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# Comparison of Grade Descriptors According to Assessment Type(s)

This document is designed to help you to **develop your own** assessment rubrics. The table below compares the grade descriptors under the **Content, Knowledge and Understanding** marking criteria for each of the different assessment types. This criterion has been chosen as an example because it is relevant to all assessment types. The aim of this table is to enable you to see examples of how the grade descriptors (as described in the **Generic Marking Criteria** document) can be adapted to meet the specific requirements of your assessment(s).

## Level 6 – Adaptations to generic marking criteria for assessment type

### Marking criteria: Content, Knowledge and Understanding

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **%** | **Generic (Level 6)** | **Essay** | **Examination** | **Viva Voce/Oral Examinations** | **Dissertation** | **Presentation** | **Posters** | **Portfolios** |
| 0-9 | Non-submission, or almost wholly missing any knowledge and understanding of material at this level. Substantial inaccuracies.  | Non-submission, or very little evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. No understanding of essay question, very poor scope and no ideas presented. Major inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements.  | Non-submission, or very little evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area or course content. No understanding of examination question(s) evident in the responses, with barely any ideas presented. Entirely inaccurate or incorrect answers presented, with significant or complete repetition and unnecessary statements.  | No response, or barely any evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area in responses to questions. No understanding of question(s) evident in verbal responses, with barely any ideas presented. Entirely inaccurate or incorrect responses, with significant or complete repetition and unnecessary statements. | Non-submission, or almost no evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Very poor or non-existent project scope, construction, methodology, and execution. No pertinent ideas presented. Major inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements.  | Non-submission, or very little evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of the presentation brief, the subject area, content, reading or research. Very poor scope and no ideas presented. Major inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements.  | Non-submission, or very little evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of the topic, the subject area, content, reading or research. Very poor scope and no ideas presented. Major inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements.  | Non-submission, or the inclusion of materials and evidence that are completely inadequate, insufficient, and which does not evidence any knowledge of the required subject or disciplinary content. |
| 10-19 | Major gaps in knowledge missing almost all knowledge and understanding of material. Substantial inaccuracies.  | Little evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Little understanding of essay question, poor scope and very few ideas presented. Major inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. | Little evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area or course content. Little understanding of examination question(s) evident in the responses, with almost no ideas presented. Major inaccuracies or incorrect answers presented, with mostly repetition and unnecessary statements throughout. | Little evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area in responses to questions. Little understanding of question(s) evident in verbal responses, with almost no ideas presented. Major inaccuracies or incorrect responses, with mostly repetition and unnecessary statements. | Little evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Significantly poor project scope, construction, methodology, and execution. Very few pertinent ideas presented. Major inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. | Little evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of the presentation brief, the subject area, content, reading or research. Poor scope and very few ideas presented. Major inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. | Little evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of the topic, the subject area, content, reading or research. Poor scope and very few ideas presented. Major inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. | Materials and evidence submitted are almost entirely inadequate and insufficient, and which does not evidence knowledge of the required subject or disciplinary content. |
| 20-29 | Substantial gaps in knowledge and understanding of material at this level. Significant inaccuracies.  | Minimal evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Minimal understanding of essay question, poor scope and minimal ideas presented. Significant inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. | Minimal evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area or course content. Minimal understanding of examination question(s) evident in the responses, with minimal ideas presented. Significant inaccuracies or incorrect answers presented, with significant repetition and unnecessary statements throughout. | Minimal evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area in responses to questions. Minimal understanding of question(s) evident in the responses, with minimal ideas presented. Significant inaccuracies or incorrect responses, with significant repetition and unnecessary statements. | Minimal evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Poor project scope, construction, methodology, and execution. Few pertinent ideas presented. Substantial inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. | Minimal evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of the presentation brief, the subject area, content, reading or research. Poor scope and minimal ideas presented. Significant inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. | Minimal evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of the topic, the subject area, content, reading or research. Poor scope and minimal ideas presented. Significant inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. | Materials and evidence submitted is mostly inadequate and insufficient, and which largely does not evidence knowledge of the required subject or disciplinary content. |
