COMMON GRADING SCHEME (Research Projects)

The Common Grading Scheme (CGS) applies to all courses, except where published Assessment & Award Regulations incorporate the 10-point scheme.

This is the marking scheme for individual pieces of work and not the degree classification scheme. The latter is calculated through the aggregation of marks from the full range of assessments undertaken by a candidate.

Each mark has a short descriptor and a full definition of what is to be expected of an answer that is assigned that mark. For the more commonly used grades, there is a core descriptor of the essential grade (e.g. upper second) and enhancer/detractor points which would place the mark in the ‘high’ or ‘low’ range of the ‘class’. Only those percentages that appear with descriptors in the marking scheme are to be used; percentages that fall between these must not be used.

Application of the Scheme

The descriptors indicate how marks should be allocated according to the standard of a piece of work in three different categories; “selection and coverage of material”, “understanding” and “structure, clarity and presentation”. Where an answer comprises entirely or almost entirely incorrect information, no credit will be given for Structure, Clarity and Presentation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Research Project Reports</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>BSc Class</th>
<th>BVM/VN/MSc/CertAVP Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>Selection &amp; Coverage of Material: Nothing presented and/or completely incorrect information and/or containing nothing at all of relevance. and / or Understanding: None evident. and / or Structure, Clarity &amp; Presentation: None or extremely poor.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Poor Answer</td>
<td>Selection &amp; Coverage of Material: Hardly any information or information that is almost entirely incorrect and/or irrelevant. and / or Understanding: No or almost no understanding evident. and / or Structure, Clarity &amp; Presentation: None or very poor.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor Answer</td>
<td>Selection &amp; Coverage of Material: Very limited amount of information that is correct and relevant. and / or Understanding: If any, extremely limited evidence of understanding. and / or Structure, Clarity &amp; Presentation: Very poor.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Answer</td>
<td>Selection &amp; Coverage of Material: Incomplete and/or inaccurate account of task with inadequate description of aims and methods of practical work and containing significant, and/or a large number of, errors. and / or Understanding: If any, very limited evidence of understanding with many unexplained observations and/or assertions likely. Little or no evidence of original/innovative thinking. Very limited reference to published work from authoritative sources. and / or Structure, Clarity &amp; Presentation: Poor.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly Deficient Answer</td>
<td>As for 45 but with a greater number, and/or more significant, omissions/ inaccuracies/errors, flaws in understanding, interpretation, presentation and/or communication of information.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptor</td>
<td>Research Project Reports</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>BSc Class</td>
<td>BVM/VN/MSc/CertAVP Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Deficient Answer               | **Selection & Coverage of Material**  
Superficial coverage with incomplete record of aims and methods of practical work and flawed by errors and/or omissions. Little comment on most observations.  

and/or  

**Understanding**  
Likely to be inaccuracies in data analysis and/or interpretation and unexplained observations or assertions. Little or no evidence of original/innovative thought. Very limited reference to published work from authoritative sources.  

and/or  

**Structure, Clarity & Presentation**  
Adequate, although may not be entirely systematic.                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 45   | Third     | Fail                     |
| Marginally Deficient Answer    | **As for 45 but with fewer, and/or less significant, omissions/inaccuracies/errors, flaws in understanding, interpretation, presentation and/or communication of information.**                                                                                                                                                                           | 48   | Third     | Fail                     |
| Adequate Answer                | **As for 55 but with more numerous, and/or more significant, omissions/inaccuracies/errors, flaws in understanding, interpretation, presentation and/or communication of information.**                                                                                                                                                                                   | 52   | 2:ii      | Pass                     |
| Sound Answer                   | **Selection & Coverage of Material**  
Systematic account of task with adequate record of aims and methods of practical work and no significant errors, omissions or inaccuracies. Appropriate speculation, if present, is likely to be unsubstantiated.  

**Understanding**  
Limited evidence of original/innovative thought. Sufficient reference to published work from authoritative sources. Data are largely accurate but there may be some unexplained observations or assertions.  

**Structure, Clarity & Presentation**  
Reasonably well-organised and logically presented with adequate clarity of expression.                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 55   | 2:ii      | Pass                     |
<p>| Very Sound Answer              | <strong>As for 55 but with fewer, and/or less significant, omissions/inaccuracies/errors and more evidence of critical ability and/or powers of argument and clarity of expression.</strong>                                                                                                                                                                                                 | 58   | 2:ii      | Pass                     |
| Quite Good Answer              | <strong>As for 65 but with less evidence of critical judgement and more, or more important, omissions/ inaccuracies/errors. There is likely to be less evidence of wider reading through reference to published work from authoritative sources.</strong>                                                                                                                                         | 62   | 2:i       | Pass                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Research Project Reports</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>BSc Class</th>
<th>BVM/VN/MSc/CertAVP Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Good Answer         | **Selection & Coverage of Material**  
                     Systematic and accurate account of task with full record of aims and methods of practical work and no significant errors or omissions. Some speculation, where appropriate, but may not be fully supported.  
                     **Understanding**  
                     Thorough grasp of concepts with reasonable comment on all observations with few unexplained findings or assertions. Some evidence of original/innovative thinking. Appropriate reference to published work from authoritative sources. Data manipulated and analysed correctly. | 65   | 2:i       | Merit                    |
|                     | **Structure, Clarity & Presentation**  
                      Logical and well-organised account with clarity of expression.                                                                                                                                                     |      |           |                          |
| Very Good Answer    | **Selection & Coverage of Material**  
                     As for 65 but with more evidence of critical judgement and fewer and/or less significant omissions/inaccuracies/errors. There is likely to be more evidence of wider reading through reference to published work from authoritative sources. | 68   | 2:i       | Merit                    |
|                     | **Structure, Clarity & Presentation**  
                      Very well-organised.                                                                                                                                                                                                   |      |           |                          |
| Extremely Good Answer| **Selection & Coverage of Material**  
                     As for 75 but demonstrating an authoritative grasp of concepts with sustained powers of argument, frequent insights and much evidence of original/innovative thinking. Virtually no errors or omissions and none of significance. | 75   | First     | Distinction              |
|                     | **Structure, Clarity & Presentation**  
                      Very well-organised.                                                                                                                                                                                                   |      |           |                          |
| Excellent Answer    | **Selection & Coverage of Material**  
                     As for 75 but demonstrating an authoritative grasp of concepts with sustained powers of argument, frequent insights and much evidence of original/innovative thinking. Virtually no errors or omissions and none of significance. | 82   | First     | Distinction              |
|                     | **Structure, Clarity & Presentation**  
                      Very well-organised.                                                                                                                                                                                                   |      |           |                          |
| Outstanding Answer  | **Selection & Coverage of Material**  
                     As for 82 but with strong evidence of original/innovative thinking throughout and no omissions or factual errors. Would be of publishable standard with only minor modifications to content. | 90   | First     | Distinction              |
|                     | **Structure, Clarity & Presentation**  
                      Exceptional depth of coverage with no identifiable errors or omissions.                                                                                                                                              |      |           |                          |
| Exceptional Answer  | **Selection & Coverage of Material**  
                     Exceptional depth of coverage with no identifiable errors or omissions.                                                                                                                                              | 100  | First     | Distinction              |
|                     | **Understanding**  
                     Exceptional powers of analysis, argument, synthesis and insight.                                                                                                                                                     |      |           |                          |
|                     | **Structure, Clarity & Presentation**  
                      Exceptional power of argument, synthesis and insight.                                                                                                                                                            |      |           |                          |
|                     |                                                                                                               |      |           |                          |