

Level Descriptors for Undergraduate Degrees (1)

Part one students (also referred to as Grade 4 - usually first year undergraduate) will be expected to produce work which:

- Demonstrates a knowledge and understanding of the main areas of the subject
- Shows ability to analyse the relevant common concepts and issues
- Applies a suitable range of approaches to evaluate evidence, solution and problems
- Applies routine approaches and methods for analysing data

Percentage	0 - 24	25 – 39	40 – 49	50 – 59	60 – 69	70 - 79	80 - 100
Degree Class	Fail	Compensatable Fail*	Third class	Class 2.2	Class 2.1	First Class	First class
Addresses task/ question set.	Inadequate evidence of knowledge. No or inappropriate evidence of reading. Little or no ability to use information effectively.	Limited and patchy evidence of knowledge and understanding. Limited evidence of reading. Patchy evidence of appropriate use of information.	Inconsistent evidence of knowledge and understanding of basic concepts. Some evidence of reading the literature. Information applied with some consistency.	Evidence of sound knowledge and understanding of basic concepts. Appropriate use of sources to show understanding of concepts. Effective but unimpressive use of information.	Good evidence of knowledge of basic concepts. Evidence of extensive reading. Literature used to support central argument or development of debate. Relates to the context of knowledge and good use of information.	A comprehensive and thorough awareness of basic concepts. As expected with 2.1 level and evidence of comprehensive reading that extends beyond core texts. Critical knowledge of how to use information to support points. Evidence of handling basic problems (e.g. numerical) with confidence.	Exceptional evidence of knowledge of basic concepts. As expected with 2.1 level and evidence of comprehensive reading that extends beyond core texts. Outstanding ability in the use of information to support points. Evidence of handling basic problems (e.g. numerical) with high level of confidence.
Shows an understanding of theory concepts.	Inadequate evidence of critical understanding. Misunderstands the question, no central argument evident.	Limited and patchy evidence of critical understanding. Lacks focus and direction with limited coherent argument.	Some evidence of superficial critical understanding. Argument is basic and poorly constructed.	Level of critical understanding is sound but lacks depth. Some confusion may evident but most argument is relevant.	Good level of critical understanding evident. Argument has structure and is legitimate.	Critical understanding is applied in a comprehensive and concise manner. Well-structured argument that provides clarity throughout the work.	Critical understanding is applied in a comprehensive and concise manner. Well-structured argument that provides clarity throughout the work.

Percentage	0 - 24	25 – 39	40 – 49	50 – 59	60 – 69	70 - 79	80 - 100
Degree Class	Fail	Compensatable Fail*	Third class	Class 2.2	Class 2.1	First Class	First class
Clearly presented, rigorously argued and focussed analysis.	No analysis, no central argument evident.	Mostly descriptive, with minimal. Limited coherent argument.	Basic and sometimes irrelevant analysis evident. Argument is basic and poorly constructed.	Analysis is evident with some reliance on description. Some confusion evident but most argument is relevant.	Analysis is relevant and mostly effective. Argument has structure and is legitimate.	Analysis appropriate and precise. Well-structured argument that provides clarity.	Analysis is most comprehensive. Well-structured argument that provides clarity.
Shows independent thinking.	No evidence.	Limited or no evidence.	Limited evidence.	Some independent ideas evident.	Independent thinking is evident	Evidence of Independent thinking and original views.	Appropriate innovative/original ideas presented.
Supports arguments with clear and effective examples/ evidence.	No evidence.	Limited or no evidence.	Limited evidence.	Some relevant ideas/ arguments evident.	Relevant examples are evident, reasonably clearly articulated.	Relevant examples are evident, very clearly articulated.	Relevant examples are evident, very clearly articulated and evidenced to the topic.
Scope of relevant literature including reference list.	No evidence.	Limited or no evidence, significant omissions.	Limited evidence with numerous omissions.	Reasonable coverage but incomplete or numerous omissions.	Good coverage with minimal omissions.	Excellent coverage with minimal errors.	Excellent coverage.
Well-structured with evidence of group work.**	Very poor and often/mostly inarticulate. Mostly incomprehensible, extremely fragmented.	Sometimes confusing and inarticulate. Often incomprehensible, fragmented.	Significant deficiencies in expression. Inconsistent and poor use of language. Slightly fragmented.	Some deficiencies are apparent. Competent but some inconsistencies apparent, Some fragmentation in style.	Mostly well expressed. Clear and appropriate use of language, consistent style.	Very well expressed. Confident and very good use of language, consistent style.	Very competent and fluent use of expression. Confident and very good use of language, professional common style.
individual contribution to group submission. **	No evidence.	Limited or no evidence.	Limited evidence.	Some evidence of limited individual contributions.	Evidence of individual contributions.	Strong evidence of individual substantive contributions and integrated.	Strong evidence of individual substantive contributions and very well integrated.