| 30-39 | Significant gaps in knowledge and understanding of material at this level, with superficial presentation of content only. Inaccuracies in content common throughout.  | Lacking evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Lacking understanding of essay question, underdeveloped scope and limited ideas presented. Some pertinent content, but inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements present. | Lacking evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area or course content. Lack of understanding of examination question(s) evident in the responses, with limited ideas presented. Some pertinent content, but with inaccuracies and incorrect answers, as well as repetition and unnecessary statements. | Lacking evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area in responses to questions. Lack of understanding of question(s) evident in verbal responses, with limited ideas presented. Some pertinent content, but with inaccuracies and incorrect responses, as well as repetition and unnecessary statements. | Lacking evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Underdeveloped project scope, construction, methodology, and execution. Few, though potentially some, pertinent ideas presented. Inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements are common. | Lacking evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of the presentation brief, the subject area, content, reading or research. Underdeveloped scope and limited ideas presented. Some pertinent content, but inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements present. | Lacking evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of the topic, the subject area, content, reading or research. Underdeveloped scope and limited ideas presented. Some pertinent content, but inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements present. | Materials and evidence submitted are patchy, largely inadequate and/or insufficient, and which may, in some places, evidence minimal knowledge of the required subject or disciplinary content. |
| 40-49 | **Threshold level.** Evidence ofunderstanding of key aspects of the field of study, with coherent knowledge and at least partially informed by current research within the subject discipline.  | **Threshold level.** Some evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Partial or underdeveloped understanding of essay question, and underdeveloped – but correct – scope and ideas. Some pertinent content, potentially mixed with some inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. | **Threshold level.** Some evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area or course content. Some understanding of examination question(s) evident in the responses, with limited ideas presented. Some pertinent content, but with inaccuracies and incorrect answers, as well as repetition and unnecessary statements. | **Threshold level.** Some evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area in responses to questions. Some understanding of question(s) evident in verbal responses, but with some limitations in ideas presented. Some pertinent content, but accompanied by inaccuracies and incorrect information, as well as repetition and unnecessary statements. | **Threshold level.** Some evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Underdeveloped, but potentially adequate, project scope, construction, methodology, and execution. Some evidence of developing pertinent ideas presented. Inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements are present, but not overwhelmingly so. | **Threshold level.** Some evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of the presentation brief, the subject area, content, reading or research. Partial or underdeveloped – but correct – scope and ideas. Some pertinent content, potentially mixed with some inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. | **Threshold level.** Some evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of the topic, the subject area, content, reading or research. Partial or underdeveloped – but correct – scope and ideas. Some pertinent content, potentially mixed with some inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements. | **Threshold level.** Materials and evidence submitted are developing and reasonably comprehensive, but potentially inadequate and/or insufficient in some places. Material largely evidences some basic knowledge of the required subject or disciplinary content.  |
| 50-59 | Good, systematic understanding and knowledge of the field of study in line with the subject level benchmarks. Partially informed, at least, by current research within the subject discipline.  | A basic factual or conceptual understanding of the subject area, content, reading or research. A basic understanding of the requirements of the essay question, and basic – but correct – scope and ideas present. Generally pertinent content, with potentially some inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements.  | Satisfactory evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area or course content. Satisfactory understanding of examination question(s) evident in the responses, with some basic ideas presented. Mostly pertinent content, but with inaccuracies and incorrect answers, as well as repetition and unnecessary statements. | Satisfactory evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area in responses to questions. Satisfactory understanding of question(s) evident in verbal responses, with some basic ideas presented. Pertinent content for the most part, but with some inaccuracies and incorrect answers, as well as repetition and unnecessary statements. | Evidence of a basic, adequate factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Generally adequate project scope, construction, methodology, and execution. Satisfactory, though potentially weak, pertinent ideas presented. Inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements are present, but not overly common. | A basic factual or conceptual understanding of the presentation brief, the subject area, content, reading or research. Basic – but correct – scope and ideas present. Generally pertinent content, with potentially some inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements.  | A basic factual or conceptual understanding of the topic, the subject area, content, reading or research. Basic – but correct – scope and ideas present. Generally pertinent content, with potentially some inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements.  | Materials and evidence submitted are adequate and reasonably comprehensive, but with some potential gaps where more could have been included. Material evidences satisfactory knowledge of the required subject or disciplinary content.  |
| 60-69 | Very good understanding of the field of study in line with the subject level benchmarks. Evidence of coherent knowledge that is informed by current research within the subject discipline.  | A good factual or conceptual understanding of the subject area, content, reading or research. A good, yet broad understanding of the requirements of the essay question, and good scope and ideas present. Pertinent content, with potentially a little repetition and unnecessary statements, or slight overuse of introduction/conclusion. | Good evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area or course content. Good understanding of examination question(s) evident in the responses, with some strong ideas presented. Pertinent content throughout, but with some slight inaccuracies and incorrect answers, as well as repetition and unnecessary statements, potentially present. | Good evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area in responses. Good understanding of question(s) evident in verbal responses, with some strong ideas presented. Pertinent content throughout, but with slight inaccuracies and incorrect answers potentially present, as well as slight repetition/unnecessary statements. | Evidence of a good factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Good project scope, construction, methodology, and execution. Good, mostly pertinent ideas presented throughout. Inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements are present, but minimal. | A good factual or conceptual understanding of the presentation brief, the subject area, content, reading or research. Good scope and ideas present. Pertinent content, with potentially a little repetition and unnecessary statements, or slight overuse of introduction/conclusion. | A good factual or conceptual understanding of the topic, the subject area, content, reading or research. Good scope and ideas present. Pertinent content, with potentially a little repetition and unnecessary statements, or slight overuse of introduction/conclusion. | Materials and evidence submitted are good and comprehensive, with some potential minor gaps where more could perhaps have been included. Material evidences good, well-rounded knowledge of the required subject or disciplinary content.  |
