

## Marking descriptors.

Developed by Stephen Newman, Carnegie Faculty, 2015

	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6	Level 7
80%+	Accomplished coverage of assessment criteria.	Extensive coverage of assessment criteria.	Exemplary coverage of assessment criteria.	Exemplary coverage of assessment criteria.
	Widespread knowledge and understanding of relevant key concepts and principles. Skilful use of specialist vocabulary.	Exceptional knowledge, understanding and analysis of a range of relevant concepts and principles. Expert use of specialist vocabulary.	Authoritative knowledge, understanding and analysis of a broad range of relevant concepts and principles. Consummate use of specialist vocabulary.	Expert knowledge, understanding and analysis of a broad range of relevant concepts and principles. Authoritative recognition of ambiguity, limits of knowledge and identification of areas for further consideration. Superb use of specialist vocabulary.
	Ability to analyse and interpret evidence to an impressive degree. Theoretical concepts and principles beginning to be applied in new contexts with originality.	Ability to analyse, evaluate and interpret evidence to a compelling degree. Theoretical concepts and principles applied in new contexts with originality.	Ability to critically review, analyse and interpret evidence to a conclusive degree. Theoretical concepts and principles systematically applied in new contexts with originality.	Evidence and sources analysed and critically evaluated in an exemplary way. Theoretical concepts and principles applied in new contexts with originality and assurance. Sophisticated autonomy and creativity applied in problem solving.
	Cohesive argument involving accomplished use of a range of sources. Accurate use of standard referencing conventions.	A considered, sound argument including a clear personal perspective. Compelling use of an extensive range of sources. Consistently accurate use of standard referencing conventions.	A methodical concise argument with a personal perspective central to its development. Conclusive use of an exemplary range of sources. Consistently accurate use of standard referencing conventions.	A disciplined, coherent and compelling argument is made, with a personal perspective central to its development, well supported by use of a wide range of sources. Consistently accurate use of standard referencing conventions.
	Fluent presentation including use of Standard English (UK).	Articulate presentation including use of Standard English (UK).	Expert presentation including use of Standard English (UK).	Exemplary presentation including excellent use of Standard English (UK).
70-79%	Comprehensive coverage of assessment criteria.	Accomplished coverage of assessment criteria	Extensive coverage of assessment criteria.	Extensive coverage of assessment criteria.
	Substantial knowledge of relevant key concepts and principles. Proficient use of specialist vocabulary.	Widespread knowledge and understanding of a range of relevant concepts and principles. Skilful use of specialist vocabulary.	Exceptional knowledge, understanding and analysis of a range of relevant concepts and principles. Expert use of specialist vocabulary.	Authoritative knowledge, understanding and analysis of a broad range of relevant concepts and principles. Well argued recognition of ambiguity, limits of knowledge and identification of areas for further consideration. Confident use of specialist vocabulary.
	Beginning to analyse and interpret evidence persuasively.	Ability to analyse, and interpret evidence to an impressive degree. Theoretical concepts and principles applied in new contexts with originality.	Ability to analyse, evaluate and interpret evidence to a compelling degree. Theoretical concepts and principles applied in new contexts with originality.	Evidence and sources analysed and critically evaluated at an advanced level. Theoretical concepts and principles systematically applied with originality. Skilful autonomy and creativity applied in problem solving.
	A systematic argument is developed using a comprehensive range of sources. Mainly accurate use of standard referencing conventions.	A cohesive argument is developed using an extensive range of sources. Consistently accurate use of standard referencing conventions.	Personal perspective contributes to the construction of a well considered academic argument. Compelling use of an extensive range of sources. Consistently accurate use of standard referencing conventions.	A coherent and disciplined argument is made with a personal perspective central to its development, supported by a wide range of sources. Consistently accurate use of standard referencing conventions.
	Effective presentation including use of Standard English (UK).	Fluent presentation including use of Standard English (UK).	Articulate presentation including use of Standard English (UK).	Expert presentation. Excellent use of Standard English (UK).

