6.1 Coursework assessment and submission**

A number of modules include coursework assignments as part of the assessment. Coursework can often occupy a large amount of time. It is worth noting that getting a few extra marks on an assignment may not justify the extra time spent. Conversely, students who forget or do not bother to hand in work can make it very difficult for themselves to achieve their full academic potential.

### **6.2 Marking and Moderation**

The School follows the University's [Double Blind Marking and Moderation Policy](#) which applies to all summative assessments on both undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes. We also follow the University's [Anonymous Marking Policy](#).

### **6.3 Penalties for late coursework submission**

When coursework is set a due date for submission will be specified and there will be associated penalties for handing in work late. Please ensure you have read the relevant section in the University Student Handbook website and familiarised yourself with this policy before your first assignment is due.

### **6.4 If for any reason you do not complete your essay by the deadline**

You will still be required to submit your late electronic essay through Turnitin. Late penalties will apply as usual, unless there are extenuating circumstances. If there are, you will need to complete a Late Submission form stating the reasons and attaching any relevant medical certificates (see below). This must be submitted to the Student Office for attaching to your electronic essay. The Special Cases Committee will meet to decide what penalties (if any) should be imposed. Lateness usually incurs a penalty – please see the [University Policy on Late Submission Penalties](#) for further information:

Late penalty marks will be applied to work submitted after the 4 pm deadline on the relevant date as follows:

<b>University Working Days Late</b>	<b>Mark</b>
<b>1</b>	(final agreed mark) *0.9
<b>2</b>	(final agreed mark) *0.8
<b>3</b>	(final agreed mark) *0.7
<b>4</b>	(final agreed mark) *0.6
<b>5</b>	(final agreed mark) *0.5
<b>More than 5</b>	Zero

### **6.5 Over Length Work**

In response to student demand for greater clarity, a consistent approach towards over length work has been adopted across the School. A link to the School Policy on Over Length Work can be found in Appendix 3.

Your individual module co-ordinators will provide further details via their Blackboard sites. This approach to over length work does not apply if a piece of work has no word limit, however, you should attend to any length guidance given by your module co-ordinators.

## **6.6 Late Submission of coursework- Extensions**

When coursework is set a due date for submission will be specified and there will be associated penalties for handing in work late. The University has a uniform [policy for the late submission](#).

See paragraph 2.5 above.

University Policy on [Special Considerations and Extensions](#)

## **6.7 Examination preparation (also see Appendix 2)**

You will know yourself how best you prepare for examinations. It is always worth remembering that the sooner you start your preparation the better and that one of the aims of each module is to help you prepare for the examination. Make sure that you have a complete set of notes; that you understand their content; that you can apply the material by solving the example sheet questions; and that you have practiced questions from past papers under examination time constraints. The University's online archive of previously set examination papers is available to assist with your learning and preparation for forthcoming examinations.

Past Exam Papers area available on the Students tab on [SUSSED](#) under Learning Resources.

Remember that if you get into difficulty during your revision process on a particular subject ask someone to help you. This may be either one of the lecturers or teaching assistants on the module.

## **6.8 Examinations**

The dates of University examination periods are published annually on the [exam timetables web page](#).

## **6.9 Illegible exam scripts**

If your examination script is considered illegible, the [Illegible Examination Scripts Policy](#) will be instigated. You will be asked to come in to dictate your script so that it can be transcribed. The costs associated with producing the transcript will fall to you and will be charged at £10.00 per hour. If you refuse to attend, you may be awarded a mark of zero (0).

## **6.10 Coursework and examination feedback**

Feedback comes in many forms and you must learn to recognise the merits of all of these. The [Student Feedback Policy](#) provides an overview of formal feedback.

Formal feedback is well documented and the following paragraphs identify ones that you are officially entitled to. Informal feedback is just as important and comes in the form of individual chats with your advisor, module leaders or project supervisors, or group meetings with academics after a lecture or practical session. Also tests and quizzes on Blackboard, which are available for several modules, can provide valuable feedback on how you are progressing.

All coursework will be marked and returned to you, accompanied by feedback which will relate to the standard of your work and the reasons for the mark/grade given. You should note that all marks are considered provisional until they have been reviewed and confirmed by the examination board. This feedback will typically be returned within **20 working days** following your submission, however within Humanities the turnaround of marking is usually within 10 – 15 working days. Large assignments (e.g. your dissertation/project work) may take slightly longer to be returned. Bear in mind that if you hand in work late, your feedback may be delayed.

Where appropriate, for example with smaller problem solving exercises like calculations, the lecturer will decide if feedback should be given individually, or reported back to the whole group. You are, however always free to ask the lecturer personally how you are progressing.



## 6.11 Access to coursework and examination scripts

### Coursework

Coursework will be retained by the Student Office for a period of one month after marking, if you wish to collect your work you should do so as soon as it is available, any unclaimed work after this period may not be retained.

### Examination scripts

You may if you wish ask to inspect your completed examination scripts, there is a procedure that will need to be followed and you should contact the Student Office for details. You are only permitted to view an examination script to enable you to see how you can improve your future performance and no mark or other annotation on the script is negotiable or open to alteration. The absence of annotation on a script does not mean that it has not been marked.

## 6.12 Scaling of Work

Occasionally, systematic issues arise in marking; for example, there may be differences noted among markers that require adjustment to bring them in line with one another, the level of difficulty of different exam questions, or anomalous variations in performance between different groups of students taking the same module. Each module is subject to a moderation process designed to identify any such issues, and subject to further review by the relevant External Examiner. Where potential issues are identified, the relevant *Director of Programmes* will review the evidence and recommend appropriate action such as re-marking using the same or a different marking scheme, re-weighting components or sub-components, or scaling the marks.

Any adjustments to marks will be made according to the principles and practices identified in the University's Double-blind Marking and Moderation Policy and Scaling Policy (both of which can be found on the [Marking and Feedback](#) page of the University's [Quality Handbook](#)) which include discussion with the External Examiner and approval by the responsible Board of Examiners to confirm that the resulting marks conform to University and national standards. As determining appropriate standards is a matter of academic judgment, these decisions are not subject to academic appeal. Where marks are adjusted, affected students will be notified of both the rationale and the process applied.

## 6.13 Release of results

Students will be given, as a matter of course, the marks they obtain in each individual module of study after they have been ratified by the Board of Examiners. More information can be found in the [Release of Marks](#) procedure.

You should note that the official transcript of your marks would normally show the latest mark obtained in each subject with a note, where appropriate, that it was obtained at repeat or referral attempt.

## 6.14 Final assessment

At the end of your programme, your overall performance will be assessed. The basis of this assessment is specified in your [programme regulations](#). If you satisfy the academic standards necessary, the examination board will recommend you for award.

If you satisfy the academic standards necessary, the examination board will recommend you for award.

# 7 STAFF STUDENT LIAISON: GETTING YOUR VOICE HEARD

## 7.1 Module reports

Your feedback to module surveys will be reflected upon by the module leader and will be included in the Module Report. Modules reports are available via SUSSED under the "programme specific information" tab.

## 7.2 Module Survey

The School aims to consult with and to provide opportunities for all students and staff to make their views known. You are encouraged to offer your comments/suggestions to members of staff and feedback is requested for each module undertaken.

## 7.3 Staff Student Liaison Committees

Staff-Student liaison committees (SSLC) have representatives from across each programme. These committees have the role of monitoring the organisation and management of the student programmes, to note

any difficulties that students may be encountering, and to take advice about ways of improving the programmes.

## 7.4 Student Representation

Through the [Students' Union](#) you will be invited to elect your School representatives (School Leaders, Academic Presidents and Course Representatives) who co-ordinate the student voice on School committees to enable your voice to be heard.

The SSLC also enables student representatives to review and feedback on the external examiners reports and responses. Outside of these meetings if students wish to see these reports they should contact the Faculty Curriculum and Quality Team [fah-cqa@soton.ac.uk](mailto:fah-cqa@soton.ac.uk).

## 8 CAREERS AND EMPLOYABILITY

The [Careers and Employability Service](#) provides support to students at all levels of study and has a range of opportunities on offer. We provide drop-in advice, 1:1 guidance, workshops, skills sessions, Careers Fairs and employer led events to support your career planning as well as the following opportunities:

- *Excel Southampton Internships*  
The Excel Southampton Internship Programme offers paid internships which enhance your CV, expand your network and open graduate recruitment opportunities
- *Business Innovation Programme*  
The Business Innovation Programme provides an opportunity to develop your business acumen, team working and problem-solving skills by working on an 8 week project put forward by local businesses or not-for-profit organisations. The BIP is supported by IBM.
- *Volunteering Bank*  
Volunteering is a great way to help you gain many of the skills employers are looking for, build your network and develop yourself in new ways.
- *Enterprise*  
Whether you want to develop your own start-up or make a real difference from within an existing organisation, enterprise skills are essential to working life and highly valued by employers. The University of Southampton's Student Enterprise Team support all students in developing their enterprising and entrepreneurial skills. Click [here](#) to find out more about opportunities and support.
- *Career Readiness Test*  
*Developed especially for University of Southampton students and graduates, our Career Readiness Test will give you an insight into your career planning. Research shows that students who are more self-aware and clear on their career strengths feel more confident in their ability to succeed in the future.*  
*The test is for everyone. Take the test to:*
  - *Understand where to start*
  - *Reflect on your strengths and areas for development*
  - *Recognise what makes students most employable*
  - *Structure your thinking*
  - *Identify priorities for action*

Just click here to access more information on [Careers and Employability Service](#) and click here to access the [Graduate Capital Model](#) to find out more.

- *Employability events within the School/Faculty*  
The Careers and Employability Service work closely with departments and Faculties to provide targeted careers support within and alongside your curriculum. Activities and opportunities may be appear within the timetable, or be advertised within your School/Faculty. Examples include lectures and workshops, online learning options, and events featuring alumni/employers. There are often opportunities to connect with organisations that offer themed events focused on employability. Some companies offer projects linked to dissertations or specific research.

## 9 FURTHER STUDY OPPORTUNITIES

There is a wide range of programmes leading to various qualifications available to you, and selecting the appropriate programme may not be easy. The first thing to realise is that you need to make a well informed decision and therefore the key is to obtain all the information you need. The Faculty always aims to retain its best and brightest students for research.

## 10 REGULATORY ISSUES: APPEALS, COMPLAINTS, DIGNITY AT WORK AND STUDY, STUDENT DISCIPLINE

We hope that you will be satisfied with your experience during your time as a student at the University of Southampton but we do recognise that, on occasion, things can go wrong. If you have a concern about any aspect of your experience at the University we encourage you to raise it as soon as the concern arises. It is always better to let us know that you feel there is a problem as soon as possible so that the matter may be resolved quickly. You may alternatively wish to consult with your student academic president if it is an issue in common with other students. Please be reassured that you will not suffer any disadvantage or recrimination as a result of raising a genuine concern, student complaint or academic appeal.

### 10.1 ACADEMIC APPEALS

Provided you have grounds, you may appeal against any academic decision made by the University. There are some exceptions and you should note you cannot appeal against a decision that has been made in the proper exercise of academic judgment. The [Regulations Governing Academic Appeals by Students](#) outlines the regulations and procedures that should be followed should you wish to steps that should be followed when making an academic appeal.

### 10.2 STUDENT COMPLAINTS

The [Regulations Governing Student Complaints](#) sets out the process that should be followed should you wish to raise a complaint about a matter relating to either the facilities and services provided by the University, its academic programmes, and the conduct of University staff, and which has materially affected you.

### 10.3 DIGNITY AT WORK AND STUDY

The [University's Dignity at Work and Study Policy](#) applies to the conduct of staff and students, in the context of their University work of study, or which otherwise affects the working, learning or social environment of the University. Fair criticism of staff or student performance or conduct will not be considered to be bullying or harassment provided that those involved are treated with dignity, courtesy and respect. Any allegation of harassment, bullying or victimisation will be treated seriously, regardless of the seniority of those involved, and anyone found to have behaved unacceptably may be the subject of disciplinary action up to and including dismissal or expulsion.

### 10.4 STUDENT NON-ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

As members of the University community, all students are expected to conduct themselves with due regard for its good name and reputation and are required to comply with the University's Regulations at all times. Any allegation of misconduct will be considered within the [Student Non-academic Misconduct Regulations](#), in accordance with the evidence and circumstances presented. Information for students on non-academic misconduct is available from the [Student and Academic Administration web pages](#).

# ENGLISH MA programmes – Marking Criteria

Assessment Criteria for MA English modules offered across  
MA English Literary Studies,  
MA Twentieth and Twenty-first Century Literature,  
MA Creative Writing,  
MA Medieval and Renaissance Culture,  
MA 18<sup>th</sup> Century Studies

This document contains the following sets of marking criteria:

1. Marking criteria for standard academic written work (including dissertations)
  2. Marking criteria for creative writing (creative component, including final project)
  3. Marking criteria for creative writing (commentary, including final project)
  4. Marking criteria for oral presentations
  5. Marking criteria for editing exercises
- The criteria below give an indication of the kinds of qualities we associate with work in different classifications.
  - A piece of work may well have qualities from different classifications, and so the marker will spend time deciding which characteristics predominate, and which should be more rewarded in the context of a given exercise.
  - Where your work falls in a particular band area will depend on how far its qualities suggest either the next class up or down, e.g., all work in the 60-69 band must have an element of independence, but a piece which gets 69 is going to have more of the originality of a distinction, and a piece which gets 60 is probably just escaping from the degree of dependence on sources which characterises the merit.
  - The ability to write well is one of the essential transferable skills provided by an English degree, and so you will need to avoid sloppy or ungrammatical English if your ideas are to get their full credit. What is an appropriate penalty will be judged in the context of the work itself, but poor English could certainly mean that a piece of work drops a class.
  - The department has agreed to use the *MHRA Style Guide* as the guide to academic style and norms of presentation.

