DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL POLICY

THE LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

MARKING FRAMEWORK: MSc PROGRAMMES

This is a guide to the principal criteria used for the marking of both assessed and 'formative' written work. The descriptors given are merely illustrative of the standards that markers apply. Feedback from markers will usually include specific comments under each of the four headings below. Overall marks/grades awarded will reflect an overall judgement, based on all four criteria, but will additionally take account of the extent to which students have substantively answered the question(s) set.

CLASS	MARK	CRITERIA			
		STRUCTURE AND CLARITY OF EXPRESSION	AWARENESS AND USE OF LITERATURE	KNOWLEDGE BASE AND UNDERSTANDING	ARGUMENT/CRITICAL ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION
Distinction	75+	Exceptionally well rounded argument; persuasively written	Excellent use of extensive literature well beyond the reading list which is impressively exploited	Excellent understanding and outstanding exposition of relevant issues; impressively well informed; insightful awareness of nuances and complexities. No major room for improvement, given constraints of essay form	Argument marshalled in an outstanding manner with excellent integration of theory/conceptual framework; searching questioning, unbiased approach; unambiguous evidence of original and independent thought.
	70-74	Excellent, logically developed argument; very well written	Very good use of wide range of literature to support argument / points	Very good understanding and exposition of relevant issues; well informed; good awareness of nuances and complexities	Well constructed arguments with appropriate use of theory/conceptual framework; questioning, unbiased approach; clear evidence of independent thought; good demonstration of originality of thought
Merit	65-69	Very well developed argument; well expressed	Good use of wide range of literature to support arguments	Clear awareness and exposition of relevant issues; some awareness of nuances and complexities but tendency to simplify matters	High standard of critical analysis with appropriate choice and use of theory/conceptual framework; some questioning of literature
	60-64	Logically presented argument; clearly expressed	Adequate use of standard literature to support arguments	Shows awareness of issues but lapses into description in places	Appropriate choice and use of theory/conceptual framework; attempts analysis
Pass	50-59	Poorly developed argument; meaning not necessarily or entirely clear	Use of narrow range of standard literature to support arguments	Work shows understanding of issue but at superficial level; no more than expected from attendance at lectures; some irrelevant material	Weak understanding or use of chosen theory/conceptual framework; too descriptive and/or analysis too superficial
Fail	40-49	Confusingly structured and argued; meaning unclear	Relies on superficial repeat of lecture/seminar notes	Establishes a few relevant points but superficial and confused; much irrelevant material	No choice or use of theory/conceptual framework; essay almost wholly descriptive; no grasp of analysis with many errors and/or omissions
Bad fail	< 40	Lacking structure and meaningful argument; difficult to understand	No significant reference to literature	Very little or no understanding of the issues raised by the topic or topic misunderstood; content largely irrelevant	No choice or use of theory/conceptual framework; essay almost wholly descriptive; no grasp of analysis with many errors and/or omissions
NOTE: marks < 30 signifies work that is significantly flawed or seriously inadequate; marks < 15 signifies work representing only a minimal or no serious attempt.					