

Psychology Marking Criteria for Coursework Assignments: Checklist

Your marker(s) will base their marks and feedback on this table of criteria. Your coursework is broken down into different criterions (outlined in the left hand column), and your marker(s) will look at to what extent you fulfilled each criterion. Your overall mark reflects to what level you met the marking criteria as a whole.

Markers complete a checklist on [eAssignment](#), like the one below, which shows you what grade you received for each criterion. It is made available to you when you access your marks and feedback. The checklist helps you to understand the overall mark you received for your coursework.

Because of this, it is important to familiarise yourself with this table and what your markers expect of you when completing your coursework assignments. The table will help you to understand why you have received certain marks, and how to improve your work.

	Needs much more work (E = Fail)			Needs some more work (D = 3)			Satisfactory (C = 2.2)			Very Good (B = 2.1)			Excellent (A = 1)		
Categorical mark	0/18	30	38	42	45	48	52	55	58	62	65	68	72	78	87/100
Relevance to Question	Not responsive to question			Most material irrelevant or tangential			Some material relevant, but mixed with tangential content			Most material relevant			Entire essay focused on question		
Depth of Knowledge	Unaware of basic concepts			Only marginal awareness of basic concepts			Clear awareness of basic concepts, but without appreciation of implications			Awareness of major concepts and main implications			Awareness of a wide range of complex concepts with in depth specialization i		
Evidence of Reading	No evidence of familiarity with relevant readings			Marginal familiarity with relevant readings			Mainly based on lecture materials and set readings			Beyond lecture materials and books			Extensive reading which may include additional journal articles		
Use of Information	No coherent discussion of topic			Discussion limited to parroting of lecture material			Some thoughtful discussion of material			Discussion of material in considerable depth			Inter-disciplinary or inter-topic comparisons		
Critical Understanding	No appreciation of course material			Limited appreciation and application of material			Good appreciation and application of material			Competent evaluation of material / Some evidence of ability to select and synthesize			Clear capacity to select, question, synthesis and evaluate material		
Development of Argument	No coherent argument presented			Most assertions are not supported by appropriate evidence			Some clearly presented supporting material			Relevant arguments well developed and supported			Convincingly developed arguments using well supported evidence		
Analysis	None			Limited analysis			Some evidence of analytical ability			Considerable critical and analytical ability			High level of critical and analytical ability, Concise logic		
Structure	No apparent organization			Headings used but no organization within headings			Some evidence of logical flow of topics			Clear and logical organization of material			Clear, logical organization which highlights relationships among sections		
Originality	None; Parroting of material from lecture			Predictable presentation; nothing new or interesting			Some evidence of creativity and independent thinking			Notable evidence of creativity and original thinking about material			Presents unique perspective and obvious creativity in approach to material		
Use of Language	Unacceptably poor			Marginally adequate			Acceptable, but not inspiring			Good overall, with flashes of flair			Impressive quality; more typical of postgraduate level or above		
Use of Academic Conventions	None			Some attempts obvious, but with many errors			Consistent use, but with many errors and omissions			Consistent use, with only a few errors or omissions			Equivalent to that normally seen in scholarly journals		