## Marking Criteria for standard academic written work (including dissertations, annotated bibliographies and reports)

### DISTINCTION

#### 85-100%

- all the qualities of a distinction but *most* carried through to a level unambiguously demonstrating an ability to pursue research at doctoral level and suggestive of possibilities for publication, with some part of the work of immediately publishable quality

#### 75-84%

- all the qualities of a distinction but *several* carried through to a level strongly suggestive of doctoral level work or indicative of unusual excellence

#### 70-74%

- original, independent, relevant and compelling thought and argument
- argument/s convincingly presented, limitations/restrictions recognised, and potential and/or extant opposing approaches to the text persuasively countered
- well-selected primary and secondary material incorporated into own text and competently, concisely, originally and imaginatively analysed
- commanding understanding of full scope and history of academic debate surrounding the subject
- exceptional in-depth knowledge of relevant conceptual issues
- readable, lucid and concise; clear, competent and exciting use of vocabulary and grammar
- well-structured and synthesised, and subtly signposted in agreement with argument
- formal requirements observed (footnotes, complete bibliography)

**MERIT**  
**60-69%**

- original, independent and relevant thought and argument
- argument/s convincingly presented, limitations/restrictions recognised
- well-selected primary and secondary material incorporated into own text and competently and imaginatively analysed
- aware of academic debate surrounding the subject
- readable, lucid and concise, clear and competent use of vocabulary and grammar
- well-structured and signposted in agreement with argument (let your reader know where you are)
- formal requirements observed (footnotes, complete bibliography)

**PASS**  
**50-59%**

- contains proof of having thought through the question independently, though relying on material from classes and general sources
- contains a clear and consistent line of argument
- relevant primary and secondary material used analytically rather than descriptively
- readable use of vocabulary and grammar, with some simplistic or inaccurate use of jargon
- clearly structured, though perhaps with some arbitrary sections
- formal requirements observed (footnotes, complete bibliography)

**FAIL**  
**40-49%**

- heavily derivative, though acknowledging sources
- argument and structure partial or unclear
- heavily descriptive; relevance to question not clear
- argument is difficult to follow and the grammar inconsistent
- formal requirements not fully observed

**FAIL**  
**35-39%:**

- heavily derivative; sources often misunderstood though acknowledged
- argument and structure garbled though with moments of sense
- often, though not always, irrelevant to question
- difficult to follow; sometimes ungrammatical; English poor
- formal requirements often ignored

**FAIL**  
**34% and below:**

- argument and structure garbled or confused
- very largely descriptive or irrelevant to question
- often incomprehensible, and written in very poor English
- formal requirements consistently ignored

**Marking Criteria for MA Creative Writing**  
**(creative component)**

**DISTINCTION:**

**80 and above** - Exceptional work surpassing that associated with the 70-79 level in terms of originality, subtlety of interpretation, or mastery of a significant theme or genre. A Creative Project (dissertation equivalent) gaining this mark will unambiguously demonstrate the ability to pursue research at doctoral level and may present possibilities for publication.

**70-79** - High quality, consistent work displaying all (rather than merely some) of the attributes of work associated with the 60-69 level, and one or more of the attributes of work associated with the 80 and above level. Work in this range suggests definite potential for pursuing research at doctoral level. It is likely to demonstrate:

- originality, independence of creative thought, with a convincing handling of (for example) character, setting, dialogue, or poetics as appropriate
- a clear handling of themes, narrative threads, and verbal patterns
- a scrupulous adherence to formal requirements (such as layout of dialogue, paragraphs, stanzas, stage directions etc.)
- ability to follow your own creative brief

**MERIT:**

**60-69** - Contains all the qualities of work in the 50-59 range but demonstrates particular merit beyond them, surpassing them in terms of at least one of the following:

- contains proof of having handled the assignment with some originality
- uses dialogue or other stylistic devices well where appropriate
- in the upper ranges, suggests at least some possibility of pursuing research at doctoral level, or developing the work into a longer project
- observes the necessary formal requirements
- creates a coherent structure for the writing

The higher the mark in this band, the more of these attributes it is likely to possess.

**PASS:**

**50-59** - Work in this category is likely to suffer from some weaknesses, though it may contain elements of successful writing as listed in higher categories. Any formal requirements will be largely observed, and the piece will demonstrate adequate presentation with no obvious faults. Qualities may include:

- handles an existing literary formula well
- aims of the piece not entirely obvious, or inadequately carried out
- not quite in control of dramatised story telling or poetic style
- mostly readable and grammatical, though the style may occasionally be simplistic, even sometimes awkward, and still in need of revision

**FAIL:**

**40-49** - Contains most of the basic materials necessary for a satisfactory treatment of the assignment, but fails to marshal them effectively in terms of overall structure or employment of techniques. Weaknesses may include (but are not limited to):

- heavily derivative but not simply imitated
- narrative reliant on explanation and simple exposition
- difficult to follow, verging on ungrammatical in an inappropriate way;
- poor control of style
- structure not clear
- formal requirements not fully observed.
- presentation is marred by easily rectifiable defects (e.g. bibliographical incompleteness or inconsistency).

**30-39** - Presents some material relevant to the aims of the task, but is significantly incomplete or unbalanced and is likely to contain the following weaknesses:

- failure to structure the work adequately
- failure to understand or effectively apply structural or critical techniques
- scrappy presentation
- expression may be in part unintelligible

**29 and below** - Displays minimal knowledge of how to tackle the subject, and will contain most if not all of the following weaknesses:

- contains substantially irrelevant material
- plagiarised (sources not acknowledged, material stolen from other people's work without indication)
- fails to engage adequately with the terms of the assignment
- often incomprehensible or unstructured, and written in very poor English
- shows lack of effort or understanding

## Marking Criteria for Creative Writing (commentaries)

### **DISTINCTION:**

**80 and above** - Exceptional work surpassing that associated with the 70-79 level in terms of originality, depth, or subtlety. Commentaries gaining this mark will suggest the ability to pursue research at doctoral level. They will also be critically aware and show an excellent knowledge of genre, form and/or audience.

**70-79** - High quality, consistent work displaying all (rather than merely some) of the attributes of work associated with the 60-69 level, and one or more of the attributes of work associated with the 80 and above level. Work in this range suggests definite potential for pursuing research at doctoral level. It is likely to demonstrate:

- originality, independence of creative thought
- a sophisticated awareness of other literary work in the same genre, or with the critical and /or generic vocabularies suggested by your work
- a scrupulous adherence to formal requirements (such as layout of dialogue, paragraphs, stanzas, stage directions etc.)

### **MERIT:**

**60-69** - Contains all the qualities of work in the 50-59 range but demonstrates particular merit beyond them, surpassing them in terms of at least one of the following:

- evidence of handling the assignment with some originality, and the ability to draw upon extensive and appropriate reading
- creates a coherent and sophisticated context for the writing in the critical component (if appropriate)
- provides evidence of having studied and learned from the set texts and discussions of creative writing
- offers a reflective and mature account of your creative process (writing, editing, redrafting, with limitations / restrictions recognised)
- well-selected primary and secondary material incorporated into your commentary and imaginatively analysed
- in the upper ranges, suggests at least some possibility of pursuing research at doctoral level
- observes the necessary formal requirements

The higher the mark in this band, the more of these attributes it is likely to possess.

### **PASS:**

**50-59** - Work in this category is likely to suffer from some weaknesses, though it may contain elements of successful writing as listed in higher categories. Any formal requirements will be largely observed, and the piece will demonstrate adequate presentation with no obvious faults. Weaknesses may include (but are not limited to):

- aims of the piece not entirely obvious, or inadequately carried out
- uses some pertinent examples, but they may be close to those presented in class, or suggest a limited frame of literary reference
- mostly readable and grammatical, though the style may occasionally be simplistic, even sometimes awkward, and still in need of revision

### **FAIL:**

**40-49** - Contains most of the basic materials necessary for a satisfactory treatment of the assignment, but fails to marshal them effectively in terms of overall structure or employment of techniques. Weaknesses may include (but are not limited to):

- aims sometimes unclear or even absent
- difficult to follow, verging on ungrammatical in an inappropriate way
- structure not clear
- formal requirements not fully observed
- demonstrates some acquaintance of related literature but may misunderstand the context or significance of the examples used

**30-39** - Presents some material relevant to the aims of the task, but is significantly incomplete or unbalanced and is likely to contain the following weaknesses:

- failure to structure the work adequately
- failure to understand or effectively apply structural or critical techniques
- scrappy presentation with inadequate citation
- expression may be in part unintelligible
- a lack of overall structure, absence of critical appraisal of material, verging at worst on plagiarism

**29 and below** - Displays minimal knowledge of how to tackle the subject, and will contain most if not all of the following weaknesses:

- contains substantially irrelevant material
- plagiarised (sources not acknowledged, material stolen from other people's work without indication)
- fails to engage adequately with the terms of the assignment
- often incomprehensible, and written in very poor English
- unstructured
- formal requirements consistently ignored
- shows lack of effort or understanding

### Marking Criteria for Oral Presentations

Please note that for oral presentations, expectations around depth of research and command of argument will depend on the precise nature of the presentation being examined. The length of the presentation and whether it is being offered in preparation for OR following the completion of a piece of written work are two major factors that will impact the examiner's expectations of what constitutes a distinction, merit, pass or fail.

#### DISTINCTION

##### 85-100%

- all the qualities of a distinction but *most* carried through to a level unambiguously demonstrating an ability to pursue research at doctoral level and suggestive of possibilities for publication, with some part of the work of immediately publishable quality

##### 75-84%

- all the qualities of a distinction but *several* carried through to a level strongly suggestive of doctoral level work or indicative of unusual excellence

##### 70-74%

- original, independent, relevant and compelling thought and argument
- argument/s convincingly presented, limitations/restrictions recognised, and potential and/or extant opposing approaches to the text persuasively countered
- well-selected primary and secondary material incorporated into own text and competently, concisely, originally and imaginatively analysed
- commanding understanding of full scope and history of academic debate surrounding the subject
- exceptional in-depth knowledge of relevant conceptual issues
- readable, lucid and concise; clear, competent and exciting use of vocabulary and grammar
- well-structured and synthesised, and subtly signposted in agreement with argument (let your reader know where you are)
- highly effective presentation management (effectively paced, imaginative use of visual material and handouts)
- highly effective communication skills (good audibility, eye and body language, good rapport with audience)

#### MERIT

##### 60-69%

- original, independent and relevant thought and argument
- argument/s convincingly presented, limitations/restrictions recognised
- well-selected primary and secondary material incorporated into own text and competently and imaginatively analysed
- aware of academic debate surrounding the subject
- readable, lucid and concise, clear and competent use of vocabulary and grammar
- well-structured and signposted in agreement with argument (let your reader know where you are)
- good presentation management (clear structure, appropriately paced, sound use of visual material and handouts)
- good communication skills (appropriate audibility, good eye and body language, responsive to audience)



**PASS****50-59%**

- contains proof of having thought through the question independently, though relying on material from classes and general sources
- contains a clear and consistent line of argument
- relevant primary and secondary material used analytically rather than descriptively
- readable use of vocabulary and grammar, with some simplistic or inaccurate use of jargon
- clearly structured, though perhaps with some arbitrary sections
- solid evidence of presentation management, but not consistently realised (some clarity of structure, some appropriate pacing, some useful deployment of visual material and handouts)
- solid evidence of communication skills (audible, some use of eye and body language, some responsiveness to audience)

**FAIL****40-49%**

- heavily derivative, though acknowledging sources
- argument and structure partial or unclear
- heavily descriptive; relevance to question not clear
- argument is difficult to follow and the grammar inconsistent
- presentation not effectively managed (faltering structure, inappropriate pacing, distracting deployment of visual material and handouts)
- presentation not effectively delivered (not fully audible, distracting use of eye and body language, no responsiveness to audience)

**FAIL****35-39%:**

- heavily derivative; sources often misunderstood though acknowledged
- argument and structure garbled though with moments of sense
- often, though not always, irrelevant to question
- difficult to follow; sometimes ungrammatical; English poor
- formal requirements often ignored
- presentation not effectively managed (faltering structure, inappropriate pacing, distracting deployment of visual material and handouts)
- presentation not effectively delivered (not fully audible, distracting use of eye and body language, no responsiveness to audience)

**FAIL****34% and below:**

- argument and structure garbled or confused
- very largely descriptive or irrelevant to question
- often incomprehensible, and written in very poor English
- formal requirements consistently ignored
- presentation not effectively managed (faltering structure, inappropriate pacing, distracting deployment of visual material and handouts)
- presentation not effectively delivered (not fully audible, distracting use of eye and body language, no responsiveness to audience)

## Marking Criteria for Editing Exercises

### **DISTINCTION**

**85-100%**

- all the qualities of a distinction but *most* carried through to a level unambiguously demonstrating an ability to pursue research at doctoral level and substantially indicative of unusual excellence