## Marking descriptors.

Developed by Stephen Newman, Carnegie Faculty, 2015

	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6	Level 7
60-69%	Thorough coverage of assessment criteria.	Comprehensive coverage of assessment criteria.	Accomplished coverage of assessment criteria.	Accomplished coverage of assessment criteria.
	Appropriate knowledge of relevant key concepts and principles. Confident use of specialist vocabulary.	Substantial knowledge and understanding of relevant key concepts and principles. Proficient use of specialist vocabulary.	Widespread knowledge, understanding and analysis of a range of relevant concepts and principles. Skilful use of specialist vocabulary.	Very good knowledge, understanding and analysis of a range of relevant concepts and principles. Comprehensive recognition of ambiguity, limits of knowledge and identification of areas for further consideration. Expert use of specialist vocabulary.
	Beginning to analyse and interpret evidence effectively.	Ability to analyse and interpret evidence persuasively.	Ability to analyse, evaluate and interpret evidence to an impressive degree. Theoretical concepts and principles applied in new contexts with originality.	Evidence and sources analysed, evaluated and interpreted at a high level. Theoretical concepts and principles comprehensively applied with originality. Proficient autonomy and creativity applied in problem solving.
	A valid argument is developed. Key sources used with basic understanding of standard referencing conventions.	A systematic argument is developed using a comprehensive range of sources. Mainly accurate use of standard referencing conventions.	Accomplished use of an extensive range of sources. Consistently accurate use of standard referencing conventions.	A clear and well considered academic argument showing evidence of a personal perspective is developed using a wide range of sources. Consistently accurate use of standard referencing conventions.
	Appropriate presentation including use of Standard English (UK).	Effective presentation including use of Standard English (UK).	Fluent presentation including use of Standard English (UK).	Articulate presentation. Consistent use of Standard English (UK).
50-59%	Adequate coverage of assessment criteria.	Thorough coverage of assessment criteria.	Comprehensive coverage of assessment criteria.	Comprehensive coverage of assessment criteria.
	Incomplete knowledge of relevant key concepts and principles but with competent use of specialist vocabulary.	Appropriate knowledge and understanding of relevant key concepts and principles. Confident use of specialist vocabulary.	Substantial knowledge, understanding and analysis of relevant key concepts and principles. Proficient use of specialist vocabulary.	Good knowledge, understanding and analysis of a range of relevant concepts and principles. Appropriate recognition of ambiguity, limits of knowledge and identification of areas for further consideration. Skilful use of specialist vocabulary.
	Indication of the ability to interpret evidence but not demonstrated consistently.	Evidence analysed and interpreted effectively.	Ability to analyse, evaluate and interpret evidence persuasively.	Evidence and sources analysed, evaluated and interpreted effectively. Theoretical concepts and principles carefully applied in new contexts with a degree of originality. Confident autonomy and creativity applied in problem solving.
	A rational argument is developed though some areas lack clarity. Key sources used but inconsistent application of standard referencing conventions.	A valid argument is developed. Key sources used with basic understanding of standard referencing conventions.	A systematic argument is developed using a comprehensive range of sources. Mainly accurate use of standard referencing conventions.	A clear argument is developed with an accomplished use of a wide range of sources. Consistently accurate use of standard referencing conventions.
	Secure presentation including use of Standard English (UK).	Appropriate presentation including use of Standard English (UK).	Effective presentation including use of Standard English (UK).	Fluent presentation. Consistent use of Standard English (UK).

## Marking descriptors.

Developed by Stephen Newman, Carnegie Faculty, 2015

	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6	Level 7
40 - 49%	Inconsistent coverage of assessment criteria; some only superficially addressed.	Adequate coverage of assessment criteria.	Thorough coverage of assessment criteria.	Thorough coverage of assessment criteria.
	Inconsistent knowledge of relevant key concepts and principles. Uncertain use of specialist vocabulary.	Incomplete knowledge and understanding of relevant key concepts and principles but with competent use of specialist vocabulary	Appropriate knowledge, understanding and analysis of relevant key concepts and principles. Confident use of specialist vocabulary.	Secure knowledge, understanding and analysis of relevant key concepts and principles. Some recognition of ambiguity, limits of knowledge and identification of areas for further consideration. Competent use of specialist vocabulary.
	Limited evidence of the ability to interpret evidence beyond a basic level.	Indication of the ability to interpret evidence but not demonstrated consistently.	Evidence analysed, evaluated and interpreted effectively.	Evidence analysed, evaluated and interpreted reasonably persuasively and consistently. Theoretical concepts and principles applied adequately and appropriately. Competent autonomy and creativity applied in problem solving.
	A reasonable argument is attempted but a number of parts lack clarity. Sources included but uncertain use of standard referencing conventions.	A rational argument is developed though some areas lack clarity. Key sources used but inconsistent application of standard referencing conventions.	A valid argument is developed. Key sources used with basic understanding of standard referencing conventions.	A systematic argument is developed using a range of sources. Sources used are not limited to only key texts. Mainly accurate use of standard referencing conventions.
	Adequate presentation including poor use of Standard English (UK).	Secure presentation including use of Standard English (UK).	Appropriate presentation including use of Standard English (UK).	Effective presentation. Competent use of Standard English (UK).
30 - 39%	Unsatisfactory coverage of assessment criteria; most only superficially addressed.	Inadequate coverage of assessment criteria; some only superficially addressed	Inconsistent coverage of assessment criteria.	Inconsistent coverage of assessment criteria.
	Insufficient knowledge of relevant key concepts and principles. Inaccurate use of specialist vocabulary.	Inconsistent knowledge and understanding of relevant key concepts and principles. Uncertain use of specialist vocabulary.	Incomplete knowledge, understanding and analysis of relevant key concepts and principles but with competent use of specialist vocabulary.	Appropriate knowledge, understanding and analysis of some relevant key concepts and principles, but with inconsistent or limited recognition of ambiguity, limits of knowledge, and identification of areas for further consideration. Some use of specialist vocabulary.
	Inadequate evidence of the ability to interpret evidence beyond a basic level.	Limited evidence of the ability to interpret evidence beyond a basic level.	Indication of the ability to analyse, evaluate and interpret evidence but not demonstrated consistently.	Limited analysis, reflection and critical evaluation, sometimes leading to a descriptive approach. Theoretical concepts and principles applied somewhat superficially. Autonomy and creativity applied inconsistently or with uncertainty in problem solving.
	The development of an argument is confused. Some sources used but inaccurate use of standard referencing conventions.	A reasonable argument is attempted but a number of parts lack clarity. Sources included but uncertain use of standard referencing conventions.	A rational argument is developed though some areas lack clarity. Key sources used but inconsistent application of standard referencing conventions.	An argument can be discerned but may lack support or overall coherence. Key sources used with basic understanding of standard referencing conventions.
	Unsuitable presentation including poor use of Standard English (UK).	Reasonable presentation including use of Standard English (UK).	Secure presentation including use of Standard English (UK).	Appropriate presentation. Generally accurate use of Standard English (UK).

