

Marking criteria for Honours work

For the most part, the School of Psychology & Neuroscience assigns marks using module specific grading criteria. This allows module grades to reflect the aims and objectives of each module: the aims, objectives and grading criteria will be available in the relevant module handbook. However, we also operate 'light touch' guidance to ensure equal standards between the modules. The overarching criteria are given here for examinations and continuous assessment. Remember that details and criteria in module handbooks supersede these guidelines.

The modules in which you are assigned a supervisor (PS4040, PS4050, PN4299 & PS4299) form a 'special' category in which all members of the School have agreed a set of grading criteria. Given the diversity of the work and length (particularly the projects), the criteria sheets given here provide general guidelines only.

Note also that the impact and weighting between the different areas of assessment within each criteria sheet will vary on a case by case basis.

Contents

Junior Honours examination grade criteria sheet	2
Junior Honours continuous assessment grade criteria sheet	3
Senior Honours examination grade criteria sheet	4
Senior Honours continuous assessment grade criteria sheet.....	5
PS4040: JH Psychology review grade criteria sheet.....	5
Senior Honours research project grade criteria sheet.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Junior Honours examination grade criteria sheet

Grade.....	0-6.9	7	8-10	11-13	14-16	17-20
Content	No meaningful use of the literature Failure to cite sources.	Major omissions. Extensive reliance on secondary or out-of-date material.	Demonstrates awareness of major theories with some factual information. Over reliance on a narrow range of sources, particularly secondary sources.	Presents the major theories / ideas in outline. Minimal use of primary sources. The majority of the relevant factual material is covered.	Covers all the relevant major issues with use of appropriate primary sources. Only minor omissions of relevant facts.	Thorough and detailed grasp of the issues with widespread use of relevant primary sources and some use of original material. Only very minor omissions of relevant facts.
Factual accuracy	Little or no accurate material	Widespread substantive errors	Many substantive errors	Some substantive errors	Few substantive errors	No substantive errors, few minor errors.
Relevance	Little or no relevant material	Most of the material irrelevant to the question	Much of the material irrelevant to the question	Some material irrelevant to the question	Little material irrelevant to the question	No or very little material irrelevant to the question
Organisation and coherence	No organisation of material	Disjointed material that does not amount to an argument or thesis	The outlines of an argument, but mostly a list of material with no development of ideas	Some development of an argument, but often disjointed and some listing	For the most part, clear with the argument or central thesis generally well structured and developed	Argument or central thesis generally well structured and developed, leading to a clear conclusion
Precision of expression	General failure to use terms and define concepts precisely	A few instances of scientific precision in the use of terms and concepts, but predominant sloppiness and redundancy	Signs of the ability to use precise scientific language, but still widespread instances of sloppiness and redundancy	Significant evidence of ability to use precise scientific language.	Overall, precise use of major terms and concepts with little sloppiness or redundancy	Generally clear analytic use of language, with precise use of concepts and negligible redundancy of expression.
Critical evaluation	No valid evaluation of evidence	General lack of evaluation	Trivial or underspecified criticisms (e.g. 'need more research') and widespread illogical reasoning	Demonstrates awareness of the important issues, but illogical reasoning or triviality clearly evident.	Raises some important issues but still displays some illogical reasoning or triviality	Identifies all the main issues relating to topic. Shows signs of independent evaluation

This sheet is for guidance for markers to enhance consistency in evaluations. It is not intended to indicate an overall grade by application of weighted averages – sections will be weighted differently and this weighting might vary according to the nature of the specific examination.

Junior Honours continuous assessment grade criteria sheet

Grade.....	0-6.9	7	8-10	11-13	14-16	17-20
Content (Turnitin will be used to help evaluate originality)	No evidence that appropriate sources have been used OR copying* from other sources	Minimal reference to appropriate sources OR over-reliance on other work (e.g. close paraphrasing*).	Major omissions. Use of a narrow range of sources. General reliance on secondary or out-of-date material.	Most major theories/ideas presented, but use of a narrow range of sources, particularly secondary sources	Covers the major issues with use of a range of appropriate and up-to-date primary sources.	Thorough grasp of the issues with use of primary sources and clear evidence of independent use of sources
Referencing	Missing references or references not cited in text	Minimal and generally inaccurate use of referencing	Frequent errors in the content and/or style of references.	Reference list comprehensive, but failure to use appropriate style	Referencing accurate, though minor errors in the reference list or in 'in text' citations	Thorough and proper referencing throughout.
Factual accuracy	Widespread substantive errors	Many substantive errors	Some substantive errors	One or two substantive errors or several minor errors	No substantive errors, but some minor errors.	No substantive errors, no minor errors.
Relevance	Most material irrelevant to the question	Much of the material irrelevant to the question	Some material irrelevant to the question	Little material irrelevant to the question	Very little material irrelevant to the question	No material irrelevant to the question
Organisation and coherence	No organisation of material	Little development of an argument, disjointed and list like	Some development of an argument, but somewhat disjointed and list like	A discernible argument, but somewhat disjointed and list like	For the most part, clear and well-structured with the argument or central thesis well developed	Argument or central thesis well structured, developed leading to clear conclusions
Precision of expression	General failure to use terms and define concepts precisely	Predominantly sloppiness and redundancy	Some instances of scientific precision, but predominant sloppiness and redundancy	Adequate precision in overall terms, but still widespread instances of sloppiness and redundancy	General use of precise scientific language with few instances of sloppiness or redundancy	Clear analytic use of language, with precise use of concepts and negligible redundancy of expression.
Critical evaluation	No valid evaluation of evidence	Trivial or underspecified criticisms (e.g. 'need more research') and illogical reasoning	Demonstrates awareness of some issues but with some illogical reasoning or triviality evident.	Raises some issues and/or displays some illogical reasoning or triviality	Identifies all the main issues relating to topic. Shows signs of independent evaluation	Sound and thorough data evaluation. Evidence of original thought.