**75-84%**

- all the qualities of a distinction but *several* carried through to a level strongly suggestive of doctoral level work or indicative of unusual excellence

**70-74%**

- textual commentary shows sensitivity to all the possibilities for historically specific meaning, commenting on semantics, wordplay, significant variants (if any) and the potential for performance (if relevant)
- introduction includes a clear and persuasive account as to how and why these differences might have arisen

### **MERIT**

**60-69%**

All the best qualities of pass work plus

- textual apparatus is accurate
- passage is punctuated with both accuracy and sensitivity for the spoken word
- considers the extent to which variants may be accidental or deliberate
- refers to analogous instances elsewhere where appropriate
- helpful explanation of difficult words and phrases
- evidence of comprehensive secondary reading
- introduction, apparatus and textual commentary all show good understanding of the problems facing any editor of the chosen passage

### **PASS**

**50-59%**

- where required, modernisation of spelling and punctuation is effected with reasonable accuracy
- substantive variants are correctly listed and explained where necessary
- an attempt to use the *OED* and other resources to explain most of the difficult words and phrases
- there may be some misunderstanding of the problems
- editorial decisions are consistent and clearly explained
- introduction contains a clear exposition of the problems facing the editor
- there may be some inaccuracy but there is a reasonable attempt to grapple with the problems
- some words and phrases may not be explained as fully as they might be, but there is evidence that you have researched the potential meaning of the passage and thought about its implications

### **FAIL**

**40-49%**

- sources often misunderstood
- argument garbled though with moments of sense
- often, though not always, including material irrelevant to topic
- difficult to follow; sometimes ungrammatical; English poor
- introduction mostly, though not completely, unstructured
- formal requirements often ignored

### **FAIL**

**35% and below:**

- plagiarised (sources not acknowledged, material stolen from other people's work without indication)
- argument garbled
- often incomprehensible, and written in very poor English
- task misunderstood and formal requirements consistently ignored

# PHILOSOPHY – MA Marking Criteria

## *Marking Criteria, Grades and Degree Classifications*

Written work (including essays, commentaries, dissertations) are marked according to the extent to which they meet the criteria below

**NB:** It is important to recognise the dimensions along which work is assessed are not wholly distinct. Failing to satisfy certain criteria (e.g., quality of organisation) is likely to prevent you from satisfying other criteria (e.g., quality of critical engagement). Also, doing well along certain dimensions (e.g. quality of exposition) can compensate for falling short in other respects (e.g. quality of critical engagement).

### *1. Quality of Exposition*

Views and arguments relevant to the topic should be expounded clearly, concisely, and accurately and the relations and interconnections among them clearly explained. It should be clear from the essay when a view or argument is accepted by you, the author of the essay, and when it is merely proposed for discussion.

### *2. Quality of Critical Engagement*

Views and arguments should be examined and discussed in a way which reflects an understanding of them. This involves, among other things, explaining the views and arguments, assessing their cogency or plausibility, identifying any presuppositions on which they rest or implications they may have, and questions they raise and, if possible, critically examining those presuppositions and implications and attempting to answer those questions.

Mere repetition of comments and evaluations found in the literature or made by lecturers does not constitute good evidence of critical engagement. When the views of others are introduced their sources should be acknowledged and they should be subjected to critical assessment if appropriate.

### *3. Quality of Organisation*

The material in the essay should be well-organised. There are different ways in which quality of organisation can be exhibited. Minimally, the essay should give a clear indication of the central problem(s) examined and of how these problems are to be approached. The discussion should have a sense of direction, with clear signposting, and each part of the discussion should work towards a specific conclusion. An essay which strings together summaries of the literature without much argumentative structure or sense of direction would not meet this requirement.

### *4. Quality of Presentation*

The essay should be easily legible. The bibliography, references to the literature, and, where appropriate, footnotes or endnotes should be carefully prepared according to the guidelines provided in the [Philosophy Student Handbook](#).

### *5. Spelling and grammar*

We do not generally penalise you for poor spelling (within limits!) but do penalise you for poor grammar and punctuation because - and to the extent that - those defects detract from the clarity of your writing/thinking and manifest lack of effort or indifference to the task in hand. The Study Skills Toolkit, available to all students via Blackboard, provides guidance on grammar and sentence structure.

### *Significance of the Grade Bands*

Work will be awarded a mark based on the degree to which it displays the above criteria. The following gives an indication of the qualities displayed by work which receives marks within the following ranges.

80% and above. The work is excellent when judged by all the above criteria. It displays all the qualities for 70-79%, plus the understanding of the topic is excellent and the level of critical engagement is very high. The work explores some advanced issues relating to the topic and includes well-developed original ideas, which are clearly presented and well defended.

The work shows potential for high quality doctoral research. Marks over 90% indicate that little to nothing more could be expected from MA work in Philosophy.

#### **70-79%**

Very good understanding of the topic, which is demonstrated in: a clear, accurate and concise presentation of the problem(s) under discussion and of the views and arguments examined. The work contains in-depth critical engagement, showing independence of thought in expounding and evaluating the views and arguments under discussion, and some ability to present and defend original ideas. The work is clearly and helpfully organised throughout. The work shows clear potential for doctoral research.

#### **60-69%**

Good to very good understanding of the topic demonstrated in explicit and mostly clear identification and explanation of the problem(s) under discussion. The discussion shows a good grasp of most of the relevant views and arguments encountered in classes and secondary reading and, while tending to rely mostly on these,

it nonetheless goes beyond mere reportage, displaying good critical engagement, with some signs of originality that are evidence of independent thought (e.g. pushing further ideas or objections encountered, or suggesting new ones, or new aspects of familiar ones). The material is basically well-organized and presented, with a fairly clear structure and helpful signposting that enable the reader to see where the discussion is going at any point. Work towards the upper end of this range shows potential for doctoral research.

**50-59%**

Reasonable grasp of the topic shown in the relevance of the discussion.

Demonstrates a fair understanding of the material consulted but tends to rely too much on class notes and/or secondary literature, showing some but not enough critical engagement. Satisfactory exposition, though in places it might lack clarity. Reasonable organization and presentation, with some sense of direction towards a conclusion, though some material might not be relevant.

**Less than 50%**

Though there might be some success at explaining the problem(s) under discussion and some views and arguments that are relevant to those problems, the essay suggests a poor understanding of the topic. The discussion is not very well structured, the different parts of the essay are not clearly related to each other, there is little critical engagement, and there may be some irrelevance or confusion. Work which fails to identify and/or explain clearly the philosophical problem(s) under discussion, or which show a very poor level of understanding, will merit a low fail.

## Modern Languages and Linguistics – MA Marking Criteria

The following descriptions refer to the typical qualities of work within each 10-mark band. They are expressed in terms of text-based submissions (essays, dissertations and similar) but may in some cases be applicable to practice-based submissions; where this is not the case, convenors of Master's programmes based on practical work should provide you with similar criteria. The final mark will reflect quality across a range of indicators including originality, command of relevant literature, coherence of argument, clarity of expression, and adherence to appropriate bibliographic standards. Higher standards in one or more of these may to some extent compensate for lower standards in others, with the particular balance between them varying from one submission to another. That is why the following descriptions are to be understood as typical of work at a given mark level, rather than as a set of fixed benchmarks.

**Please note:** Although the Master's marking scale may look very similar to the undergraduate marking scale, this is not the case. Please read the following descriptions carefully to judge your performance against the specific criteria, which apply at Master's level.

### **Distinction:**

80 and above — Exceptional work surpassing that associated with the 70–79 level in terms of originality, subtlety of interpretation, or mastery of a significant body of data. A dissertation gaining this mark will unambiguously demonstrate the ability to pursue research at doctoral level and may present possibilities for publication in an academic journal.

70–79 — High quality, consistent work displaying all (rather than merely some) of the attributes of work associated with the 60–69 level. Suggest definite potential for pursuing research at doctoral level.

### **Merit:**

60–69 — Contains all the qualities of work in the 50–59 range but surpasses it in terms of at least one of the following: information deployed (normally going beyond reliance on standard secondary sources), clarity and coherence of argumentation, or critical and analytical insight. Suggest at least some possibility of pursuing research at doctoral level.

### **Pass:**

50–59 — Demonstrates reasonable grasp of all the principal materials relevant to the subject and links them into an at least partly sustained argument from premises to conclusions, resulting in an overall structure which is logical if not fully thought through. Displays some evidence of analytical or critical ability in the handling of sources and evidence. Adequate presentation (no obvious faults).

### **Fail:**

40–49 — Contains most of the basic materials necessary for a satisfactory treatment of the topic, but fails to marshal them effectively in terms of overall structure or sustained argument.

Demonstrates some acquaintance with key literature but is unsophisticated in employment of it. Presentation is marred by easily rectifiable defects (e.g. bibliographical incompleteness or inconsistency).

30–39 — Presents some material relevant to the subject, but is significantly incomplete or unbalanced; failure to structure the work through argument from premises to conclusions; relies too heavily on secondary sources, contains partially garbled information, or presents statements of opinion inadequately supported by evidence. Scrappy presentation with inadequate citation.

29 and below — Displays minimal knowledge of the subject, with major errors or omissions, or substantially irrelevant material; lack of overall structure, characterized by unsupported assertion rather than argumentation; absence of critical appraisal of material, verging at worst on plagiarism. Expression may be in part unintelligible and sources are unacknowledged.

## Guidelines for MA dissertations in Modern Languages/Linguistics

The Dissertation requires you to plan, execute and report an independent piece of research or creative work with some element of originality. Within the limits of what is achievable in the available timescale, and dissertation length, it should demonstrate your capability in the four major areas outlined in Table 1.

**Table 1: General descriptors for MA dissertation\***

Knowledge and understanding	Design and implementation	Interpretation and application	Organization and presentation
<p>Which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge, interpretation and critical evaluation of relevant literature</li> <li>Understanding, interpretation and critical evaluation of current research findings</li> <li>Systematic understanding of knowledge</li> <li>Critical awareness of current problems and new insights</li> <li>Originality in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline</li> </ul>	<p>Which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understanding of techniques applicable to the research</li> <li>Application of appropriate models, using a variety of research designs, methodologies, measurements and techniques of analysis</li> <li>Formulation, testing and implementation of new ideas</li> <li>Justification of approach and methods</li> </ul>	<p>Which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relating current research findings to practice as appropriate</li> <li>Synthesis of findings, ideas and current research</li> <li>Making informed judgements in the absence of complete data</li> </ul> <p>Independent judgement and critical self-awareness</p>	<p>Which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation of ideas and research findings in a well-structured and convincingly argued way</li> <li>Demonstration of self direction and originality in tackling and solving problems</li> <li>Autonomy in planning and implementing tasks</li> <li>Systematically and creatively dealing with complex issues</li> <li>Communicating conclusions clearly</li> <li>Appropriate and comprehensive referencing</li> </ul>

**\*general descriptors adapted from University of Southampton general guidelines for MA work, QA Handbook Section 2.2.3**

Dissertations will be marked on a percentage scale from 0–100, with 50 representing the ‘pass’ level, 60 the ‘merit’ level and 70 the ‘Distinction’ level. The band descriptors given in Table 2 provide guidance for dissertation markers in Modern Languages/Linguistics regarding the overall qualities of dissertations to be placed in different percentage bands. They will be interpreted holistically and a single percentage mark will be given.

**Table 2: Band descriptors for MA dissertations in Modern Languages/ Linguistics**

### Marking scale band 80 and above

Knowledge and understanding of the field	Project design and implementation	Interpretation and application	Organisation and presentation
Dissertation possesses all qualities of 70–79 band and in addition targets a cutting edge ‘gap’ and makes a substantial independent contribution to the field (may be of publishable quality)	As for 70–79 band	As for 70–79 band	As for 70–79 band

### Marking scale band 70–79 (Distinction)

Knowledge and understanding of the field	Project design and implementation	Interpretation and application	Organisation and presentation
Excellent critical understanding of key concepts and research approaches in the field, including recent theoretical debates	Articulation of a well focussed research question or set of questions, which target a current 'gap' in the field	Systematic and rigorous approach to data analysis including use of content analysis/ quantitative techniques where appropriate	Strong expression of personal voice and originality in point of view; arguments and conclusions are well focussed clearly organised and expressed
Well focused critical review of literature including current relevant theoretical, methodological and/ or empirical material where appropriate	Critical awareness of alternative research approaches, ability to justify appropriate methodological choices	Insightful critical interpretation and discussion of findings with reference to original research questions	Presentation user friendly and consistent, appropriate to content (e.g. effective use of diagrams or tables where appropriate) and fully in line with recommended style guidelines
	Clearly designed small scale research investigation which addresses the stated question(s) effectively, with attention to practicality, reliability/ validity and triangulation where appropriate	Effective connection of findings with the development of theory in the field and/ or with real world issues, e.g. pedagogical implications and applications	Language clear, consistent and in appropriate genre
	Systematic approach to fieldwork and other forms of data collection (e.g. selection of documents), including careful consideration of practical issues, ethics and risk, where appropriate	Ability to evaluate project achievements and limitations critically and make proposals for further research/ development activity.	Referencing fully in line with recommended academic conventions.

