

UCL Institute of Archaeology postgraduate-taught (Master's) marking criteria, 2024/25

Markers should refer to the criteria spelled out in the rubrics in their feedback and connect them to concrete examples in the student's coursework. The criteria are a tool to allow students to better understand their performance and the marker's feedback and to act upon these. Criteria should also be considered a tool to identify students who struggle early and to communicate our expectations as to their level of performance clearly and consistently.

The rubrics include **threshold criteria** (in bold and highlighted in orange) which serve to clearly identify coursework in which the student failed to demonstrate knowledge and/or academic practice that is needed for a) receiving a pass mark, or b) receiving a mark better than the indicated threshold.

If a piece of coursework fails to demonstrate a threshold criterion it should not be marked higher than the threshold indicates. For instance, an essay without a bibliography will necessarily be a fail ('Inadequate') irrespective of other strengths.

These threshold criteria clarify minimum expectations of taught postgraduate students, reinforce standards of good academic practice and address the misuse of AI. All markers are to observe these threshold criteria and part of the moderators' jobs will be to confirm that markers apply these thresholds consistently.

(Graduate Diploma coursework should be marked using the Y2 and Y3 undergraduate criteria. Please consult the undergraduate criteria for further guidance.)

PGT	Outstanding >75	Excellent 70-75	Good 60-70	Fair 50-60	Inadequate <50
<p>Argument Does the coursework address the assignment question/task, use a clear structure and build a relevant discussion and conclusion?</p>	<p>A very distinctive or even original response that is convincing (see 'excellent'), very insightful in identifying and assessing relevant material or ideas beyond those taught AND/OR genuinely original. There MAY BE unusually clear perception in suggesting future research.</p>	<p>A convincing response that directly addresses the assignment question / task. It has a very clear structure AND mounts a compelling argument AND weighs competing arguments to arrive at appropriately nuanced conclusions. There MAY BE some evidence of insight in identifying and assessing relevant material or ideas beyond those taught</p>	<p>A sound response that directly addresses the assignment question/task with a clear structure AND logical argument leading to reasonable straightforward conclusions. There MAY BE some evidence of nuance.</p>	<p>A reasonable response that directly addresses the assignment question/ task, BUT there is scope for improvement in the structure, argument and or conclusions.</p>	<p>The coursework does not address the assignment question / task OR provides an indirect response which demonstrates only very generalised or limited understanding.</p>
<p>Knowledge Does the coursework demonstrate knowledge relevant to the assignment question/task?</p>	<p>Striking understanding of complexities of issues and their relation to core concepts, with sophisticated insights. Exceptionally clear statement of research problem.</p>	<p>Thorough understanding of issues and their relation to core concepts, with clear evidence of insights into broader implications. Clear statement of research problem.</p>	<p>Good understanding of issues with only minor slips. Some indication of insights into broader implications and research problem.</p>	<p>More than minor slips in the understanding of issues and their broader implications, but overall a fair demonstration of knowledge.</p>	<p>Rudimentary understanding or general misunderstanding of issues with confusions OR repeated significant slips in understanding.</p>
<p>Evidence Does the coursework employ evidence to answer the question / task? Are case studies used and are they selected appropriately?</p>	<p>All claims are supported by impressive, detailed, distinctive and reflexive use of evidence demonstrating substantial research beyond the course materials. Excellent awareness of unresolved issues with the evidence.</p>	<p>All claims are supported by evidence. There is barely any scope for improvement in the provision of detail or demonstration of relevance AND there may be some use of evidence demonstrating research beyond the course materials. Awareness of unresolved issues with the evidence.</p>	<p>Almost all claims are supported by good quality evidence AND there is only limited scope for improvement in the provision of detail or demonstration of relevance.</p>	<p>Use of evidence, but limited in quality OR not always effectively used to support claims.</p>	<p>There is either no effort to support claims, OR the evidence provided is typically irrelevant or inaccurate</p>

