<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module Descriptor</th>
<th>Mark Band</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Determinator within grade band</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **A** (Outstanding) | 80–100 | • Thorough and systematic knowledge and understanding of module content;  
• Clear grasp of issues involved, with evidence of innovative and original use of learning resources  
• Knowledge beyond module content  
• Clear evidence of independence of thought and originality  
• Methodological rigour  
• High critical judgement and confident grasp of complex issues | Originality of argument |
| **A** (Clear) | 70–79 | • Methodological rigour  
• Originality  
• Critical judgement  
• Use of additional learning resources. | Methodological rigour |
| **B** | 60–69 | • Very good knowledge and understanding of module content  
• Well argued answer  
• Some evidence of originality and critical judgement  
• Sound methodology  
• Critical judgement and some grasp of complex issues | Extent of use of additional or non-core learning resources |
| **C** | 50–59 | • Good knowledge and understanding of the module content  
• Reasonably well argued  
• Largely descriptive or narrative in focus  
• Methodological application is not consistent or thorough | Understanding of the main issues |
| Marginal Fail | 40–49 | • Lacking methodological application  
• Adequately argued  
• Basic understanding and knowledge  
• Gaps or inaccuracies but not damaging | Relevance of knowledge displayed |
| Weak Fail | 0–39 | • Little relevant material and/or inaccurate answer or incomplete  
• Disorganised  
• Largely irrelevant material and misunderstanding  
• No evidence of methodology  
• Minimal or no relevant material | Weakness of argument |

*module content* should be interpreted as the topic or area of research being undertaken in the study in keeping with the learning outcomes for the module. The above criteria can be applied to both taught modules at M-level and the M-level dissertation (ignoring reference to *module content*).