### Marking scale band 60–69 (Merit)

Knowledge and understanding of the field	Project design and implementation	Interpretation and application	Organisation and presentation
Very good understanding of key concepts and research approaches in the field, including some reference to recent theoretical debates	Articulation of a well focussed research question or set of questions, which target a current issue of concern in the field	Systematic approach to data analysis including use of content analysis/ quantitative techniques where appropriate	Positive expression of personal voice; arguments and conclusions well organised and clearly expressed
Coherent and insightful review of literature including theoretical material , policy material and/or empirical research where appropriate	Awareness of alternative research approaches, ability to comment on their relevance and justify appropriate methodological choices	Critical interpretation and discussion of findings with reference to original research questions	Presentation consistent and appropriate to content, fully in line with recommended style guidelines

	Clearly designed small scale research investigation which addresses the stated question(s) with attention to practicality, reliability/ validity and triangulation where appropriate	Substantial connection of findings with the development of theory in the field and/ or with real world issues, e.g. pedagogical implications and applications	Language clear, consistent and in appropriate genre
	Systematic approach to fieldwork and other forms of data collection including careful consideration of practical issues, ethics and risk	Ability to evaluate project achievements and limitations and make proposals for further research/ development activity.	Referencing fully in line with recommended academic conventions.

#### Marking scale band 50–59 (Pass)

Knowledge and understanding of the field	Project design and implementation	Interpretation and application	Organisation and presentation
An understanding of relevant concepts and research approaches in the field	Articulation of a research question or set of questions, which relate to current discussions in the field	Data analysis is carried out and data-based conclusions are drawn	Personal voice expressed to some extent; arguments and conclusions presented in a generally orderly way
Review of an appropriate selection of literature which may include theoretical, methodological and/ or empirical material	Some awareness of alternative research approaches, some comment on personal methodological choices	Some discussion of findings with reference to original research questions	Presentation generally observes recommended style guidelines, though there may be some inconsistencies
	Design and implementation of small scale research investigation which generally addresses the stated question(s)	Some connection of findings with theory in the field and/ or with real world issues, e.g. pedagogical implications and applications	Language broadly communicates intended meanings effectively, though there may be some inconsistencies in structure and/or in genre
	Planning and implementation of fieldwork and other forms of data collection shows some awareness of practical issues, ethics and risk	Some acknowledgement of project achievements and limitations and/ or proposals for further research/ development activity	Referencing generally observes recommended bibliographic conventions though there may be some inconsistencies.



**Marking scale band 40–49 (Fail)**

Knowledge and understanding of the field	Project design and implementation	Interpretation and application	Organisation and presentation
A limited understanding of relevant concepts and research approaches in the field	Some limited articulation of an issue of concern which relates to current discussions in the field	Some data analysis is carried out and limited conclusions are drawn	Expression of personal voice very limited; sequencing of argumentation and conclusions often hard to follow
Limited review of some selected literature	Little awareness of alternative research approaches, or comment on personal methodological choices	Limited discussion of findings with reference to original issue of concern	Presentation makes some attempt to observe recommended style guidelines, but is inconsistent
	Little ability to describe methodological choices and decisions	Inadequate connection of findings with theory in the field and/ or with real world issues, e.g. pedagogical implications and applications	Language attempts to communicate intended meanings, but with considerable inconsistencies in structure and/or in genre
	Some attempt at the design and implementation of a small scale investigation relating to the issue of concern	Little awareness of project limitations	Referencing makes little attempt to observe recommended bibliographic conventions

**Marking scale band 39 and below (Weak Fail)**

Knowledge and understanding of the field	Project design and implementation	Interpretation and application	Organisation and presentation
Does not clearly demonstrate understanding of relevant concepts and/or research approaches in the field	Issue of concern is poorly identified	Data analysis is obscure or lacking; any conclusions drawn are not clearly based on findings	Little or no expression of personal voice; no real sequencing of argumentation
Literature review is limited or inadequate	Almost no apparent awareness of alternative research approaches, or comment on personal methodological choices	Little or no discussion of findings with reference to original issue of concern	Presentation is not consistent with recommended style guidelines
	Methodological choices and decisions are erratic or obscure	Findings not connected with theory or with real world issues	Language may not communicate intended meanings
	Investigation does not address issue of concern or not carried out	Lack of awareness of project limitations	Referencing fails to observe recommended bibliographic conventions

## FILM – MA Marking Criteria

The following information applies to all Film Master's programmes:

### Marking scale guidance:

The following descriptions refer to the typical qualities of work within each 10-mark band. They are expressed in terms of text-based submissions (essays, dissertations and similar) but may in some cases be applicable to practice-based submissions; where this is not the case, convenors of Master's programmes based on practical work should provide you with similar criteria. The final mark will reflect quality across a range of indicators including originality, command of relevant literature, coherence of argument, clarity of expression, and adherence to appropriate bibliographic standards. Higher standards in one or more of these may to some extent compensate for lower standards in others, with the particular balance between them varying from one submission to another. That is why the following descriptions are to be understood as typical of work at a given mark level, rather than as a set of fixed benchmarks.

**PLEASE NOTE:** *Although the Master's marking scale may look very similar to the undergraduate marking scale, this is not the case. Please read the following descriptions carefully to judge your performance against the specific criteria which apply at Master's level.*

### DISTINCTION:

**80 and above** - Exceptional work surpassing that associated with the 70-79 level in terms of originality, subtlety of interpretation, or mastery of a significant body of data. A dissertation gaining this mark will unambiguously demonstrate the ability to pursue research at doctoral level and may present possibilities for publication in an academic journal.

**70-79** - High quality, consistent work displaying all (rather than merely some) of the attributes of work associated with the 60-69 level. Suggest definite potential for pursuing research at doctoral level.

### MERIT:

**60-69** - Contains all the qualities of work in the 50-59 range but surpasses it in terms of at least one of the following: information deployed (normally going beyond reliance on standard secondary sources), clarity and coherence of argumentation, or critical and analytical insight. Suggest at least some possibility of pursuing research at doctoral level.

### PASS:

**50-59** - Demonstrates reasonable grasp of all the principal materials relevant to the subject and links them into an at least partly sustained argument from premises to conclusions, resulting in an overall structure which is logical if not fully thought through. Displays some evidence of analytical or critical ability in the handling of sources and evidence. Adequate presentation (no obvious faults).

### FAIL:

**40-49** - Contains most of the basic materials necessary for a satisfactory treatment of the topic, but fails to marshal them effectively in terms of overall structure or sustained argument. Demonstrates some acquaintance with key literature but is unsophisticated in employment of it. Presentation is marred by easily rectifiable defects (e.g. bibliographical incompleteness or inconsistency).

**30-39** - Presents some material relevant to the subject, but is significantly incomplete or unbalanced; failure to structure the work through argument from premises to conclusions; relies too heavily on secondary sources, contains partially garbled information, or presents statements of opinion inadequately supported by evidence. Scrappy presentation with inadequate citation.

**29 and below** - Displays minimal knowledge of the subject, with major errors or omissions, or substantially irrelevant material; lack of overall structure, characterized by unsupported assertion rather than argumentation; absence of critical appraisal of material, verging at worst on plagiarism. Expression may be in part unintelligible and sources are unacknowledged.

### University Calendar 2019/20

Section IV : General Regulations

[Progression, Determination and Classification of Results : Standalone Masters Programmes](#)

# HISTORY – MA Marking Criteria

## General essay marking guidelines

### *Distinction – upper (75+)*

Outstanding work; a task completed with originality and attention to detail, exceptional research, sophisticated analysis of sources, and critical awareness and argument, and near-flawless writing and presentation. A mark of 80% or over signifies exceptional work; significant originality of argument and approach which challenges existing historiography where it exists, or proposes new interpretations of otherwise overlooked or underused sources, or connects sources together in an innovative manner and pushes the boundaries of the course material.

### *Distinction – lower (70–74)*

Excellent work judged by all criteria; some originality of approach and convincing argument supported by significant historiographical research and a diverse selection of relevant primary sources often beyond what is provided in the module handbook. The essay will demonstrate fluidity, authority, and even flair in presenting its interpretation. The discussion will have critiqued a generous sample of recent scholarship and provided substantial analysis of primary materials. There may be one or two small errors, but these should relate to details and supporting evidence rather than major arguments or key analysis. Footnotes and bibliography will be presented precisely and accurately.

### *Merit – upper (65–69)*

A very well-argued essay that makes a comprehensive examination of recent scholarship, and provides a close analysis of relevant primary sources and/or historiography. The essay presents an assessment of the historiography, while paying attention to variations in methodology and use of sources. The essay will show good analytical skills but may be either slightly unoriginal or less authoritative in places, and not quite as dependent on original research as the first class range. Writing will be clear and effective, and footnotes and bibliography will be presented accurately with perhaps one or two small errors.

### *Merit – lower (60–64)*

Directly focuses on the question and has some awareness of the wider issues raised; linking central argument with context in places. The essay may contain one or two overlong sentences, but is generally well-organised and free from typographical errors. There will be a critical engagement with primary source evidence and/or reference to historiography, but less analysis and detail than the upper 2:1 range. The student may have made one or two factual errors, a relevant primary source may be missing and there may be omissions in the essay's treatment of the historiography. Footnotes and bibliography will be presented accurately with perhaps two or three small errors.

### *Pass (50–59)*

Recognises issues raised by question, but may drift into narrative or description, be overly general or simplistic in places, or neglect the context. There may be errors of interpretation, minimal supporting evidence from primary sources and major omissions of historiography. It is likely that more specific detail and analysis will be required. Toward the lower end of this classification, the essay may not maintain its focus or relevance, or may be significantly dependent on material from lectures and seminars. There may be omissions of footnotes and proper citations, and the bibliography may show evidence of limited reading. Essays which are poorly written, poorly structured, and poorly proof-read are unlikely to score higher than this mark classification.

### *Fail (Below 50)*

Responds to question indirectly or incoherently, so that the answer is at best approximate. There may be little evidence for engagement with primary sources or with historiography, and there may be considerable dependence on lecture and seminar material rather than independent research. The structure and argument may not be appropriate, and the presentation of the essay may have substantial flaws in writing, layout, footnotes or bibliography, even the omission of one or more of those components.

## HIST6081: Research Skills Semester 1 marking criteria: Seminar Critique

### *Distinction (70% and above)*

Will display all (rather than some) of the attributes of work associated with the 60-69 level. In addition to engaging critically with the arguments advanced in the paper, the work discusses those arguments in the light of current historical, theoretical or methodological debates and may reflect on the value of the seminar format itself. The writing will be clear, accurate, and well-judged in tone.

### *Merit (60-69)*

The critique provides a cogent and nuanced summary of the paper's content, in a way that indicates a good grasp of the historiographical context. There is clear evidence of a personal response to the speaker and his/her

argument, without descending into caricature and with a good sense of what can and what cannot be demanded of a speaker. There is some consideration of the speaker's response to audience questions and comments. The writing will be coherent and clear, but perhaps with some lapses in style and accuracy.

***Pass (50-59)***

The critique provides a cogent summary of the paper's content. It endeavours to place it in its broad historiographic context and to assess it as a performance, albeit in a schematic or unnuanced fashion. Some of the criticisms may betray unrealistic expectations of what is achievable when scholars present work in this way. The writing may be flawed, with errors of grammar and style.

***Fail (Below 50)***

The critique is poorly written and offers an incoherent summary of the paper's content with little or no grasp of the speaker's thesis or argument. The piece makes no effort to assess the paper reading as a performance (style, pace, accessibility) and fails to comment on the discussion after the paper.

**HIST6081: Research Skills Semester 1 marking criteria: Programme Review**

***Distinction (70% and above)***

The review displays all of the attributes of work associated with the 60-69 level. It shows considerable knowledge of how television/radio has presented history over several decades, and may in some cases (where relevant) comment on the directors, editors, commissioners and marketing of the relevant network or broadcast channel. It places the programme in context and, in the best cases, will display knowledge and understanding of historiographical debates in the relevant field of historical research, such as enables them to comment on whether the programme ignores such scholarly debates entirely or seeks to engage with them. It will use the specific programme as an opportunity to comment on the overall relationship between academic and broadcast history, and the very best work (of 80 or above) will be of publishable quality.

***Merit (60-69)***

The review gives a well-written, clearly structured and fair account of the programme. It shows some knowledge of how such programmes are produced. It is able to provide a coherent and convincing discussion of target audience and rival programmes and places the programme in context. Any suggestions for the programme's improvement are within the realm of the possible. The review shows a good grasp of the issues under discussion and is able to place those in context. It is well written and structured, although possibly with some lapses.

***Pass (50-59)***

The review attempts to summarize the programme's argument as well as its topic. It identifies and discusses some elements, be they pre-title sequences, archive, reconstruction, voiceover, music, graphics/special effects, interviewees, and shows some awareness of style (didactic, professorial, charismatic, playful, casual, low-key, irreverent, iconoclastic etc). Basic scheduling information is provided (i.e. the channel on which it was broadcast), but with little attempt to identify the intended audience or place the programme among rival broadcasts, no attempt to place the programme in a broader historiographical context, and no evidence of secondary reading about topics discussed or on how history is presented in the media. The review may be poorly written or structured.

***Fail (30-50)***

Though the programme reviewed is historical and of the correct length, language and format, the review offers little more than a factual synopsis, which may itself be garbled. The review might fail to comment on target audience, style of presenting or editing techniques, or offer comments that betray ignorance of how such programmes are produced. Where they are attempted, suggestions for amendment or improvement of the programme might be uninformed, making demands which are unrealistic.