*Compensatable fail is only possible for compulsory or optional modules, subject to University of Southampton Progression Regulations. ** For group submissions only

Level Descriptors for Undergraduate Degrees (2)

Part two (also referred to as Grade 5 - usually second year undergraduate) students will be expected to produce work which:

- Demonstrates an understanding of the scope and defining features of the subject
- Undertakes critical analysis and evaluation of ideas, concepts and information
- Applies this analysis when considering case studies or examples
- Applies a wide range of approaches to evaluate evidence, solutions and problems, and to analyse data

Percentage	0 - 24	25 – 39	40 – 49	50 – 59	60 – 69	70 - 79	80 - 100
Degree Class	Fail	Compensatable Fail*	Third class	Class 2.2	Class 2.1	First Class	First class
Addresses task/ question set.	Inadequate evidence of knowledge. No or inappropriate evidence of reading. Little or no ability to use information effectively.	Limited and patchy evidence of knowledge and understanding. Limited evidence of reading. Patchy evidence of appropriate use of information.	Inconsistent evidence of knowledge and understanding of the essential concepts and principles taught at level 5. Some evidence of reading the literature. Information applied with some consistency.	Adequate evidence of sound knowledge and understanding of principles and concepts. Appropriate use of sources to show understanding of concepts. Effective but unimpressive use of information.	Good evidence of knowledge of the key principles, concepts and techniques. Evidence of extensive reading. Literature used to support central argument or development of debate. Relates to the context of knowledge and good use of information.	A comprehensive and thorough awareness of concepts and techniques of the subject. As expected with 2.1 level and evidence of comprehensive reading that extends beyond core texts. Critical knowledge of how to use information to support points. Evidence of handling complex problems (e.g. numerical) with confidence.	Exceptional evidence of knowledge of concepts and techniques of the subject. As expected with 2.1 level and evidence of comprehensive reading that extends beyond core texts. Outstanding ability in the use of information to support points. Evidence of handling complex problems (e.g. numerical) with high level of confidence.

*Compensatable fail is only possible for compulsory or optional modules, subject to University of Southampton Progression Regulations. ** For group submissions only