UG YEAR 1	Outstanding >75	Excellent 70-75	Good 60-70	Fair 50-60	Inadequate <40
<p>Analysis Critical reflection and ability to recognise and evaluate own and other scholars' assumptions.</p>	<p>Impressive and original thought, independent analysis and interpretation. Concepts deftly defined and accurately used with a strong sense of conceptual framework. Strong critical reflection AND ability to recognise and evaluate own assumptions.</p>	<p>Sustained evidence of student's own analysis. Concepts clearly defined and used systematically AND clear evidence of critical reflection. There may be evidence of ability to evaluate own assumptions.</p>	<p>Evidence of student's own analysis. Concepts defined and used systematically AND some evidence of critical reflection.</p>	<p>Good reproduction of ideas from taught materials. Most concepts defined and used systematically. Possibly some evidence of critical reflection.</p>	<p>Erroneous or limited analysis. Very rudimentary definition and use of concepts OR concepts are not defined, wrongly used or absent.</p>
<p>Sources Has the candidate consulted appropriate sources? Understanding is assessed under 'knowledge' and 'evidence', while scholarly practice and academic integrity is assessed under 'academic integrity'.</p>	<p>Impressive understanding of relevant literature. Ambitious reading beyond the sources recommended by staff AND clear evidence of discrimination of relative value of different sources throughout.</p>	<p>Thorough engagement with a wide range of sources recommended by staff AND demonstrates sound understanding of literature consulted. ADDITIONALLY, some relevant reading beyond the sources recommended by staff AND some evidence of discrimination of the relative value of different sources.</p>	<p>Sustained evidence of engagement beyond the 'essential' sources recommended by staff AND demonstrates good understanding of literature consulted.</p>	<p>Good engagement with the 'essential' sources recommended by staff AND demonstrates good understanding of most of the literature consulted.</p>	<p>Fails to engage with relevant sources recommended by staff AND/OR frequently weak understanding of literature consulted.</p>

UG YEAR 1	Outstanding >75	Excellent 70-75	Good 60-70	Fair 50-60	Inadequate <40
<p>Academic integrity Use of in-text references and bibliography. Use of software assistance.</p>	<p>Perfect referencing which systematically follows IoA formatting guidelines. Use of software assistance is unproblematic.</p>	<p>Near perfect referencing which systematically follows IoA formatting guidelines. Use of software assistance is unproblematic.</p>	<p>Sound demonstration of referencing skills with very few slips in the accuracy or form of referencing. Referencing largely follows IoA formatting guidelines. Use of software assistance is unproblematic.</p>	<p>Generally sound demonstration of referencing skills with occasional slips in the accuracy or form of referencing. Use of software assistance is unproblematic.</p>	<p>Failure to demonstrate a systematic attempt to meet the requirement for academic integrity. <u>In-text references AND/OR bibliography missing AND/OR</u> compromised by poor accuracy, OR systematic failure to meet technical requirements (e.g. quotation marks, page numbers, correct bibliographic fields). Use of <u>software assistance</u> is unacknowledged OR extends beyond that permitted.</p>
<p>Visuals Use of tables, charts & illustrations. Clarity and effectiveness in supporting argument. These criteria may not be relevant in all cases.</p>	<p>Compelling choice of visuals which actively contribute to argument and synthesise data in original forms.</p>	<p>Visuals used effectively to highlight points and actively contribute to the argument.</p>	<p>Visuals used throughout, BUT there is scope to integrate them more effectively.</p>	<p>Some visuals, BUT not used effectively to support argument and/or poorly presented (size, legibility).</p>	<p>Visuals absent or irrelevant/inaccurate.</p>
<p>Writing Use of appropriate spelling, vocabulary, grammar and syntax. Fluency and clarity in the use of language.</p>	<p>Consistently good use of appropriate vocabulary demonstrating very extensive knowledge. Style and word choice greatly enhance ideas and demonstrate verve. No or barely any grammar and spelling mistakes.</p>	<p>Consistently good use of appropriate vocabulary demonstrating very extensive knowledge. Style and word choice greatly enhance ideas and demonstrate verve. No or barely any grammar and spelling mistakes.</p>	<p>Good use of appropriate vocabulary. Style, word choice, grammar and spelling mistakes rarely detract from conveying ideas.</p>	<p>Reasonable use of appropriate vocabulary. Style, word choice, grammar and spelling mistakes sometimes detract from conveying ideas.</p>	<p>Very limited use of appropriate vocabulary. Style, word choice, grammar and spelling mistakes seriously detract from conveying of ideas OR interfere with comprehension.</p>