***Fail (Below 30)***

The programme reviewed is not a broadcast history programme of the length appropriate for a review of this nature or is of an incorrect format or language or age or on a topic which is not sufficiently historical. In all cases it is the student's responsibility to check with the Convenor that their programme is appropriate. Their writing style might be poor, with serious lapses in style and accuracy.

## **HIST6081: Research Skills Semester 1 marking criteria: Review Article**

### ***Distinction (70% and above)***

The review displays all of the attributes of work associated with the 60-69 level. It delivers a persuasive, well-informed and perceptive assessment of the books and displays an excellent and detailed grasp of their contribution to an academic field as well as offering an original critical perspective. Those scoring above 80 will be of a quality such that it would be easy to imagine them appearing in the review section of a good academic journal. The writing will be clear, accurate, and well-judged in tone.

### ***Merit (60-69)***

The review gives a well-written, clearly structured and fair account of the books and their argument. It endeavours to assess whether the books are persuasive, and demonstrated a good understanding of broader trends in the field. The piece imitates the conventions of an academic review and the writing is clear, well-judged, accurate and coherent, but possibly with some lapses.

### ***Pass (50-59)***

The review attempts to give a sense of a particular field of historical scholarship as well as a cogent summary of the books' content, but the resulting picture as well as the account of the books' authors and theses lacks detail and tends towards a simple description of the books rather than analysis. The piece might adopt a register unsuitable for an academic review. The clarity and standard of prose might be flawed.

### ***Fail (30-50)***

Although the three books reviewed are works of historical scholarship, there is little or no attempt to consider them from a professional historical perspective, as a contribution to a field with its own specialists and scholarly agendas. The review provides a poorly structured summary of the books' content, showing a lack of knowledge and understanding of the books under review. The writing may be flawed, with errors of grammar and style.

### ***Fail (Below 30)***

The review may be poorly written and the three books chosen for review not works of historical scholarship. The review is poorly structured, lacking in coherence, and lacking knowledge and understanding of the book under review.

## **HIST6081: Research Skills Semester 2 marking criteria: Historiographical essay**

### ***Distinction (70% and above)***

High quality, consistent work displaying a sustained and inventive critical engagement with reading materials of all kinds; demonstrates a clear capacity to muster those materials behind a convincing argument and to organise that argument effectively from premises to conclusion; lucidly and fluently expressed, and presented to a high professional standard.

### ***Merit (60-69)***

Displays a critical engagement with the research questions and secondary materials necessary for a satisfactory treatment of the topic; demonstrates a good ability to structure an argument and to achieve consistency between argument and evidence; adequately expressed and presented.

### ***Pass (50-59)***

The work shows basic competence but may be flawed in terms of expression, presentation and structure; there may be some incoherence in the development of the argument; the treatment of the topic may be superficial in places.

### ***Fail (Below 50)***

The essay fails to structure the discussion effectively; engages insufficiently with reading materials and/or with the historiographical questions that animate the module; limited critical appraisal of material; assertions inadequately based on evidence; poorly expressed and presented.

## **HIST6081: Research Skills Semester 2 marking criteria: Dissertation proposal**

### ***Distinction (70% and above)***

The proposal sets out an intellectual agenda for the dissertation, included a critical discussion of the principal primary and secondary sources for the dissertation. It will consider how the primary sources will be interrogated and how they might illuminate the topic, and how the secondary literature contributes to our understanding of, presents a misguided view of, or simply ignores the topic in question. There is also an attempt to reflect on broader issues of methodology. Provisional conclusions and/or working hypothesis are proposed, and there is a clear sense that the project balances challenging scholarship with a level-headed conception of what is achievable, given the time and resources available.

### ***Merit (60-69)***

The proposal sets out an intellectual agenda for the dissertation, included a critical discussion of the principal primary and secondary sources for the dissertation. There may be issues with feasibility; that is, the proposed range of sources to be assessed may be somewhat overambitious. The originality of the project and its approach may be overstated.

### ***Pass (50-59)***

The proposal sketches out the basic outline of events and historical actors in a cogent and clear fashion, albeit without reflecting on why these events or historical figures are significant. Previous work in the field or in neighbouring fields is cited and summarised, but there is little sense of the author taking a position his or herself. The author might seem to be simply transplanting an approach or methodology wholesale, rather than seeking to reflect on what approaches would be most effective in this particular area of historical investigation.

### ***Fail (Below 50)***

The piece fails to identify a field appropriate for historical enquiry, or is so overambitious in its reach as to be outlandish. The piece does not discuss potential sources; or, if it does, they are sources that do not exist, are inaccessible or simply unhelpful. The piece exhibits only the haziest sense that other historians have produced work in the field and/or have developed methodologies worth considering.

## **HIST6082 Public History: Portfolio exercise**

### ***Distinction (70% and above)***

The review displays all of the attributes of work associated with the 60–69 level. It delivers a persuasive, well-informed and perceptive assessment of the institution or theme under discussion, displaying an excellent and detailed grasp of their contribution to public history provision as well as offering an original critical perspective. The writing will be clear, accurate, and well-judged in tone.

### ***Merit (60-69)***

The portfolio provides a well-written, clearly structured and fair account of the public history provision of the chosen institution or theme. It shows some knowledge about the operations and limitations of the institutions, organisations and/or media discussed. It offers a coherent and convincing discussion of wider social, political and historiographical contexts, intended audiences, and stakeholders. Criticisms of the institutions, organisations and/or media are constructive, critiques are fair and based on realistic expectations, and suggestions for improvement are within the realm of the possible. The portfolio shows a good grasp of the issues under discussion and an engagement with the wider context of public history provision. It is clear, well-structured, well-judged, accurate and coherent, but possibly with some lapses in style.

### ***Pass (50-59)***

The portfolio identifies and discusses some elements in the public history provision of the chosen institution or in the presentation of the chosen theme. It gives an impression of a particular institution or theme, but the overall assessment lacks detail and tends towards a simple description rather than providing insightful analysis. There might be some attempt to provide basic details about context, audience and stakeholders, but there is little attempt to analyse the intended audiences or place the institution or theme in a wider historiographical context. There is little evidence of secondary reading about the topics discussed. The piece might adopt a register unsuitable for a work of historical scholarship. The clarity and standard of prose might be flawed.

***Fail (30-50)***

Though the institution or chosen theme is appropriate, the portfolio offers little more than a factual synopsis, which may itself be confused or inaccurate. There is little or no evidence of engagement with, or reflection on, the public history provision of the institution or theme investigated. The portfolio might fail to include key elements of the exercise, such as considerations of context, stakeholders and audience. The writing style might be poor, with lapses in style and accuracy.

***Fail (Below 30)***

The institution or theme discussed is not suitable or appropriate for analysis as public history. In all cases, it is the student's responsibility to check with the module convenor to ensure that the institution or chosen public history theme is appropriate. The portfolio may poorly structured, lacking in coherence, and lacking knowledge and understanding of the institutions or themes discussed. The writing style might be poor, with serious lapses in style and accuracy.

## MUSIC – MMUS Assessment Descriptors

	Essay Modules	Performance	Composition
80-100	Exceptional, systematic subject knowledge Exceptional understanding of ideas, concepts and materials Exceptional critical analysis (including where appropriate a thoroughly original and/or creative approach) Exceptional organisation and presentation Accurate, consistent and appropriate citation and referencing	Exceptional, masterful musical understanding Exceptional (flawless or near flawless) technical execution Exceptional presentation (appropriate dress, demeanour and/or engagement with audience) Exceptional organisation (duration, punctuality, adherence to guidelines)	Exceptional, masterful creativity, originality, inventiveness and imagination Exceptional (flawless or near flawless) technical execution (including where appropriate production skills) Exceptional attention to the brief Exceptional organisation (presentation and other delivery requirements)
70-79	Excellent, comprehensive, systematic subject knowledge; evidence of very extensive reading Excellent understanding of ideas, concepts and materials Very high degree of critical analysis (including where appropriate evidence of an original or creative approach) Highly sophisticated organisation and presentation Accurate, consistent and appropriate citation and referencing	Excellent, comprehensive musical understanding Very high degree of technical competence Highly sophisticated presentation (appropriate dress, demeanour and/or engagement with audience) Excellent organisation (duration, punctuality, adherence to guidelines)	Excellent creativity, originality, inventiveness and imagination, demonstrating comprehensive study and preparation Very high degree of technical competence (including where appropriate production skills) Excellent attention to the brief Highly sophisticated organisation (presentation and other delivery requirements)
60-69	Good, systematic subject knowledge; evidence of extensive reading Good understanding of ideas, concepts and materials Good critical analysis; some evidence of independent thought Very good organisation and presentation Accurate, consistent and appropriate citation and referencing	Evidence of good, systematic musical understanding High degree of technical competence Very good presentation (appropriate dress, demeanour and/or engagement with audience) Very good, consistent organisation (duration, punctuality, adherence to guidelines)	Clear evidence of creativity, originality, inventiveness and imagination High degree of technical competence (including where appropriate production skills) Very good attention to the brief Very good, consistent organisation (presentation and other delivery requirements)



50-59	<p>Competent subject knowledge</p> <p>Good understanding of ideas, concepts and materials</p> <p>Competent critical analysis</p> <p>Good organisation and good presentation</p> <p>Generally accurate, consistent and appropriate citation and referencing (towards the bottom of the band possibly a few errors)</p>	<p>Competent musical understanding</p> <p>Good technical execution</p> <p>Good presentation (appropriate dress, demeanour and/or engagement with audience)</p> <p>Generally consistent organisation (towards the bottom of the band a few problems with duration, punctuality, adherence to guidelines)</p>	<p>Evidence of competence in creativity, originality, inventiveness and imagination</p> <p>Good technical execution (including where appropriate production skills)</p> <p>Good attention to the brief</p> <p>Generally consistent organisation (towards the bottom of the band a few problems with presentation and other delivery requirements)</p>
35-49	<p>Some subject knowledge</p> <p>Some understanding of ideas, concepts and materials</p> <p>Some evidence of critical analysis</p> <p>Competent organisation and presentation</p> <p>Generally accurate, consistent and appropriate citation and referencing (some errors)</p>	<p>Some musical understanding</p> <p>Some evidence of sound technical execution</p> <p>Competent presentation (appropriate dress, demeanour and/or engagement with audience)</p> <p>Generally consistent organisation (some problems of duration, punctuality, adherence to guidelines)</p>	<p>Some evidence of creativity, originality, inventiveness and imagination</p> <p>Some evidence of sound technical execution (including where appropriate production skills)</p> <p>Some evidence of attention to the brief</p> <p>Generally consistent organisation (some problems with presentation and other delivery requirements)</p>
0-34	<p>Very little subject knowledge</p> <p>Little understanding of ideas, concepts and materials</p> <p>Inadequate critical analysis</p> <p>Poor organisation and borderline poor presentation</p> <p>Poor or absent citation and referencing</p>	<p>Very little musical understanding</p> <p>Some technical competence</p> <p>Poor presentation (appropriate dress, demeanour and/or engagement with audience)</p> <p>Poor organisation (duration, punctuality, adherence to guidelines)</p>	<p>Very little evidence of creativity, originality, inventiveness and imagination</p> <p>Some technical competence (including where appropriate production skills)</p> <p>Borderline poor attention to the brief</p> <p>Poor organisation (presentation and other delivery requirements)</p>

## ARCHAEOLOGY – MA/MSc Marking Criteria

	<b>Grade descriptor</b> Core criteria for grade	<b>Essays and essay-style examinations</b> Discursive writing on a particular subject or choice of subjects
> 85 Exemplary	Outstanding work that is, or is close to, a standard that could be published. Comprehensive and original. Shows understanding of a range of complex ideas, and contributes to the development of new ideas.	Uses a wide range of well-chosen primary and secondary sources. Shows outstanding critical evaluation and original analysis of evidence expressed in a very well-reasoned, logical manner. Excellent organisation and structure, with a range of appropriate examples to illustrate points and justify arguments. Excellent presentation and use of illustrations, where relevant. Clearly demonstrates potential for doctoral level research.
78-84 Exceptional	Excellent work with almost no flaws. Very knowledgeable and at least partly original. Shows understanding of a range of complex ideas.	Demonstrates knowledge of a wide range of primary and secondary sources. Discussion deploys critical evaluation and original analysis of evidence to develop a consistent explanation or interpretation. Excellent organisation and structure, with a range of appropriate examples to illustrate points and justify arguments. Excellent presentation and use of illustrations, where relevant.
70-77 Excellent	Excellent work with very few flaws. Detailed knowledge that is deployed appropriately. Shows understanding of some complex ideas.	Content drawn from a range of primary and secondary sources. Very good critical evaluation and original analysis of evidence expressed in a very well-reasoned, logical manner. Very good organisation of information, with good use of examples to illustrate points and justify arguments. Very good presentation.
65-69 Highly proficient	Very good work with very few flaws. Detailed knowledge with very few omissions Shows understanding of all established ideas.	Content drawn from a good range of primary and secondary sources. Good critical evaluation and analysis of evidence expressed in a well-reasoned logical manner. Information is well organised, and makes use of examples to illustrate points and justify arguments. Good presentation.
60-64 Proficient	Very good work with some flaws. Detailed knowledge with very some notable omissions Shows understanding of most of the established ideas.	Content drawn from a range of primary and secondary sources. Some critical evaluation and analysis of evidence expressed in a largely well-reasoned and consistent manner. Information is generally well organised, and makes use of examples to illustrate points and justify arguments. Acceptable presentation.
55-59 Acceptable	Acceptable work with some significant flaws. Reasonable knowledge with very notable omissions Shows understanding of some of the established ideas.	Content drawn from a basic range of sources. Shows competent critical evaluation and analysis of evidence expressed with basic reasoning and logic. Some use of examples to illustrate points and justify arguments. Acceptable presentation.
50-54 Pass	Acceptable work with many significant flaws. Some relevant knowledge, with very notable omissions Limited understanding of the established ideas.	Content drawn from a basic range of sources. Shows limited level of critical evaluation and analysis of evidence. Attempts to use examples to illustrate points and justify arguments. Acceptable presentation.
45-49 Fail	Poor work with many significant flaws. Little relevant knowledge Very little understanding of any of the ideas or concepts.	Content drawn from a limited range of sources. Little evidence of critical evaluation and analysis, argument shows basic reasoning and logic. Basic organisation of information and limited use of examples to illustrate points and justify arguments. Presentation may be poor. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.
40-44 Fail	Very poor work with many significant flaws Hardly any relevant knowledge with very notable omissions Very poor understanding of any of the ideas of concepts	Content drawn from a very limited range of sources. Very little evidence of critical evaluation and analysis, argument shows little reasoning and logic. Poor organisation of information and very limited use of examples to illustrate points and justify arguments. Presentation may be poor. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.
25-39 Fail	Unacceptably poor work with many significant flaws. Almost no relevant knowledge Shows no understanding of any of the ideas or concepts	Content drawn from few relevant sources. Almost no evidence of critical evaluation and analysis, argument shows flawed reasoning and logic. Information is not well organised and/or examples are not present or are not relevant. Presentation may be poor. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.

