

## UCL Institute of Archaeology postgraduate-taught (Master's) marking criteria, 2024/25

Markers should refer to the criteria spelled out in the rubrics in their feedback and connect them to concrete examples in the student's coursework. The criteria are a tool to allow students to better understand their performance and the marker's feedback and to act upon these. Criteria should also be considered a tool to identify students who struggle early and to communicate our expectations as to their level of performance clearly and consistently.

The rubrics include **threshold criteria** (in bold and highlighted in orange) which serve to clearly identify coursework in which the student failed to demonstrate knowledge and/or academic practice that is needed for a) receiving a pass mark, or b) receiving a mark better than the indicated threshold.

**If a piece of coursework fails to demonstrate a threshold criterion it should not be marked higher than the threshold indicates.** For instance, an essay without a bibliography will necessarily be a fail ('Inadequate') irrespective of other strengths.

These threshold criteria clarify minimum expectations of taught postgraduate students, reinforce standards of good academic practice and address the misuse of AI. All markers are to observe these threshold criteria and part of the moderators' jobs will be to confirm that markers apply these thresholds consistently.

**(Graduate Diploma coursework** should be marked using the Y2 and Y3 undergraduate criteria. Please consult the undergraduate criteria for further guidance.)

PGT	Outstanding >75	Excellent 70-75	Good 60-70	Fair 50-60	Inadequate <50
<p><b>Argument</b> Does the coursework address the assignment question/task, use a clear structure and build a relevant discussion and conclusion?</p>	<p>A very distinctive or even original response that is convincing (see 'excellent'), very insightful in identifying and assessing relevant</p>				

PGT	Outstanding >75	Excellent 70-75	Good 60-70	Fair 50-60	Inadequate <40
<p><b>Analysis</b> Critical reflection and ability to recognise and evaluate own and other scholars' assumptions.</p>	<p>Impressive and original thought, independent analysis and interpretation. Concepts deftly defined and accurately used with a strong sense of conceptual framework. Strong critical reflection</p>	<p>Sustained evidence of student's own analysis. Concepts clearly defined and used systematically AND clear evidence of critical reflection. There may be evidence of ability to evaluate own assumptions.</p>	<p>Evidence of student's own analysis. Concepts defined and used systematically AND some evidence of critical reflection.</p>	<p>Good reproduction of ideas from taught materials. Most concepts defined and used systematically. Possibly some evidence of critical reflection.</p>	
	<p>and evaluate own assumptions.</p>				

PGT	Outstanding >75	Excellent 70-75	Good 60-70	Fair 50-60	Inadequate <40
<p><b>Academic integrity</b> Use of in-text references and bibliography. Use of software assistance.</p>	<p>Perfect referencing which systematically follows IoA formatting guidelines. Use of software assistance is unproblematic.</p>	<p>Near perfect referencing which systematically follows IoA formatting guidelines. Use of software assistance is unproblematic.</p>	<p>Sound demonstration of referencing skills with very few slips in the accuracy or form of referencing. Referencing largely follows IoA formatting guidelines. Use of software assistance is unproblematic.</p>	<p>Generally sound demonstration of referencing skills with occasional slips in the accuracy or form of referencing. Use of software assistance is unproblematic.</p>	<p><b>Failure to demonstrate a systematic attempt to meet the requirement for academic integrity.</b> <u>In-text references AND/OR bibliography missing AND/OR</u> compromised by poor accuracy, OR systematic failure to meet technical requirements (e.g. quotation marks, page numbers, correct bibliographic fields). Use of <u>software assistance</u> is unacknowledged OR extends beyond that permitted.</p>
<p><b>Visuals</b> Use of tables, charts &amp; illustrations. Clarity and effectiveness in supporting argument. These criteria may not be relevant in all cases.</p>	<p>Compelling choice of visuals which actively contribute to argument and synthesise data in original forms.</p>	<p>Visuals used effectively to highlight points and actively contribute to the argument.</p>	<p>Visuals used throughout, BUT there is scope to integrate them more effectively.</p>	<p>Some visuals, BUT not used effectively to support argument and/or poorly presented (size, legibility).</p>	<p>Visuals absent or irrelevant/inaccurate.</p>

**Writing**

Use of appropriate spelling, vocabulary, grammar and syntax.