

Marking Criteria for Foundation Year Assessments

There are different marking criteria for: Section A of the exam; Coursework assignments and Section B of the exam; the Extended Project; Section C of the exam.

Marking Criteria for the Textual Sources Exercise (Section A of the final Examination)

Note: 'context' here refers to a historical/literary/political/religious/social context as appropriate to the text.

Mark (%)	Student's work:
Excellent	
80-100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Situates the extract accurately in a nuanced and relevant context. Shows a persuasive and nuanced argument which addresses the relevant issues insightfully. Demonstrates an exceptional ability to synthesise and express ideas. Demonstrates an exceptionally developed capacity for critical analysis.
70-79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Situates the extract accurately in a detailed and relevant context. Shows a clear and perceptive argument which addresses the relevant issues insightfully. Demonstrates an excellent ability to organise, develop and express ideas. Demonstrates excellent critical analysis.
Very Good (Threshold for progression to Tripos)	
65-69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Situates the extract accurately in a relevant context. Shows a convincing structure and sustained argument which addresses the relevant issues clearly. Demonstrates a very good ability to organise, develop and express ideas. Offers a strong and regular demonstration of critical analysis skills.
Good	
60-64	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Situates the extract in a relevant context but may contain some minor errors or inaccuracies. Shows a generally clear structure and argument which addresses many of the relevant issues. Demonstrates a good ability to organise, develop and express ideas. Shows clear evidence of critical analysis skills.
Competent	
50-59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relates the extract to a relevant context but may contain errors or inaccuracies. Shows a competent structuring of argument and a clear attempt to respond to some relevant issues. Demonstrates a competent ability to organise, develop and express ideas. Provides some evidence of critical analysis skills.
Weak	
40-49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relates the extract only vaguely to a relevant context. Shows significant weakness in the structure and response to relevant issues. Shows significant weakness in the ability to organise, develop and express ideas Has weak evidence of critical analysis.
Unsatisfactory	
30-39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to relate the extract to a relevant context.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Structurally disorganised; the argument is only of limited relevance to the extract; largely consists of unsupported assertions. Work at the lower end will have more than one of these characteristics. Contains significant errors, omissions or irrelevancies and shows a poor grasp of key concepts. Negligible evidence of critical analysis. Answers which do not have the form required (e.g. an answer which consists of one paragraph, or is solely an outline plan) will not receive more than 30.
0-29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No attempt to develop an argument in relation to the extract and/or the statements and evidence provided do not amount to an argument. The material presented is not related to the question, or, where material is relevant, the majority of it is vague, misrepresented and/or factually incorrect

Marking Criteria for Coursework Assignments and Essays (Section B) of the Final Examination

Mark (%)	Student's work:
Excellent	
80-100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develops a persuasive and nuanced argument which demonstrates mastery of the material. As appropriate to the task, demonstrates exceptional breadth and/or depth of knowledge and understanding of the topic; shows an impressive mastery of key concepts. Demonstrates an exceptionally developed capacity for critical analysis and outstanding evaluation of relevant approaches. It is likely that work in this range contains some original features. Has perceptive and insightful use of an excellent range of academic sources, evidence, and material as appropriate to the topic. Work in this range will make significant use of material beyond the core readings/sources.
70-79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develops a clear and perceptive argument which demonstrates an excellent ability to organise, develop and express ideas, and is focussed on the question throughout. As appropriate to the task, demonstrates a wide range and/or significant depth of relevant knowledge and information relevant to the topic; shows excellent understanding of key concepts. Shows an excellent demonstration of powers of critical analysis and insightful evaluation of relevant approaches. Has perceptive and insightful use of an excellent range of academic sources, evidence, and material as appropriate to the topic. Work in this range is likely to use material beyond the core readings/sources.
Very Good (Threshold for progression to Tripos)	
65-69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a convincing structure and sustained argument which is focussed on the question; shows effective synthesis of the issues under discussion. Shows a thorough and accurate grasp of relevant knowledge and information and a strong understanding of relevant concepts. Regularly demonstrates strong critical analysis skills and effective evaluation of relevant approaches. Has accurate reference to a very good range of appropriate academic sources, evidence, and material as appropriate to the topic.
Good	
60-64	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a generally clear structure and argument which mostly addresses the question. Shows a secure grasp of relevant knowledge and information and has evidence of a good understanding of relevant concepts.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows clear evidence of critical analysis skills and the ability to evaluate relevant approaches. Makes clear reference to a good range of appropriate academic sources, evidence and material as appropriate to the topic.
Competent	
50-59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has competent structuring of argument and a clear attempt to respond to the question. Shows a competent grasp of relevant knowledge and information and evidence of a competent understanding of relevant concepts. Provides some evidence of critical analysis skills and evaluation of relevant approaches. Reference to a reasonable range of relevant academic sources, evidence and material as appropriate to the topic.
Weak	
40-49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant weakness in the structure and/or argument. Evidence of some assimilation of relevant knowledge, but contains errors, omissions or irrelevancies. Weak evidence of critical analysis skills. Limited reference to relevant academic sources, evidence or material appropriate to the topic.
Unsatisfactory	
30-39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Structurally disorganised; the argument is only of limited relevance to the task; largely consists of unsupported assertions. Work at the lower end will have more than one of these characteristics. Contains significant errors, omissions or irrelevancies and shows a poor grasp of key concepts. Negligible evidence of critical analysis. Inadequate reference to relevant academic sources, evidence or material appropriate to the topic. Answers which do not have the form required (e.g. an essay or report which is under 1000 words or which fails to have an introduction, main body, and conclusion; an anthology which fails to draw on more than one collection; a Section B answer which consists of one paragraph or is solely an outline plan) will not receive more than 30.
0-29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No attempt to develop an argument in relation to the task and/or the statements and evidence provided do not amount to an argument. The material presented is not related to the task, or, where material is relevant, the majority of it is vague, misrepresented and/or factually incorrect.