0-24 Fail	Unacceptably poor work with many significant flaws. No relevant knowledge No understanding of any of the ideas or concepts	Very little relevant content, drawn from very few relevant sources. No evidence of critical evaluation and analysis, argument shows flawed reasoning and logic. Information is poorly organised and examples are either not present or are not relevant. Presentation may be poor. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.
--------------	--	---

	<b>Grade descriptor</b> Core criteria for grade	<b>Dissertations and projects</b> Dissertations and projects with a significant element of independent study
> 85 Exemplary	Outstanding work that is, or is close to, a standard that could be published. Comprehensive and original. Shows understanding of a range of complex ideas, and contributes to the development of new ideas.	Significant and highly original piece of work that should certainly be published. Demonstrates complete understanding of complex ideas and mastery of the relevant literature. The contents are publishable with only minor revision necessary. The dissertation demonstrates that the student has analysed and synthesized a topic or set of data with great insight and/or exceptional critical thought. Clearly demonstrates potential for doctoral level research.
78-84 Exceptional	Excellent work with almost no flaws. Very knowledgeable and at least partly original. Shows understanding of a range of complex ideas.	Significant or original work that could be published with some revisions; demonstrates excellent understanding of complex ideas and the relevant literature. The text of the dissertation is well written and illustrated. Demonstrates that the student has analysed and synthesized a topic or set of data with high levels of insight and/or critical thought.
70-77 Excellent	Excellent work with very few flaws. Detailed knowledge that is deployed appropriately. Shows understanding of some complex ideas.	A potentially significant thesis, but additional research would be needed to develop the project to the point of possible publication. Demonstrates a high level of understanding of the ideas and a mastery of the relevant literature. Demonstrates that the student has analysed and synthesized a topic or set of data with insight and/or critical thought.
65-69 Highly proficient	Very good work with very few flaws. Detailed knowledge with very few omissions Shows understanding of all established ideas.	The dissertation shows understanding of all the main ideas and relevant literature; some originality in the construction of research aims and interpretation of data or substantial original independent laboratory or field research conducted at a high level of professional competence. Appropriate selection, interpretation and evaluation of source material and evidence of ability to analyse and synthesise data and formulate conclusions.
60-64 Proficient	Very good work with some flaws. Detailed knowledge with very some notable omissions Shows understanding of most of the established ideas.	Clear understanding and/or awareness of the main ideas and a selection of the relevant literature. Some significant original fieldwork or other independent research conducted at a reasonable level of professional competence. Satisfactory consistency, organisation and presentation. Good selection, interpretation and evaluation of source material.
55-59 Acceptable	Acceptable work with some significant flaws. Reasonable knowledge with very notable omissions Shows understanding of some of the established ideas.	Generally sound understanding and/or awareness of the main ideas and a selection of relevant literature. Fieldwork or other independent research has been conducted to an adequate level of professional competence. Some selection, interpretation and evaluation of source material.
50-54 Pass	Acceptable work with many significant flaws. Some relevant knowledge, with very notable omissions Limited understanding of the established ideas.	Some understanding and awareness of the main issues and ideas, and some of the relevant literature. Fieldwork or other independent research shows an adequate level of professional competence. Selection, synthesis and evaluation of source material largely descriptive.
45-49 Fail	Poor work with many significant flaws. Little relevant knowledge Very little understanding of any of the ideas or concepts.	Limited understanding of subject area, and limited reading of relevant literature. Confused or vague research aims. Original fieldwork or other independent research below an acceptable professional standard. Methods inappropriate or poorly executed and described. Significant weaknesses in presentation, referencing or bibliography. Poorly organised. Significant errors of spelling, punctuation or grammar. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.
40-44 Fail	Very poor work with many significant flaws	Very limited understanding of subject area, and very limited reading of relevant literature. Confused or vague research aims. Original fieldwork or other independent research below an acceptable professional standard. Methods inappropriate or poorly executed and described. Very

	Hardly any relevant knowledge with very notable omissions Very poor understanding of any of the ideas of concepts	significant weaknesses in presentation, referencing or bibliography. Poorly organised. Very significant errors of spelling, punctuation or grammar. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.
25-39 Fail	Unacceptably poor work with many significant flaws. Almost no relevant knowledge Shows no understanding of any of the ideas or concepts	Little understanding of the subject area. Research aims or questions are not clear. No evidence of original fieldwork or other independent research. Serious confusion over techniques. No serious discussion of methods. Inadequate structure. No further reading. Poorly presented with little referencing of sources and inadequate or absent bibliography. Badly organised. Significant errors of spelling, punctuation or grammar. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.
0-24 Fail	Unacceptably poor work with many significant flaws. No relevant knowledge No understanding of any of the ideas or concepts	No understanding of subject area. No clear research aims or questions. No original fieldwork or other independent research. No analytical work. No discussion of methods. No evidence of relevant further reading. Structure is fragmentary; incoherent or incomplete. Poorly presented, with no referencing of sources and an inadequate or absent bibliography. Inadequate style; substantial errors of spelling, punctuation or grammar. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.

	<b>Grade descriptor</b> Core criteria for grade	<b>Technical, lab and field reports</b> Reports that involve collecting and analysing data
> 85 Exemplary	Outstanding work that is, or is close to, a standard that could be published. Comprehensive and original. Shows understanding of a range of complex ideas, and contributes to the development of new ideas.	Addresses all of the relevant literature. Outstanding presentation of a sound data set, demonstrating exceptional experimental/survey design coupled with technically excellent and systematic data collection. Excellent discussion of results in the context of relevant literature and excellent attempts to reconcile inconsistencies and irregularities. Clear statement of the implication of the study and sensible suggestions for further work. Clearly demonstrates potential for doctoral level research.
78-84 Exceptional	Excellent work with almost no flaws. Very knowledgeable and at least partly original. Shows understanding of a range of complex ideas.	Addresses a wide range of relevant literature. Excellent presentation of a sound data set, demonstrating very good experimental/survey design and thorough, technically competent and systematic data collection. Very good discussion of results showing awareness of relevant literature and good attempts to reconcile inconsistencies and irregularities. Clear statement of the implication of the study and sensible suggestions for further work.
70-77 Excellent	Excellent work with very few flaws. Detailed knowledge that is deployed appropriately. Shows understanding of some complex ideas.	Addresses a range of relevant literature. Very good presentation of a sound data set, demonstrating sound experimental/survey design coupled with technically competent and systematic data collection. Good discussion of results and good attempts to reconcile inconsistencies and irregularities. Clear statement of the implication of the study and sensible suggestions for further work.
65-69 Highly proficient	Very good work with very few flaws. Detailed knowledge with very few omissions Shows understanding of all established ideas.	Good work, addressing a range of relevant literature. Good presentation of a sound data set, demonstrating competent experimental/survey design and competent and systematic data collection. Good discussion of results in the light of relevant literature with acknowledgement of and some attempt to reconcile inconsistencies and irregularities. Identification of some implications of the study including some suggestion for further work.
60-64 Proficient	Very good work with some flaws. Detailed knowledge with very some notable omissions Shows understanding of most of the established ideas.	Good work, addressing a range of relevant literature. Good presentation of a sound data set, demonstrating competent experimental/survey design and competent and systematic data collection. Demonstrates reasonable understanding of method and theory. Good discussion of results in the context of relevant literature and some attempt to reconcile inconsistencies and irregularities. Identification of some implications of the study including some suggestion for further work.
55-59 Acceptable	Acceptable work with some significant flaws. Reasonable knowledge with very notable omissions Shows understanding of some of the established ideas.	Competent work, addressing some relevant literature. Competent presentation of a basically sound data set, with no major flaws in experimental/survey design, and reasonably competent and systematic data collection. Competent discussion of results in the light of some relevant literature, with acknowledgement of at least some inconsistencies and irregularities and a basic attempt at their reconciliation. Identification of a few implications of the study.
50-54 Pass	Acceptable work with many significant flaws.	Weak work, addressing some relevant literature. Competent presentation of a basically sound data set that may have some flaws in experimental/survey design. Shows some understanding of method and

	Some relevant knowledge, with very notable omissions Limited understanding of the established ideas.	theory. Some discussion of results, with acknowledgement of at least some inconsistencies and irregularities and a basic attempt at their reconciliation.
45-49 Fail	Poor work with many significant flaws. Little relevant knowledge Very little understanding of any of the ideas or concepts.	Limited presentation of basic data set, demonstrating limited understanding of method and theory. Flaws in experimental/survey design, and incomplete data collection. Limited or confused discussion of results, related to little relevant literature. Acknowledgement of at least some inconsistencies and irregularities. Identification of limited implications of the study. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.
40-44 Fail	Very poor work with many significant flaws Hardly any relevant knowledge with very notable omissions Very poor understanding of any of the ideas of concepts	Poor presentation of basic data set, demonstrating very limited understanding of method and theory. Significant flaws in experimental/survey design, and incomplete data collection. Limited or confused discussion of results, related to little relevant literature. Acknowledgement of several inconsistencies and irregularities. Identification of a few implications of the study. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.
25-39 Fail	Unacceptably poor work with many significant flaws. Almost no relevant knowledge Shows no understanding of any of the ideas or concepts	Rudimentary work addressing little, if any, relevant literature and showing very little understanding of method and theory. Poor presentation of data set, significant flaws in experimental/survey design and incomplete data collection. Rudimentary discussion of results in the light of at least some relevant literature. Limited acknowledgement of at least some inconsistency and irregularities. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.
0-24 Fail	Unacceptably poor work with many significant flaws. No relevant knowledge No understanding of any of the ideas or concepts	Rudimentary work addressing almost no relevant literature and showing no understanding of method or theory. Poor presentation of data set, significant flaws in experimental/survey design and very incomplete data collection. No appreciable discussion of results. No attempt to resolve inconsistency and irregularities. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.

	<b>Grade descriptor</b> Core criteria for grade	<b>Presentations (including verbal presentations, posters and multimedia)</b> Presentations involving verbal communication and other media
> 85 Exemplary	Outstanding work that is, or is close to, a standard that could be published. Comprehensive and original. Shows understanding of a range of complex ideas, and contributes to the development of new ideas.	Outstanding presentation in which the content is communicated effectively and clearly to a standard that would be acceptable at a relevant professional or academic forum or conference. The content is thoroughly understood, and the presentation communicates complex ideas effectively, making exemplary use of the available media. Clearly demonstrates potential for doctoral level research.
78-84 Exceptional	Excellent work with almost no flaws. Very knowledgeable and at least partly original. Shows understanding of a range of complex ideas.	Exceptional presentation in which the content is communicated effectively and clearly to a standard that could be brought to the level of a relevant professional or academic forum or conference with little further work or supervision. The content is thoroughly understood, and the presentation communicates ideas effectively, making excellent use of the available media.
70-77 Excellent	Excellent work with very few flaws. Detailed knowledge that is deployed appropriately. Shows understanding of some complex ideas.	Excellent presentation in which the content is communicated effectively and clearly to a standard that could be brought to the level of a relevant professional or academic forum or conference with further work and supervision. The content is thoroughly understood, and the presentation communicates ideas effectively, making good use of relevant media.
65-69 Highly proficient	Very good work with very few flaws. Detailed knowledge with very few omissions Shows understanding of all established ideas.	Very good presentation in which the content is communicated effectively and clearly to the specified audience. The content is largely understood, and the presentation communicates the relevant ideas effectively, making proficient use of relevant media.
60-64 Proficient	Very good work with some flaws. Detailed knowledge with very some notable omissions	Very good presentation in which the content is communicated reasonably effectively and clearly to the specified audience.

	Shows understanding of most of the established ideas.	The content is largely understood, and the presentation communicates most of the relevant ideas, making proficient use of relevant media.
55-59 Acceptable	Acceptable work with some significant flaws. Reasonable knowledge with very notable omissions Shows understanding of some of the established ideas.	Good presentation in which the content is communicated reasonably effectively to the specified audience. The content is predominantly understood, and the presentation communicates some of the relevant ideas, making reasonable use of relevant media.
50-54 Pass	Acceptable work with many significant flaws. Some relevant knowledge, with very notable omissions Limited understanding of the established ideas.	Acceptable presentation in which most of the required content is communicated to the specified audience. The content is partly understood, and the presentation communicates some of the relevant ideas, making reasonable use of relevant media.
45-49 Fail	Poor work with many significant flaws. Little relevant knowledge Very little understanding of any of the ideas or concepts.	Acceptable presentation in which some of the required content is communicated to the specified audience. The content is only partly understood, and the presentation communicates only some of the relevant ideas, making poor use of relevant media. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.
40-44 Fail	Very poor work with many significant flaws Hardly any relevant knowledge with very notable omissions Very poor understanding of any of the ideas or concepts	Barely acceptable presentation in which some of the required content is communicated to the specified audience. The content is poorly understood, and the presentation communicates a small number of the relevant ideas, making poor use of relevant media. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.
25-39 Fail	Unacceptably poor work with many significant flaws. Almost no relevant knowledge Shows no understanding of any of the ideas or concepts	Unacceptable presentation in which little of the required content is communicated to the specified audience. The content is understood to a limited extent, and the presentation communicates few of the relevant ideas, making poor use of relevant media. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.
0-24 Fail	Unacceptably poor work with many significant flaws. No relevant knowledge No understanding of any of the ideas or concepts	Unacceptable presentation in which very little of the required content is communicated to the specified audience. The content has not been understood, and the presentation fails to communicate any relevant ideas, making no effective use of relevant media. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.

	<b>Grade descriptor</b> Core criteria for grade	<b>Portfolios</b> Assignments consisting of collections of smaller pieces of work
> 85 Exemplary	Outstanding work that is, or is close to, a standard that could be published. Comprehensive and original. Shows understanding of a range of complex ideas, and contributes to the development of new ideas.	Entirely complete, and to which considerable additional work has been added beyond the minimum specification for the assignment. All the work presented is to the highest standard. Individual elements are of a professional or academic quality suitable for publication with minor revisions. Clearly demonstrates potential for doctoral level research.
78-84 Exceptional	Excellent work with almost no flaws. Very knowledgeable and at least partly original. Shows understanding of a range of complex ideas.	Entirely complete, and to which additional work has been added beyond the minimum specification for the assignment. All the work presented is to an excellent standard. Individual elements are of a professional or academic quality suitable for publication with some revisions.
70-77 Excellent	Excellent work with very few flaws. Detailed knowledge that is deployed appropriately. Shows understanding of some complex ideas.	Entirely complete, and to which some additional work has been added beyond the minimum specification for the assignment. All the work presented is to an excellent standard. Individual elements are of a professional or academic quality that could be made suitable for publication with some supervision and revision.

65-69 Highly proficient	Very good work with very few flaws. Detailed knowledge with very few omissions Shows understanding of all established ideas.	Entirely complete, and to which a little additional work may have been added beyond the minimum specification for the assignment. All the work presented is to a very good standard. Individual elements conform to relevant professional standards.
60-64 Proficient	Very good work with some flaws. Detailed knowledge with very some notable omissions Shows understanding of most of the established ideas.	Largely complete. The majority of the work presented is to a very good standard. Most individual elements conform to relevant professional standards.
55-59 Acceptable	Acceptable work with some significant flaws. Reasonable knowledge with very notable omissions Shows understanding of some of the established ideas.	Largely complete. The majority of the work presented is to a very good standard. Most individual elements conform to relevant professional standards.
50-54 Pass	Acceptable work with many significant flaws. Some relevant knowledge, with very notable omissions Limited understanding of the established ideas.	The majority of the elements are present. The majority of the work presented is to an acceptable standard. Some of the individual elements conform to relevant professional standards.
45-49 Fail	Poor work with many significant flaws. Little relevant knowledge Very little understanding of any of the ideas or concepts.	A minority of the elements are present. The work presented is to a poor standard, or does not conform to the assignment specification. Many of the individual elements fail to conform to relevant professional standards. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.
40-44 Fail	Very poor work with many significant flaws Hardly any relevant knowledge with very notable omissions Very poor understanding of any of the ideas of concepts	A minority of the elements are present. The work presented is to a very poor standard, or does not conform to the assignment specification. Many of the individual elements fail to conform to relevant professional standards. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.
25-39 Fail	Unacceptably poor work with many significant flaws. Almost no relevant knowledge Shows no understanding of any of the ideas or concepts	A minority of the elements are present. The work presented is to an inadequate standard, or does not conform to the assignment specification. Most of the individual elements fail to conform to relevant professional standards. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.
0-24 Fail	Unacceptably poor work with many significant flaws. No relevant knowledge No understanding of any of the ideas or concepts	Significantly incomplete. The work presented is not to an acceptable standard, or does not conform to the assignment specification. None of the elements conform with relevant professional standards. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.

	<b>Grade descriptor</b> Core criteria for grade	<b>Reviews, research designs, plans, annotated biographies and similar</b> Written assignments geared to more specific tasks than essays
> 85 Exemplary	Outstanding work that is, or is close to, a standard that could be published. Comprehensive and original. Shows understanding of a range of complex ideas, and contributes to the development of new ideas.	Includes all the required elements, each of which is completed to a technical standard that could be incorporated into a funded research project or professional archaeological work with little or no modifications. This work goes well beyond the requirements set out in the assignment rubric, demonstrating (for example) an exemplary level of critical reading, a highly-developed or original research design. Clearly demonstrates potential for doctoral level research.
78-84 Exceptional	Excellent work with almost no flaws. Very knowledgeable and at least partly original.	Includes all the required elements, each of which is completed to a technical standard that could be incorporated into a funded research project or professional archaeological work with a little further work or supervision.

	Shows understanding of a range of complex ideas.	This work exceeds the requirements set out in the assignment rubric, demonstrating (for example) an exceptional level of critical reading, an excellent and imaginative research design.
70-77 Excellent	Excellent work with very few flaws. Detailed knowledge that is deployed appropriately. Shows understanding of some complex ideas.	Includes all the required elements, each of which is completed to a technical standard that could be incorporated into a funded research project or professional archaeological work with significant further work or supervision. This work fully meets the requirements set out in the assignment rubric, demonstrating (for example) an excellent level of critical reading, an excellent research design.
65-69 Highly proficient	Very good work with very few flaws. Detailed knowledge with very few omissions Shows understanding of all established ideas.	Includes nearly all the required elements, which are completed to an extremely proficient technical standard that complies with the rubric and relevant professional standards. This work fully meets the requirements set out in the assignment rubric, demonstrating (for example) a very good level of critical reading, a robust and well-planned research design.
60-64 Proficient	Very good work with some flaws. Detailed knowledge with very some notable omissions Shows understanding of most of the established ideas.	Includes the majority of the required elements, which are completed to a proficient technical standard. The majority of the work complies with the rubric and relevant professional standards. This work largely meets the requirements set out in the assignment rubric, demonstrating (for example) a good level of critical reading, a reasonably well-planned research design.
55-59 Acceptable	Acceptable work with some significant flaws. Reasonable knowledge with very notable omissions Shows understanding of some of the established ideas.	Includes the majority of the required elements, which are completed to an acceptable technical standard. The majority of the work complies with the rubric and some of it meets relevant professional standards. This work only partly meets the requirements set out in the assignment rubric, demonstrating (for example) some level of critical reading, a promising, but flawed, research design.
50-54 Pass	Acceptable work with many significant flaws. Some relevant knowledge, with very notable omissions Limited understanding of the established ideas.	Includes most of the required elements, some of which are completed to an acceptable technical standard. The majority of the work addresses the rubric. This work only partly meets the requirements set out in the assignment rubric, demonstrating (for example) a limited level of critical reading, a flawed research design.
45-49 Fail	Poor work with many significant flaws. Little relevant knowledge Very little understanding of any of the ideas or concepts.	Includes some of the required elements, many of which have not been completed to an acceptable technical standard. Much of the work is missing or fails to address the rubric. This work fails to demonstrate (for example) an acceptable level of critical reading, or an acceptable understanding of how to write a research design. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.
40-44 Fail	Very poor work with many significant flaws Hardly any relevant knowledge with very notable omissions Very poor understanding of any of the ideas or concepts	Includes a small number of the required elements, many of which have not been completed to an acceptable technical standard. Much of the work is missing or fails to address the rubric. This work fails to demonstrate (for example) an acceptable level of critical reading, or an acceptable understanding of how to write a research design. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.
25-39 Fail	Unacceptably poor work with many significant flaws. Almost no relevant knowledge Shows no understanding of any of the ideas or concepts	Includes few of the required elements, many of which have not been completed to an acceptable standard. The majority of the work is missing or fails to address the rubric. This work fails to demonstrate (for example) the required level of relevant critical reading, or sufficient understanding of how to write a research design. Work of this level falls below that required of master's students.
0-24 Fail	Unacceptably poor work with many significant flaws. No relevant knowledge No understanding of any of the ideas or concepts	Includes very few or none of the required elements, and those that are present are well below an acceptable standard. The majority of the work may be missing or fails to address the assignment rubric. This work fails to demonstrate (for example) any relevant critical reading, or any understanding of how to write a research design. Work of this level falls below that required of masters students.



## Appendix 1:

### Additional Costs

Students are responsible for meeting the cost of essential textbooks, and of producing such essays, assignments, laboratory reports and dissertations as are required to fulfil the academic requirements for each programme of study. In addition to this, students registered for this programme typically also have to pay for the items listed in the table below.

In some cases you'll be able to choose modules (which may have different costs associated with that module) which will change the overall cost of a programme to you. Details of such costs will be listed in the Module Profile. Please also ensure you read the section on additional costs in the University's Fees, Charges and Expenses Regulations in the University Calendar available at [Fees, Charges and Expenses](#)

Main Item	Sub-section	PROGRAMME SPECIFIC COSTS
<b>Stationery</b>		You will be expected to provide your own day-to-day stationary items, e.g. pens, pencils, notebooks, etc.). Any specialist stationery items will be specified under the Additional Costs tab of the relevant module profile.
<b>Textbooks</b>		<p>Where a module specifies core texts these should generally be available on the reserve list in the library. However due to demand, students may prefer to buy their own copies. These can be purchased from any source.</p> <p>Some modules suggest reading texts as <b>optional</b> background reading. The library may hold copies of such texts, or alternatively you may wish to purchase your own copies. Although not essential reading, you may benefit from the additional reading materials for the module.</p>
<b>Equipment and Materials Equipment</b>	Laboratory Equipment and Materials:	All laboratory equipment and materials are provided.
<b>IT</b>	Computer Discs or USB drives	Students are expected to provide their own portable data storage device.
	Software Licenses	All software is provided
	Hardware	It is advisable that students provide their own laptop or personal computer, although shared facilities are available across the University campus.
<b>Printing and Photocopying Costs</b>		<p>Where possible, coursework such as essays; projects; dissertations is likely to be submitted on line. However, there are some items where it is not possible to submit on line and students will be asked to provide a printed copy.</p> <p>A list of the University printing costs can be found here: <a href="http://www.southampton.ac.uk/isolutions/students/printing/">http://www.southampton.ac.uk/isolutions/students/printing/</a></p>
<b>Placements (including Study Abroad Programmes)</b>		Students on placement programmes can expect to cover costs for health and travel insurance, accommodation and living expenses; travel costs; visa costs. This will vary depending on which country you are travelling to. Specific details on what additional costs there will be are detailed in the individual module profiles which can be found under the modules tab of the <a href="#">programmes details</a> of your programme.