# Marking descriptors.

Developed by Stephen Newman, Carnegie Faculty, 2015

	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6	Level 7
20-29%	Most unsatisfactory coverage of assessment criteria: some not addressed.	Unsatisfactory coverage of assessment criteria; most only superficially addressed.	Inconsistent coverage of assessment criteria; some only superficially addressed.	Inconsistent coverage of assessment criteria; some only superficially addressed.
	Weak knowledge of relevant key concepts and principles. Insufficient or inappropriate use of specialist vocabulary.	Insufficient knowledge or understanding of relevant key concepts and principles. Inaccurate use of specialist vocabulary.	Inconsistent knowledge, understanding and analysis of relevant key concepts and principles. Uncertain use of specialist vocabulary.	Incomplete knowledge, understanding and analysis of relevant key concepts and principles. Inconsistent recognition of ambiguity, limits of knowledge and identification of areas for further examination. Limited use of specialist vocabulary.
	Little indication of the ability to interpret evidence.	Inadequate evidence of the ability to interpret evidence beyond a basic level.	Limited evidence of the ability to analyse, evaluate and interpret evidence beyond a basic level.	Largely descriptive, with limited evidence of the ability to analyse, evaluate and interpret evidence. Theoretical concepts and principles applied insufficiently or inconsistently. Limited autonomy and creativity applied in problem solving.
	The development of an argument is irrational. Little or no referencing or evidence of background reading.	The development of an argument is confused. Some sources used but inaccurate use of standard referencing conventions.	A reasonable argument is attempted but a number of parts lack clarity. Sources included but uncertain use of standard referencing conventions.	An attempt is made to develop an argument, though areas may lack clarity, coherence or support. Key sources used. Inconsistent application of standard referencing conventions.
	Unacceptable presentation including poor use of Standard English (UK).	Unsuitable presentation including use of Standard English (UK).	Reasonable presentation including use of Standard English (UK).	Reasonably secure presentation. Limited use of Standard English (UK).
1-19%	Extremely unsatisfactory coverage of assessment criteria; most not addressed.	Most unsatisfactory coverage of assessment criteria: some not addressed.	Unsatisfactory coverage of assessment criteria; most only superficially addressed.	Unsatisfactory coverage of assessment criteria; most only superficially addressed.
	Poor knowledge of relevant key concepts and principles. Specialist vocabulary not used.	Weak knowledge of relevant key concepts and principles. Insufficient or inappropriate use of specialist vocabulary.	Insufficient knowledge, understanding or analysis of relevant key concepts and principles. Inaccurate use of specialist vocabulary.	Inconsistent knowledge, understanding and analysis of relevant key concepts and principles. Little recognition of ambiguity, limits of knowledge and identification of areas for further consideration. Very limited use of specialist vocabulary.
	No indication of ability to interpret evidence.	Little indication of the ability to interpret evidence.	Inadequate evidence of the ability to analyse, evaluate and interpret evidence beyond a basic level.	Descriptive approach with very limited evidence of the ability to analyse, evaluate and interpret evidence beyond a basic level. Theoretical concepts and principles not applied appropriately. Uncertain autonomy and creativity applied in problem solving.
	The structure of the argument rambles. No evidence of background reading.	The development of an argument is irrational. Little or no referencing or evidence of background reading.	The development of an argument is confused. Some sources used but inaccurate use of referencing conventions.	An argument is attempted but significant parts lack coherence, clarity, or support. Sources missing or very limited, and/or inaccurate use of referencing conventions.
	Poor presentation including poor use of Standard English (UK).	Unacceptable presentation including poor use of Standard English (UK).	Unsuitable presentation including poor use of Standard English (UK).	Unsuitable presentation. Poor use of Standard English (UK).

Marking descriptors.

Developed by Stephen Newman, Carnegie Faculty, 2015