Marking Criteria for the Extended Project

Mark (%)	Student's work:
Excellent	
80-100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develops and sustains a persuasive and nuanced argument which demonstrates mastery of the material. Situates the research question(s) insightfully within the relevant context. Demonstrates exceptional depth of knowledge and understanding of the research question(s), an impressive mastery of key concepts. Demonstrates an exceptionally developed capacity for critical analysis and outstanding evaluation of relevant approaches. Has perceptive and insightful use of academic sources, evidence and material as appropriate to the topic. It is likely that work in this range contains some original features.
70-79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustains a clear and perceptive argument throughout the project and demonstrates an excellent ability to organise, develop and express ideas.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Situates the research question(s) appropriately within the relevant context. • Demonstrates significant depth of knowledge and information relevant to the research question(s) and an excellent understanding of key concepts. • Shows an excellent demonstration of powers of critical analysis and insightful evaluation of relevant approaches. • Has perceptive and insightful use of academic sources, evidence and material as appropriate to the topic.
Very Good (Threshold for progression to Tripos)	
65-69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has a convincing structure and sustained argument which is focussed on the research question(s); shows effective synthesis of the issues under discussion. • Shows a thorough and accurate grasp of relevant knowledge and information and a strong understanding of relevant concepts. • Regularly demonstrates strong critical analysis skills and effective evaluation of relevant approaches. • Has accurate reference to a very good range of appropriate academic sources, evidence and material as appropriate to the topic.
Good	
60-64	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has a generally clear structure and argument which mostly addresses the research question(s). • Shows a secure grasp of relevant knowledge and information and evidence of a good understanding of relevant concepts. • Shows clear evidence of critical analysis skills and the ability to evaluate relevant approaches. • Makes clear reference to a good range of appropriate academic sources, evidence and material as appropriate to the topic.
Competent	
50-59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has a competent structuring of argument and a clear attempt to respond to the research question(s). • Shows a competent grasp of relevant knowledge and information and evidence of a competent understanding of relevant concepts. • Provides some evidence of critical analysis skills and evaluation of relevant approaches. • Reference to a reasonable range of relevant academic sources, evidence and material as appropriate to the topic.
Weak	
40-49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has significant weakness in the structure and/or argument. • Shows evidence of some assimilation of relevant knowledge, but contains errors, omissions or irrelevancies. • Weak evidence of critical analysis skills. • Limited reference to relevant academic sources, evidence and material as appropriate to the topic.
Unsatisfactory	
0-39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is poorly structured and fails to address the relevant issues. • Contains significant errors, omissions or irrelevancies and poor grasp of relevant concepts. • Negligible evidence of critical analysis skills. • Inadequate reference to relevant academic sources, evidence or material appropriate to the topic. • Answers which do not have the form required (i.e. a sustained piece of writing which presents the student's research into a specific topic) will not receive more than 30 • Answers which do not have the form required will not receive more than 30. i.e. it is not a sustained piece of writing which presents the student's research into a specific topic, or is a piece of work below 2000 words.
0-29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No attempt to develop an argument in relation to the topic and/or the statements and evidence provided do not amount to an argument.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The material presented is not related to the topic, or, where material is relevant, the majority of it is vague, misrepresented and/or factually incorrect.
--	---

Marking criteria for Latin (Section C of the Final Examination)

Students taking Latin who wish it to count towards their overall grade profile complete one Section A question, one Section B question and also Section C.

Additional formative assessment may be recommended by the Faculty of Classics to assess suitability for progression to the 3-year course but does not contribute to your Foundation Year final mark.

Section C is divided into two equally-weighted components.

Mark (%)	Student's work:
Excellent	
80-100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows an insightful awareness of the relevant issues and evidence of an excellent understanding of the passages. Can discuss detailed morphological, grammatical, syntactical, and other linguistic matters with exceptional accuracy and insight. Demonstrates an exceptionally developed capacity for critical linguistic and textual analysis and accuracy of understanding.
70-79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows an excellent awareness of the relevant issues and evidence of an excellent understanding of the passages. Can discuss detailed morphological, grammatical, and syntactical matters with high levels of accuracy and insight. Shows an excellent demonstration of powers of critical linguistic and textual analysis and accuracy of understanding.
Very Good (Threshold for progression to Tripos)	
65-69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows a very good awareness of the relevant issues and evidence of a very good understanding of the passages. Can discuss detailed morphological, grammatical, and syntactical matters with very good accuracy. Has a strong and consistent demonstration of critical linguistic and textual analysis skills and accuracy of understanding.
Good	
60-64	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows a good awareness of the relevant issues and evidence of a good understanding of the passages. Can discuss detailed morphological, grammatical, and syntactical matters with good accuracy. Shows clear evidence of critical linguistic and textual analysis skills and accuracy of understanding.
Competent	
50-59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows a competent awareness of the relevant issues and evidence of a competent understanding of the passages. Can discuss detailed morphological, grammatical, and syntactical matters with a fair degree of accuracy. Provides some evidence of critical linguistic and textual analysis skills and accuracy of understanding.
Weak	

40-49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows only a weak awareness of relevant issues and understanding of the passages. Weak discussion of detailed morphological, grammatical, and syntactical matters. Has weak evidence of analysis and/or lacks critical analytical approach and/or accuracy of understanding.
Unsatisfactory	
30-39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not show an awareness of relevant issues or evidence of an understanding of the passages. Poor discussion of, and/or significant errors in, detailed morphological, grammatical, and/or syntactical matters. Has little evidence of analysis or a critical analytical approach and/or accuracy of understanding.
0-29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contains major inaccuracies throughout Little or no evidence of familiarity with set texts

Marking Criteria for Advanced Modern Languages

Advanced Modern Languages papers will be marked according to the scheme for those papers (see <https://www.langcen.cam.ac.uk/culp/Adv.AssessFramework.pdf>).

A Pass (50%) in Advanced Language paper together with a Certificate in Advanced Plus is considered to be equivalent to 65% in a Foundation Year paper. The marks will be scaled accordingly to provide parity.

The Advanced Languages option is equivalent in workload to two FYP papers. Students taking the Advanced Languages will have their final mark calculated based on one of two options:

1. The higher mark from the two summative assessments submitted in Michaelmas term contributes 10% and the Advanced Languages mark contributes 20%;
2. Both FYP summative assessments submitted in Michaelmas Term are counted, thereby contributing 20% and the contribution of the Advanced Languages mark is reduced to 10%

The final mark will be determined using the option which yields the higher of the two marks. This means that students studying Advanced Languages can gain credit for the very significant amount of work invested but not be unduly affected if they find the course more challenging than they anticipated.

Marking and Moderation

Markers will award a mark for each piece of work/question you are required to attempt.

To fall into a particular range, an assignment must display all of the positive qualities listed, and should not be impeded by any of the negative qualities included under the criteria for a lower range.

Assessed coursework marks will be moderated using a representative sample (all scripts up to 10 per paper, and 10% thereafter). The moderation process will be undertaken

anonymously; the first marker, who will also provide the feedback to the student, is not able to mark anonymously for practical reasons.

Examinations will all be double marked, anonymously.

An External Examiner appointed by the University will ratify all marks below 40%. The External Examiner will also consider any script where markers have an unresolved disagreement and confirm the mark for any paper which by itself reduces the mark of a candidate to below the progression threshold. For context, they will see a sample of papers from each band.