

School of Economics and Finance
Undergraduate marking criteria and scale

We assess coursework and examinations on a variety of criteria, and each module will have its own specific set (outlined in the module syllabus). These are the general criteria that are common to all modules:

Grade		Exams and Tests	Coursework
80.0 – 100.0 (A)	Outstanding	Outstanding answers which provides a near perfect solution to all questions, and demonstrate high level of understanding of key theories and concepts. Highly competent use of quantitative techniques, which demonstrate some ability to work beyond routine levels of complexity. Demonstrates critical and thorough understanding of key concepts. Excellent use of examples and diagrams, where appropriate, which are insightful, relevant, accurately presented, and correctly explained. Meets, and or exceeds, all learning outcomes.	Outstanding work which demonstrates depth of understanding, some elements of originality, and coherent synthesis of ideas. Highly competent use of quantitative techniques, which display ability to work beyond routine contexts or levels of complexity. Excellent use of examples and diagrams, where appropriate, which are insightful, relevant, accurately presented, and correctly explained. Excellent presentation and structure, with no spelling or grammatical errors. A wide range of sources, which are discriminately chosen and accurately referenced. Meets, and or exceeds, all learning outcomes.
70.0 – 79.9 (A)	Excellent	Excellent answers which provides a detailed answer to all questions and demonstrates good understanding of key theories and concepts. Highly competent use of quantitative techniques to solve standard problems with very few errors in calculation. Demonstrates critical and thorough understanding of key concepts. Excellent use of examples and diagrams, where appropriate, which are insightful, relevant, accurately presented, and correctly explained. Meets, and or exceeds, all learning outcomes.	Excellent work which demonstrates depth of understanding of key theories and concepts. Highly competent use of quantitative techniques. Excellent use of examples and diagrams, where appropriate, which are insightful, relevant, accurately presented, and correctly explained. Excellent presentation and structure, with no spelling or grammatical errors. A wide range of sources, which are discriminately chosen and accurately referenced. Meets, and or exceeds, all learning outcomes.
60.0 – 69.9 (B)	Very good	A very good answer which demonstrates understanding and comprehension of the subject. Highly competent use of quantitative techniques to solve standard problems, but with some inaccuracies and/or minor mistakes.	Very good work which demonstrates understanding of key theories and concepts. Highly competent use of quantitative techniques, but may be some minor errors in calculation. Good use of examples and diagrams, where appropriate, which are relevant and correctly explained.

School of Economics and Finance
Undergraduate marking criteria and scale

		Good use of examples and diagrams, where appropriate, which are relevant and correctly explained.	Good presentation and structure. Good use and understanding of source materials, but may be minor errors in referencing.
50.0 – 59.9 (C)	Good	Demonstrates familiarity with the subject and provides a generally good answer. However, there may be some errors or missing steps in the solution and/or analysis. Good use of examples and diagrams, where appropriate, but there may be some errors in explanation, derivation, or presentation. Work may be of mixed quality, demonstrating gaps in knowledge and understanding of subject. Performance demonstrates achievement of most, but not all, learning outcomes.	Demonstrates familiarity with the subject and provides a generally good answer. However, there may be some errors or missing steps in the solution and/or analysis. Good use of examples and diagrams, where appropriate, but there may be some errors in explanation, derivation, or presentation. Generally well presented and structured. Work may be of mixed quality, demonstrating gaps in knowledge and understanding of subject. The work may demonstrate either good use and understanding of source materials, but with errors in referencing, or limited use of source material which is correctly referenced. Performance demonstrates achievement of most, but not all, learning outcomes.
40.0 – 49.9 (D)	Adequate	Demonstrates some familiarity with the subject, but only partially answers the question. Limited ability to apply appropriate techniques to identify and model standard problems. There may be significant calculation errors or methods may be used incorrectly. Performance demonstrates only limited achievement of learning outcomes.	A limited attempt which demonstrates incomplete knowledge of key theories and concepts. Poor presentation, structure and spelling/grammar. Inaccurate referencing with significant omissions. Performance demonstrates only limited achievement of learning outcomes.
0.0 – 39.9 (F)	Insufficient	Limited answer which only marginally addresses the question. Fundamental misunderstanding of key concepts. Performance fails to demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes.	A very limited attempt which demonstrates inadequate knowledge of key theories and concepts. Poor presentation, structure and spelling/grammar. No references or very limited use with errors. Performance fails to demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes.