

The following table is designed to provide students with an idea in words of what examiners expect for classification of honours, 1st Class, Upper 2nd Class, Lower 2nd, etc. You should note the emphasis placed upon effective use of the geological literature and other recommended sources of data.

CLASS and MARKS	Descriptive Equivalent for EXAMS	Descriptive Equivalent of PROJECT/ESSAYS	Descriptive Equivalent for MAPPING DISSERTATIONS
90% - 100% 1st Class I	An outstanding, perceptive answer with exceptional command of the material required and going well beyond lecture coverage. Well-organised with critical discussion & conclusions ..... Excellent answer with evidence of a wide knowledge and understanding of the subject beyond any lecture coverage. Some critical analysis. Well-structured with sound conclusions .....	Outstanding submission with clearly stated aims and objectives wholly realised. Critical analysis of wide range of data or literature. Superb presentation. ..... Well-written and imaginatively illustrated with a thorough review of own data and published literature. Some critical analysis .....	Reveals outstanding ability and critical thought. Superb presentation. ..... Detailed comprehensive notebooks and field maps fully consistent with sections and report. Addresses implications of irregularities novel interpretations. Well presented. .....
80% - 90%	Good understanding of the issues and a well written and illustrated treatment. Evidence of integration of outside reading into course material but little critical analysis. .....	Well written and clearly structured account which shows an understanding of the arguments. Efficient use of data and relevant literature, but limited critical analysis. .....	Map, section(s) and report fully consistent. Good organisation of information and good use of examples to illustrate points and justify arguments. Demonstrates thorough grasp of the geology of the area. .....
70% - 80% Upper Second 2 I	Good understanding of the presented course material and a coherent, reasonably illustrated treatment. Small factual errors or omissions may be present. .....	Adequate data or literature base. Some omissions in discussion or minor errors in understanding. Coherent writing and good presentation. .....	Demonstrates solid grasp of major features of geology. Only minor inconsistencies between map, sections and report. Coherent writing. .....
60% + 60% - Lower Second 2 II	Answer based largely on lecture material. Little detail or originality but presented in an adequate framework. Small factual errors allowed. .....	Pedestrian treatment of wide literature or database, or adequate treatment of incomplete data or literature. Writing competent but lacking critical appraisal. .....	Minor parts of map and/or section(s) untenable or inconsistent with the report. Presentation generally good but with some items of irrelevance or poor arguments. Basic grasp of the geology of the area. Lacks appreciation of the implications arising from the map/section(s) .....
50% + 50% - Third Class 3	Based entirely on lecture material but unstructured and with increasing error component. Concepts are disordered or flawed. Poor presentation. Errors of concept/scope or poor knowledge, structure and expression (as in a highly foreshortened answer with third qualities). .....	Very basic approach to a narrow or misguided selection of material. Lacking in background or flawed in arguments. Limited writing style. Little effort. Shallow and poorly presented. Lacking in conclusions or conclusions incorrect. .....	Flaws in map and/or section(s) with some mis-match between map, section(s) and report. Shortcomings in accuracy and relevance in report. Poor presentation. Only partial grasp of the area. Marginally competent. .....
40% + 40% - Fail	Significant inability to tackle the question or answer to an imaginary question. Marks compiled from zero up. .....	No adherence to project/essay outline or title. No clue as to what was required. .....	Serious flaws in the map and Section(s). Major mismatch between map, section(s) and report. Report seriously deficient in content or organisation. Poor presentation. Very limited understanding of the mapped area. .....
0%			