## Additional costs for Music Programmes

<p><b>Vocal and Instrumental Lessons</b></p>		<p>Specialist vocal and instrumental tuition for single and joint honors Music students taking performance modules is generally provided free at the point of delivery. When lessons happen away from Highfield Campus students are expected to cover the cost of travel to and from their lessons. Students are expected to cover the cost of travel to and from off-campus rehearsal, performance and music examination venues. Most of those we use are within walking distance of Highfield Campus.</p> <p>Students taking instrumental lessons are expected to own and maintain their own instruments, maintenance including the cost of repairs and of replacement parts (new strings, drumheads etc.). Students are strongly advised to arrange insurance for their instruments, covering all the usual risks including theft from places of residence and from university storerooms. Storage space for instruments is available in Music Department storerooms. Dozens of students have access to them: it is not possible to guarantee security. The university will accept no responsibility for loss or damage to instruments left in storerooms. Students taking performance modules will be given keys to practice rooms and storerooms. Keys must be returned on or before graduation day. Students will be charged £10.00 per replacement key in the event of loss.</p> <p>Jazz and pop students must buy and use their own ear protectors if asked to do so by a teacher.</p> <p>Hartley Library holds a very large collection of sheet music which students can borrow free of charge. Students who want or are advised by teachers to buy their own music, perhaps in order to mark it up, will be expected to cover the cost themselves.</p> <p>The Music Department has a large collection of keyboard instruments to which keyboard students are allowed free access. It owns a number of other instruments (piccolo trumpet, bass sax, basset horn etc.) which students can borrow on their teacher's recommendation. We do not charge for the use of them but do recommend that students make private insurance arrangements when taking them off campus, especially on tour. If not returned intact they must be replaced like for like at the student's expense or at their insurer's.</p> <p>Students may wish to hire professional accompanists to play with them in performance exams. Accompanists charge varying levels of fee (rarely more than £60.00 per exam accompaniment, including prior rehearsal) and students are expected to pay the fees themselves.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Turner Sims -- the university concert hall -- makes 10 tickets for each of its own-promoted concerts available free of charge to Music on a first come, first served basis. (There are very rare exceptions: gala concerts intended to raise funds for Turner Sims for instance.) Monday and Friday lunchtime concerts in Turner Sims organised by the Music Department are free of charge both to Music students and to the wider public. External promoters hiring Turner Sims can charge what they like for admission to concerts.</p> <p>Student-run performing arts societies such as the University of Southampton Symphony Orchestra, JazzManix and Showstoppers (there are many others which Music students might like to join) are free to set their own membership subscriptions. The Music Department does not contribute directly towards the cost of running these societies.</p> <p>ACADEMIC MODULES</p> <p>Very few Music lecturers insist that students purchase specific set texts. Copies of set texts are made available in Hartley Library, if necessary in the reference-only "course collection" or on short-term loan. Students may wish to own copies of recommended books but are free to choose which to buy and which to borrow.</p> <p>Some lecturers prepare course handbooks for the modules they are teaching. These are generally made available free of charge to students taking the modules. For unusually bulky handbooks there may be a charge to pay -- never more than £10.00 per copy.</p> <p>Music software packages are available for licensed use at designated university computer workstations free of charge to Music students. Students who wish to install compatible software on their own computers will have to cover the cost themselves.</p> <p>Students using the university's Follow Me print service will be charged per page printed out, at rates listed in <a href="#">Printing</a> for Students</p>
--	--	--

#### Additional costs for Archaeology Programmes

Fieldtrips and Fieldwork		<p>The range of options and variety of activities open to you on your archaeology degree means that there may be times when you incur small additional costs. We seek to minimise this as much as possible, but there are certain personal pieces of clothing and equipment that you may need to obtain. These items will be to ensure your own safety and comfort.</p> <p>During your degree you are likely to go on a number of fieldtrips, and to take part in fieldwork. The exact number and nature of these trips will</p>
--------------------------	--	--

		<p>depend on your module and fieldwork choices. However, wherever and whatever you do you are likely to need access to; waterproofs, sturdy shoes or boots, sun hat and a small rucksack. For some sites you may be asked to have steel toed boots.</p> <p>For those qualified to do so, you may become involved in diving projects. In these circumstances you would normally be required to bring/hire your own mask, fins, snorkel, knife, exposure suit and dive watch (and if possible, dive computer).</p>
--	--	--

## **Appendix 2 - Revision Strategy and Examination Techniques**

### **2.1 Revision strategy**

Revision should be an on-going process which starts very early in your programme. The amount of knowledge to be accumulated and the variety of skills and techniques to be developed are large and they are best assimilated gradually and consolidated as you go along. Regular revision is really a part of the learning process but, of necessity, becomes more concentrated as the examination approaches. "Re-vision" means looking again at things you have already seen – it is not about learning for the first time.

#### **2.1.1 Final revision programme**

At the start of your final revision schedule (during the Christmas Vacation for Semester 1 exams, and during the Easter Vacation and at the end of the taught element of the programme for Semester 2 exams) you must get organised, and the best way to do this is to devise a revision timetable. Plan your time carefully, give yourself definite objectives for each session, revise actively, test yourself regularly, make notes, and practise problem solving. Use revision sessions to study topics you have worked on before, as revision is simply the process of reminding you of topics and techniques previously understood. You will appreciate how well-organised notes will help you during your revision. Write out important definitions, proofs, formulae and equations, checking them against your notes. Re-work previously solved problems without looking at your previous solution, then attempt questions that you have not looked at before. Make special revision notes for quick reference on cards to keep in your pocket and charts to hang on the wall of your study room. Practise your examination technique.

#### **2.1.2 Examination practice**

You should be familiar with the modules and syllabuses you will be examined in at the end of Semesters 1 and 2. Analyse recent examination papers. Work out how long you have for each question and become familiar with the style of questions.

During your ordinary study periods you will no doubt have attempted many questions but will have seldom given yourself strict time restrictions. In examinations the timing of your answers to questions is vitally important. Practice answering examination questions in mock examination conditions, allowing yourself only the normal available examination time and the equipment you are permitted to take into the examination room. To obtain 'mock examination' practice save one or two complete examination papers so that you can use them as final test papers 'against the clock'.

Examination nerves are common and understandable but will be lessened if you have followed a sensible course of study and revision. You may not do yourself justice if you have a poor examination technique. The hints on the next page should help you to tackle the examination with greater confidence.

### **2.2 Examination techniques**

#### **2.2.1 Before the day**

Before the actual day of your examination, make sure you know:

- the date, day, time and venue of each paper for your course;
- how to get to the examination venue if it is not well known to you;
- your candidate number;
- the telephone number of the Student Office.

Prepare any equipment you will need for your particular examination:

- pens which are comfortable to use;
- sharp pencils, a pencil sharpener and rubber;
- drawing instruments such as a ruler, compasses, protractor, set squares;
- University approved calculator (if allowed) and spare batteries (check that you know how to replace them quickly);
- an accurate watch or small clock.

#### **2.2.2 On the Day**

*Before the examination:*

Check that you have all the equipment you will need before setting off for your examination with plenty of time to spare. If you are delayed, contact the Student Office (have the telephone number with you) to explain what has happened. Arrive at the examination room early; a late start to an examination cannot be a good start and you will not be permitted to enter the examination room later than 30 minutes after its scheduled start time.

### *Just before the start:*

Listen carefully to the invigilator. There may be some changes or special instructions which you were not expecting or some errors in the paper. Fill in any details, such as your candidate number, when the invigilator instructs you to do so.

### *Reading the instructions*

When the invigilator says that you may begin, read the instructions on your examination paper very carefully. Make sure that it is the correct examination paper and, in particular, note:

- the number of sections and questions you have to do;
- how much time you have to do them in;
- which questions (if any) are compulsory;
- what choice of questions (if any) you have;
- how to present your answers.

### *Planning your time*

Quickly calculate the length of time you should spend on each question. You will have practised doing this for past papers but make sure that you use the instructions on your actual examination paper, rather than making any assumptions. Try to allow about 10 minutes at the end for checking your paper.

### *Choosing the questions*

Read through the whole examination paper carefully, checking that you have read each page. If you have a choice of questions:

- cross out the ones you can't do;
- tick those you can definitely do;
- choose the correct number to do;
- mark the order in which you are going to attempt them, attempting your best question(s) first.

### *Answering the question*

Before you attempt to answer a question, read it all again carefully, jotting down points such as formulae and information relating to that question. These hints should help you when writing an answer.

- Plan before you write – the stress of working under time constraints in the exam room can make all your good study intentions disappear. However, this is when it is more important than ever. Take a few minutes to think and plan.
- Think about what the question is actually *asking*. What are you expected to include in your answer. What material will be *relevant*?  
Underline the key words in the question; identify the main topic and discussion areas; choose a few points/arguments about which you can write; make a mini plan which puts them in order before you start writing. You can cross it through afterwards.
- Make sure that your writing is legible.
- Present your answer in a neat, logical and concise way.
- Show all your working; marks are often given for methodology as well as your answers.  
You should be able to refer by name to the main theorists/researchers in your topic, giving the year of their major works. You do not need to give page numbers of lengthy quotes, except in an open book exam. You do not need a reference list.
- Do not do things you are not asked for.
- If relevant, state any principles, results or formulae used and indicate your reasons for using them.
- Check any formulae you use with the formula sheet, if provided.
- Always do a rough estimate of any calculation to check that your answer is sensible.
- When using a calculator, make sure that each calculation is shown clearly in your answer and give your final answer to the required degree of accuracy.
- If you get 'stuck', re-read the question carefully to check that you have not missed any important information or hints given in the question itself.
- When you have completed your answer, re-read the question to check that you have answered all parts.

### *Examination discipline*

It is important that you try to keep to the times you have allocated to answering a question or section and that you answer the correct number of questions. If you answer less than the number of questions required you are limiting the number of marks available to you.

*At the end*

Before handing in your examination script check that:

- any 'front sheet' is completed according to the instructions;
- every loose page is clearly marked with your candidate number, etc;
- every answer is numbered correctly;
- pages are numbered clearly and in order.

# School of Humanities policy and penalties for over-length assessed work

## 1. Introduction

Although the types, lengths and styles of assessed written work vary considerably between disciplinary contexts, the production of written work to a specified length is an important transferrable skill that students are expected to develop during their studies because the ability to produce concise, clear writing to a determined length is fundamental both to academic work and to professional working life.

This policy applies to all credit-bearing teaching within the School of Humanities, and should be read in addition to, and without replacing relevant parts of the University's Assessment Framework:

<http://www.southampton.ac.uk/quality/assessment/framework/index.page>

## 2. Definitions

For the purposes of this policy:

**Written work** refers to any piece of structured writing undertaken as part of your studies. Examples include essays, reports and dissertations but also other forms of writing that might be used for particular teaching, learning or assessment activities;

**Written assessment** refers to any piece of written work for which a summative mark is awarded;

**Word limit** refers to the defined *maximum* length of a written assessment, expressed either as a single limit (e.g. "Maximum length 2,000 words"), or as the upper part of a range (e.g. "Between 1,800 and 2,000 words"). The word limit for a written assessment should be clearly stated in the relevant Module Profile and Assessment Rubric.

**Word count** refers to the number of separate words submitted for assessment by a student. Note that:

The **word count** includes:

- Title, subtitle, headings and subheadings;
- Abstract;
- Body of text (text that develops the substantive text or argument, wherever located);
- Quotes and citations that are integral to the body of text.

The **word count** excludes:

- Acknowledgements;
- Table of contents, list of figures, list of plates etc.;
- Appendices (which may include supplementary quotes or transcripts for qualitative work);
- Bibliography/List of References;
- Footnotes;
- Captions to figures, tables or plates.

## 3. Policy

**3.1 Written assessments** may specify a **word limit** EITHER as a single figure OR as the upper limit of a range.

**3.2** Where a submitted **written assessment** exceeds the specified **word limit**, the marker should base the awarded mark solely on the proportion of the work that falls within the word limit.



## 4. Frequently Asked Questions

### 4.1 Is the **word limit** for guidance only?

No. In order to build the skills that academics in many of our disciplines work to themselves, and which the professional world expects of graduates, the **word limit** is a word limit, as defined above.

### 4.2 What does “Over-length by up to 50% of the original limit” mean?

This means that a written assignment has a **word count** that is more than the **word limit**, but less than or equal to 150% of the **word limit**. For example, if the **word limit** is 1,000 words, then it refers to submitted work that has a **word count** of between 1,001 and 1,500 words.

### 4.3 Is there a “percentage over” or under that I will not be penalised for?

No. The **word limit** is a word limit, as defined above, and penalties may start if you exceed the **word limit** by a single word. A word limit of 1,000 words with a 10% “leeway” policy would, effectively, be a word limit of 1,100 words!

### 4.4 Can I avoid the **word limit** by moving words to places that are excluded from the word count?

The word count excludes things like captions, acknowledgements and footnotes which have a welldefined purpose. If the marker judges that you have used those to develop your main argument, or you include substantive text within these with the purpose of avoiding the word limit, then they are entitled to either exclude that text from their judgement of the mark, or to count that text as part of the word count and apply the appropriate penalty under this policy.

### 4.5 What about footnotes?

The use of footnotes varies significantly from discipline to discipline. You should consult the student handbook for the discipline to which you are submitting the written assessment, and if in doubt you should ask the module lead for advice on use of footnotes.

In general, and in line with the policies of many academic Journal’s on submitting manuscripts, our advice to candidates is that footnotes within the argument of an assignment should be used sparingly, and should only articulate a (relevant) aside, without which the text would still stand as a coherent argument.

Footnotes are *not* included within the **word count**. However, if a marker feels that a candidate is placing core material into footnotes as a way to exclude it from the **word count**, feedback should be provided to the candidate on the first occasion, and a penalty under this policy may be applied in repeated instances.

### 4.6 What about appendices?

Appendices may be included with some written work (check the rubric or ask) and are *not* included in the **word count**. However, an appendix should contain only material that the reader may wish to consult (additional data, primary sources) but which are not essential to the argument. You should not assume that material in an appendix will be read by the marker.

### 4.7 Will excess material be read?

Markers are under no *obligation* to read assessed work beyond the specified word limit, and are instructed to base their mark only on the material that falls within the word limit. However, the assignment in its entirety *may* be read in order to provide guidance to a candidate on issues such as the generation and expression of an argument and conciseness of writing, and to provide feedback for the preparation of future assignments.

## Document history

- Based on 7.1 *Over-length Work FSMS\_HUMS Policy* (nd)
- Draft 0.1 - 0.3 David Wheatley April/May 2017
- Approved by FPC 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017