Percentage	0 - 24	25 – 39	40 – 49	50 – 59	60 – 69	70 - 79	80 - 100
Degree Class	Fail	Compensatable Fail*	Third class	Class 2.2	Class 2.1	First Class	First class
Shows an understanding of theory concepts.	Inadequate evidence of critical understanding. Misunderstands the question, no central argument evident.	Limited and patchy evidence of critical understanding. Lacks focus and direction with limited coherent argument.	Some evidence of superficial critical understanding. Argument is basic and poorly constructed.	Level of critical understanding is sound but lacks depth. Some confusion may be evident but most argument is relevant.	Good level of critical understanding evident. Argument has structure and is legitimate.	Critical understanding is applied in a comprehensive and concise manner. Well-structured argument provides clarity throughout the work.	Critical understanding is applied in a comprehensive and concise manner. Well-structured argument provides clarity throughout the work.
Clearly presented, rigorously argued and focussed analysis.	No analysis evident. Lacks ability to develop an effective argument as required for level 5	Mostly descriptive, with minimal. Limited coherent argument	Basic and sometimes irrelevant analysis evident. Argument not always consistent.	Analysis is evident with some reliance on description. Most argument is relevant and adequate.	Analysis is relevant and mostly effective. Argument that is well structured and legitimate.	Analysis appropriate and precise. Uses innovative and original argument.	Analysis is most comprehensive. Comprehensive innovative and original argument.
Shows independent thinking.	No evidence.	Limited or no evidence.	Limited evidence.	Some independent ideas evident.	Independent thinking is evident	Evidence of Independent thinking and original views.	Appropriate innovative/original ideas presented.
Supports arguments with clear and effective examples/ evidence.	No evidence.	Limited or no evidence.	Limited evidence.	Some relevant ideas/ arguments evident.	Relevant examples are evident, reasonably clearly articulated.	Relevant examples are evident, very clearly articulated.	Relevant examples are evident, very clearly articulated and evidenced to the topic.
Scope of relevant literature including reference list.	No evidence.	Limited or no evidence, significant omissions.	Limited evidence with numerous omissions.	Reasonable coverage but incomplete or numerous omissions.	Good coverage with minimal omissions.	Excellent coverage with minimal errors.	Excellent coverage.
Well-structured with evidence of group work.**	Very poor and often/mostly inarticulate. Mostly incomprehensible, extremely fragmented.	Sometimes confusing and inarticulate. Often incomprehensible, fragmented.	Significant deficiencies in expression. Inconsistent and poor use of language, slightly fragmented..	Some deficiencies are apparent. Competent but some inconsistencies apparent, Some fragmentation in style.	Mostly well expressed. Clear and appropriate use of language, consistent style.	Very well expressed. Confident and very good use of language, consistent style.	Very competent and fluent use of expression. Confident and very good use of language, professional common style.

*Compensatable fail is only possible for compulsory or optional modules, subject to University of Southampton Progression Regulations. ** For group submissions only

Percentage	0 - 24	25 – 39	40 – 49	50 – 59	60 – 69	70 - 79	80 - 100
Degree Class	Fail	Compensatable Fail*	Third class	Class 2.2	Class 2.1	First Class	First class
Evidence of individual contribution to group submission. **	No evidence.	Limited or no evidence.	Limited evidence.	Some evidence of limited individual contributions.	Evidence of individual contributions.	Strong evidence of individual substantive contributions and integrated.	Strong evidence of individual substantive contributions and very well integrated.

*Compensatable fail is only possible for compulsory or optional modules, subject to University of Southampton Progression Regulations. ** For group submissions only

Level Descriptors for Undergraduate Degrees (3)

Part three (also referred to as Grade 6 - usually third year undergraduate) students will be expected to produce work which:

- Demonstrates a knowledge of the principal areas, boundaries and conventions of the subject
- Critically identifies, defines and analyses complex problems and issues
- Demonstrates originality in thinking and approach to problem solving and research
- Applies a wide range of approaches and methods for analysing complex data and problems