This sheet is for guidance for markers to enhance consistency in evaluations. It is not intended to indicate an overall grade by application of weighted averages – sections will be weighted differently in the final determination of the overall grade, and furthermore this weighting might vary according to the nature of the specific assignment.

*All instances of possible plagiarism will be referred to the Academic Misconduct Officer and may result in a grade of 0 being awarded

Senior Honours examination grade criteria sheet

Grade.....	0-6.9	7	8-10	11-13	14-16	17-20
Content	Little or no use of the literature. Failure to cite all sources.	Inadequate reference to the literature perhaps with lack of understanding of the material.	Demonstrates awareness of major theories and ideas with factual information. Heavy reliance on secondary or a narrow range of sources	Presents the major theories / ideas and factual information in outline. Much of the central material from secondary sources.	Wide reading of appropriate and up-to-date primary sources. Covers all the major aspects. Few minor omissions of relevant facts.	Wide reading of original material. Careful selection of up-to-date material for "in depth" citation. Only very minor omissions of relevant facts.
Factual accuracy	Widespread substantive errors	Many substantive errors	Some substantive errors	Few substantive errors	No substantive errors, only minor errors.	No substantive errors, virtually no minor errors.
Relevance	Little or no relevant material	Most of the material irrelevant to the question	Much of the material irrelevant to the question	Some material irrelevant to the question	Little material irrelevant to the question	No or very little material irrelevant to the question
Organisation and coherence	No organisation of material	Little sign of an overall argument, listing of material with little development of ideas	Some development of an argument, but somewhat disjointed and list like	A discernible argument, but somewhat disjointed and list like	Clear and well-structured with the argument or central thesis well developed	Argument or central thesis structured and sustained leading to well-argued conclusion
Precision of expression	Absence of scientific precision in the use of terms and concepts	General failure to use terms and define concepts precisely	Some instances of scientific precision in the use of terms and concepts, but predominant sloppiness and redundancy	Adequate precision in overall terms, but still widespread instances of sloppiness and redundancy	General use of precise scientific language with few instances of sloppiness or redundancy	Clear analytic use of language, with precise use of concepts and negligible redundancy of expression.
Critical evaluation	No valid evaluation of evidence	Trivial or underspecified criticisms (e.g. 'need more research') and illogical reasoning	Demonstrates awareness of the important issues, but illogical reasoning or triviality clearly evident.	Raises some issues but displays some illogical reasoning or triviality	Identifies all the main issues relating to topic. Shows signs of independent evaluation	Sound and thorough data evaluation. Clear evidence of original thought.

This sheet is for guidance for markers to enhance consistency in evaluations. It is not intended to indicate an overall grade by application of weighted averages – sections will be weighted differently and this weighting might vary according to the nature of the specific examination.

Senior Honours continuous assessment grade criteria sheet

Grade.....	0-6.9	7	8-10	11-13	14-16	17-20
Content (Turnitin will be used to help evaluate originality)	No evidence that appropriate sources have been used OR copying* from other sources	Minimal reference to appropriate sources OR over-reliance on other work (e.g. close paraphrasing*).	Major omissions. Use of a narrow range of sources. General reliance on secondary or out-of-date material.	Major theories/ideas presented, but use of a narrow range of sources, particularly secondary sources	Covers all the major issues with use of a wide range of appropriate and up-to-date primary sources. Some independent use of sources	Thorough and detailed grasp of the issues with widespread use of primary sources and widespread evidence of independent use of sources
Referencing	Missing references or references not cited in text	Minimal and generally inaccurate use of referencing	Frequent errors in the content and/or style of references.	Reference list comprehensive, but failure to use appropriate style	Referencing accurate, though minor errors in the reference list or in 'in text' citations	Thorough and proper referencing throughout.
Factual accuracy	Widespread substantive errors	Many substantive errors	Some substantive errors	One or two substantive errors or several minor errors	No substantive errors, only minor errors.	No substantive errors, no minor errors.
Relevance	Most material irrelevant to the question	Much of the material irrelevant to the question	Some material irrelevant to the question	Little material irrelevant to the question	Very little material irrelevant to the question	No material irrelevant to the question
Organisation and coherence	No organisation of material	Some development of an argument, but somewhat disjointed and list like	A discernible argument, but somewhat disjointed and list like	For the most part, clear and well-structured with the argument or central thesis well developed	Argument or central thesis well structured, developed leading to well-argued conclusion	Argument or central thesis well-structured and sustained throughout, leading to well-argued conclusions
Precision of expression	General failure to use terms and define concepts precisely	Some instances of scientific precision, but predominant sloppiness and redundancy	Adequate precision in overall terms, but still widespread instances of sloppiness and redundancy	General use of precise scientific language with few instances of sloppiness or redundancy	Clear analytic use of language, with precise use of concepts and negligible redundancy of expression.	Clear analytic use of language, with exact use of concepts using precise and concise expression
Critical evaluation	No valid evaluation of evidence	Trivial or underspecified criticisms (e.g. 'need more research') and illogical reasoning	Demonstrates awareness of the issues, but also some illogical reasoning or triviality	Identifies most issues but displays some triviality or illogical reasoning	Identifies all the main issues relating to topic. Shows evidence of original thought	Sound and thorough data evaluation. Widespread evidence of original thought.

This sheet is for guidance for markers to enhance consistency in evaluations. It is not intended to indicate an overall grade by application of weighted averages – sections will be weighted differently in the final determination of the overall grade, and furthermore this weighting might vary according to the nature of the specific project.

*All instances of possible plagiarism will be referred to the Academic Misconduct Officer and may result in a grade of 0 being awarded