

## **Marking Criteria for Undergraduate Examinations in Economic History From Academic Session 2013-2014**

Examiners use the following benchmark when assessing summative assessments (examinations and thesis work).

### **First Class (70-100)**

*90-100* Analysis of such originality or insight as potentially to change some aspect of conventional understanding on the subject treated; and in the case of a thesis to be potentially publishable.

*80-89* Analysis of exceptional quality, based on comprehensive knowledge (both historical and conceptual) of the topic, and *either* developing an original argument in response to the question, *or* demonstrating independent critical discussion and insight.

*70-79* Analysis which shows both broad and deep knowledge of the historical evidence as well as conceptual command of the subject matter based on close engagement with the question, an informed understanding of the historical period, and the issues raised by the historical literature.

### **Upper Second Class (60-69)**

Clearly written and well-argued work which reflects an understanding of the question as well as the historical period and issues under discussion, engages seriously with the question and offers a thorough analysis of the relevant materials.

### **Lower Second Class (50-59)**

Work which displays an understanding of the questions set and knowledge of the historical periods and issues under discussion, but which tends to a less than systematic critical analysis of material and to presentation of a discussion which is not consistently focused or relevant.

### **Third Class (40-49)**

Work which shows sufficient knowledge to frame a basic answer to the question and which contains relevant information about the historical period and issues under discussion, but which is otherwise characterised by lack of clarity and originality, by an absence of analytical skills, by a tendency to factual error and by straying from the question at hand.

### **Fail (0-39)**

*34-39:* Work which provides some material relevant to the question and demonstrates some knowledge of the historical period and issues raised but which is otherwise badly marred by weaknesses of error, omission and relevance, and which demonstrates very little analytical understanding.

*30-33* Work which fails to proceed beyond the most rudimentary acquaintance with the historical period and issues under discussion, which pays little attention to the precise

question posed and has persistent factual errors or an inability to frame a consistently coherent argument.

20-30 Characterised by paucity of information, confusion and lack of relevance but with some germane points or information.

0-19 Work which reveals paucity of information or knowledge about the period and question under discussion and is characterised by persistent confusion and error concerning any historical ideas it mentions, as well as by a total inability to engage with the question and frame a coherent argument in response to it. Alternatively, work which is seriously truncated and totally undeveloped.