Percentage	0 - 24	25 – 39	40 – 49	50 – 59	60 – 69	70 - 79	80 - 100
Degree Class	Fail	Compensatable Fail*	Third class	Class 2.2	Class 2.1	First Class	First class
Addresses task/ question set.	Inadequate evidence of knowledge. No or inappropriate evidence of reading. Little or no ability to use information effectively.	Limited and patchy evidence of knowledge and understanding. Limited evidence of reading. Patchy evidence of appropriate use of information.	Sufficient but inconsistent evidence of knowledge and understanding concepts and principles taught at level 6. Some evidence of reading the literature. Information applied with some consistency.	Adequate evidence of sound knowledge and understanding of the key or higher order principles and concepts. Appropriate use of sources to show understanding of concepts. Effective but unimpressive use of information.	Good evidence of knowledge of the key or higher order principles, concepts and techniques. Evidence of extensive reading. Literature used to support central argument or development of debate. Relates to the context of knowledge and good use of information.	A comprehensive and thorough awareness of the key or higher order principles, concepts and techniques of the subject. As expected with 2.1 level and evidence of comprehensive reading that extends beyond core texts. Critical knowledge of how to use information to support points. Evidence of handling complex problems (e.g. numerical) with confidence.	Exceptional evidence of knowledge of concepts and techniques of the subject. As expected with 2.1 level and evidence of comprehensive reading that extends beyond core texts. Outstanding ability in the use of information to support points. Evidence of handling complex problems (e.g. numerical) with high level of confidence.
Shows an understanding of theory concepts.	Inadequate evidence of critical understanding. Misunderstands the question, no central argument evident.	Limited and patchy evidence of critical understanding. Lacks focus and direction with limited coherent argument.	Some evidence of superficial critical understanding. Argument is basic and poorly constructed.	Level of critical understanding is sound but lacks depth. Some confusion may be evident but most argument is relevant.	Good level of critical understanding evident. Argument has structure and is legitimate.	Critical understanding is applied in a comprehensive and concise manner. Well-structured argument provides clarity throughout.	Critical understanding is applied in a comprehensive and concise manner. Well-structured argument provides clarity throughout.

*Compensatable fail is only possible for compulsory or optional modules, subject to University of Southampton Progression Regulations. ** For group submissions only

Percentage	0 - 24	25 – 39	40 – 49	50 – 59	60 – 69	70 - 79	80 - 100
Degree Class	Fail	Compensatable Fail*	Third class	Class 2.2	Class 2.1	First Class	First class
Clearly presented, rigorously argued and focussed analysis.	No analysis evident. Lacks ability to develop an effective argument as required for level 6	Mostly descriptive. Limited coherent argument that lacks focus and direction	Basic and some irrelevant analysis evident. Argument is just adequate but may be inconsistently structured	Analysis is evident with some reliance on description. Some confusion but most argument is relevant and adequate	Analysis is relevant and mostly effective. Argument is well sustained, structured and legitimate.	Analysis appropriate and precise. Some innovative and original argument.	Analysis is most comprehensive. Extensive innovative and original argument.
Shows independent thinking.	No evidence.	Limited or no evidence.	Limited evidence.	Some independent ideas evident.	Independent thinking is evident	Evidence of Independent thinking and original views.	Appropriate innovative/original ideas presented.
Supports arguments with clear and effective examples/ evidence.	No evidence.	Limited or no evidence.	Limited evidence.	Some relevant ideas/ arguments evident.	Relevant examples are evident, reasonably clearly articulated.	Relevant examples are evident, very clearly articulated.	Relevant examples are evident, very clearly articulated and evidenced to the topic.
Scope of relevant literature including reference list.	No evidence.	Limited or no evidence, significant omissions.	Limited evidence with numerous omissions.	Reasonable coverage but incomplete or numerous omissions.	Good coverage with minimal omissions.	Excellent coverage with minimal errors.	Excellent coverage.
Well-structured with evidence of group work.**	Very poor and often/mostly inarticulate. Mostly incomprehensible, extremely fragmented.	Sometimes confusing and inarticulate. Often incomprehensible, fragmented.	Significant deficiencies in expression. Inconsistent and poor use of language, slightly fragmented..	Some deficiencies are apparent. Competent but some inconsistencies apparent. Some fragmentation in style.	Mostly well expressed. Clear and appropriate use of language, consistent style.	Very well expressed. Confident and very good use of language, consistent style.	Very competent and fluent use of expression. Confident and very good use of language, professional common style.
Individual contribution to group submission. **	No evidence.	Limited or no evidence.	Limited evidence.	Some evidence of limited individual contributions.	Evidence of individual contributions.	Strong evidence of individual substantive contributions and integrated.	Strong evidence of individual substantive contributions and very well integrated.

*Compensatable fail is only possible for compulsory or optional modules, subject to University of Southampton Progression Regulations. ** For group submissions only