| 70-79 | Excellent knowledge and understanding of the main concepts and theories of the subject discipline. Clear knowledge that is informed by current research within the subject discipline, and evidence of a developing awareness of the limitations of the knowledge base.  | A very good factual or conceptual understanding of the subject area, content, reading or research. A comprehensive understanding of the requirements of the essay question, and very good scope and ideas present. Unnecessary or repeated material almost completely eliminated. | Very good evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area or course content. Very good understanding of examination question(s) evident in the responses, with some strong ideas presented. Pertinent content throughout, but with some slight inaccuracies and incorrect answers, as well as repetition and unnecessary statements, potentially present. | Very good evidence of factual or conceptual understanding of subject area in verbal responses. Very good understanding of question(s) evident in verbal responses, with some strong ideas presented. Pertinent content throughout, with minimal inaccuracies and incorrect answers, or repetition and unnecessary statements. | Evidence of a very good factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Very strong project scope, construction, methodology, and execution. Very good, almost entirely pertinent ideas presented throughout. Inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements are minimal. | A very good factual or conceptual understanding of the presentation brief, the subject area, content, reading or research. A comprehensive, and very good scope and ideas present. Unnecessary or repeated material almost completely eliminated. | A very good factual or conceptual understanding of the topic, the subject area, content, reading or research. A comprehensive, and very good scope and ideas present. Unnecessary or repeated material almost completely eliminated. | Materials and evidence submitted are very good and comprehensive, with only very minor gaps where more could perhaps have been included. Material evidences very good, well-rounded knowledge of the required subject or disciplinary content.  |
| 80-89 | Highly detailed knowledge and understanding of the main concepts and theories of the subject discipline. Excellent knowledge that is informed by current research within the subject discipline, and evidence of a good awareness of the limitations of the knowledge base. | An excellent factual or conceptual understanding of the subject area, content, reading or research. A comprehensive and broad understanding of the requirements of the essay question, and excellent scope and ideas present. Entirely pertinent content, with no repetition and unnecessary statements. | An excellent factual or conceptual understanding of the subject area, content, reading or research. A comprehensive and broad understanding of the requirements of the examination question(s), and excellent scope and ideas present. Entirely pertinent content, with no repetition and unnecessary statements. | An excellent factual or conceptual understanding of the subject area evident in verbal responses. A comprehensive and broad understanding of the question(s), and excellent ideas presented. Entirely pertinent content, with no repetition and unnecessary statements. | Evidence of an excellent factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Excellent project scope, construction, methodology, and execution. Excellent and entirely pertinent ideas presented throughout. Inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements are almost completely non-existent. | An excellent factual or conceptual understanding of the presentation brief, the subject area, content, reading or research. Excellent, comprehensive scope and ideas presented. Entirely pertinent content, with no repetition and unnecessary statements. | An excellent factual or conceptual understanding of the topic, the subject area, content, reading or research. Excellent, comprehensive scope and ideas presented. Entirely pertinent content, with no repetition and unnecessary statements. | Materials and evidence submitted are excellent and comprehensive, with minimal to no gaps. Material evidences excellent, well-rounded knowledge of the required subject or disciplinary content. |
| 90-100 | Sophisticated, highly-detailed knowledge and understanding of the main concepts and theories of the subject discipline. Exceptional knowledge that is informed by current research within the subject discipline, and evidence of a very strong awareness of the limitations of the knowledge base. | An exceptional factual or conceptual understanding of the subject area, content, reading or research. A sophisticated, comprehensive and broad understanding of the requirements of the essay question, and excellent scope and ideas present. Entirely pertinent content, with no repetition and unnecessary statements. | An exceptional factual or conceptual understanding of the subject area, content, reading or research. A sophisticated, comprehensive and broad understanding of the requirements of the examination question(s), and excellent scope and ideas present. Entirely pertinent content, with no repetition and unnecessary statements. | An exceptional factual or conceptual understanding of the subject area, content, reading or research. A sophisticated, comprehensive and broad understanding of the questions, and excellent ideas presented. Entirely pertinent content, with no repetition and unnecessary statements. | Evidence of an exceptional factual or conceptual understanding of subject area, content, reading or research. Sophisticated project scope, construction, methodology, and exceptional execution. Excellent and entirely pertinent ideas presented throughout. Inaccuracies, repetition and unnecessary statements are almost completely non-existent. | An exceptional factual or conceptual understanding of the presentation brief, the subject area, content, reading or research. Excellent, sophisticated scope and ideas present. Entirely pertinent content, with no repetition and unnecessary statements. | An exceptional factual or conceptual understanding of the topic, the subject area, content, reading or research. Excellent, sophisticated scope and ideas present. Entirely pertinent content, with no repetition and unnecessary statements. | Materials and evidence submitted is exceptionally well-selected and comprehensive, with no gaps. Material evidences excellent, well-rounded knowledge of the required subject or disciplinary content. |