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**Introduction**

This guide will give you all the information you need to present your written work at the standard postgraduate study requires. You will find guidelines on how to format your essays correctly, how to cite and reference other works you might be called on to use, and an example of student work to illustrate these principles in practice. Alongside these notes, you will also find further details on assessment and the marking process. We include, for instance, tables of marking criteria, to shed further light on the ways in which your work is graded, and the various University regulations touching on submitted work. We hope that these prove accessible and helpful, but please do not forget that your module tutors and Personal Tutor are always available to give you further advice. Should you have any comments about this booklet, please contact the Programme Administrator on englishMA@le.ac.uk.
How to Present Your Work

Your coursework must meet each of the following conditions:

- You should agree your essay question with the module tutor before commencing to write.
- The School of Arts recommends the MHRA referencing system (www.style.mhra.org.uk), but if you are familiar with an alternative system, such as MLA or Harvard, you may use this instead. (Please note on your work the name of the alternative referencing system.) Please consult an appropriate style guide to ensure you are using your chosen system correctly.
- Your essay should be within the stated word limit. Word limits include footnotes and appendices but exclude bibliographies.
- Make sure that you put your student number and module title in the header of your essay. Do not put your name on either.
- The pages must be numbered.
- It is ESSENTIAL for you to keep a copy of your work.
- All course work is submitted via Turnitin, no hard copy is required.
- If your piece of work does not meet all the Department’s requirements, it will not be accepted as examinable material.
- Work submitted for assessment which does not meet the requirements of the examiners in respect of presentation (including grammar, spelling and punctuation) will be referred back for amendment.
- Candidates who have not passed their coursework will not be permitted to proceed to the dissertation, or, in the case of part-time students, will not be permitted to enter the second year of the course.

Essays and exercises are second marked. Work is usually marked within 21 days of submission, excepting when this period includes public holidays and days when the University is officially closed, these days of closure being added into the total. Work which is submitted late, for any reason, falls outside of this schedule.

The exception to the 21-day turnaround is the dissertation, for which, in line with University Regulations, marks and feedback can only be returned following the relevant Board of Examiners. The Department of English Postgraduate Board of Examiners usually takes place in early November, but a comprehensive list of dates can be located here:

http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/sas2/quality/committees/academic-policy-committee/implementation/assessment-regulations/boe-dates

In addition, for dissertations:

- Supervisors may read and offer feedback on all of a dissertation in draft but must not be asked to look at multiple drafts of the same section/chapter.
- Dissertations should not be more than 15,000 words in length (25,000 words for the MA ES 90-credit version) including notes, but excluding the bibliography. This limit may only be exceeded by prior permission of the supervisor.
- Put your student number, not your name, on the dissertation.
- Front cover (cardboard) of dissertation should bear same details as title page, i.e.

**DISSERTATION TITLE**

MA in [Degree Title]

University of Leicester

2017
CANDIDATE NUMBER (NOT NAME)

- Students are required to submit three copies of their dissertation, word-processed and soft bound (also called 'perfect bound'), by 30 September* of the year in which they submit their proposal, with a completed Postgraduate Assessment Feedback: Written Work cover sheet placed in (but not bound into) each copy. Students should also complete a Dissertations Deposit Agreement (see www2.le.ac.uk/library/find/theses/dissertations-for-students for details).
- We recommend that dissertations be bound by the University’s Print Services (website www2.le.ac.uk/offices/printservices; drop-off and collection service via the Bookshop), who require one day for binding or three days for printing/copying and binding. Enquiries to 0116 252 2851 or printservices@le.ac.uk. You are free to select your own choice of colour for the cover.
- Dissertations should be handed in at the School Office (Att.1514) and also submitted electronically on Turnitin.
- It may not be possible for dissertations submitted after 30 September* to be considered by the next Board of Examiners. Thus, failure to submit by the deadline may mean the award of the degree, and the opportunity to graduate, will be delayed.

* Or by the following Tuesday, where 30 September falls on a weekend or a Monday.

The sample essay that follows has been presented according to the MHRA Style Guide, which is available free online. If you have questions about MHRA style, please consult the extensive advice in the Style Guide as your first resort. If you are familiar with an alternative system, such as MLA or Harvard, you may use this instead.
Swift’s satire of science is of particular interest to a modern reader. As George Reuben Potter observed in 1941, we live in an age that ‘has built its particular sort of civilization so largely upon the discoveries and inventions of men like those who inspired his ridicule’, and this is even truer of the twenty-first century than the twentieth. However, science was also central to Swift’s own age: following the foundation of the Royal Society in 1660, science rapidly began ‘staking a claim to be the gold standard of positive knowledge’. Further, the importance of reason and the esteem of empirical investigation, embodied in Francis Bacon’s scientific method, comprise much of what defines modern conceptions of the Enlightenment. In order to explain why Swift satirised science, it is necessary to establish both the nature of Enlightenment science and the degree to which Swift was able to engage with it. Swift’s attitudes to science can then be illuminated with a reading of the third voyage of *Gulliver’s Travels*. Finally, these findings can be reconciled with the broader context of both the *Travels* and Swift’s wider literary production.

Swift was well acquainted with contemporary science. Potter claims that ‘from the mid-eighteenth century down to our own day, evidence has been accumulating that with both mathematical knowledge and non-mathematical natural philosophy Swift was certainly more than a little acquainted’. This is in part due to the company he kept. He ‘enjoyed lifetime friendships with many natural philosophers’: his circle of friends included two former presidents of the Royal Society, in addition to several contributors

---

3 Potter, ‘Swift and Natural Science’, p. 98.
to its regular publication, the *Philosophical Transactions*.\(^4\) One of his closest friends and fellow Scriblerian Dr John Arbuthnot was ‘intimately acquainted’ with the *Philosophical Transactions* and evidently discussed experiments with Swift, which would alone be adequate to explain the scientific knowledge he displays in his writing.\(^5\) However, some critics have maintained that Swift himself was a ‘humorously critical and surprisingly careful reader’ of the *Philosophical Transactions*, though the evidence for this is not complete.\(^6\) In either case, Swift could not have avoided absorbing some scientific knowledge: he was a prominent figure in a society that found itself increasingly influenced by the New Science. The modern British historian Roy Porter records the following:

Science entered and shaped the world of the educated in many ways. An instrument trade flourished – an erudite gentleman or lady of means might be expected to own a microscope or a telescope, alongside a cabinet of beetles or stuffed birds.\(^7\)

Porter also notes the emergence of ‘popular science books’, so doubtless many of Swift’s non-scientific acquaintances also discussed scientific issues.\(^8\) Evidently there was no escaping the influence of contemporary science as it ‘staked its place in polite culture’.\(^9\)

\(^7\) Porter, *Enlightenment*, p. 144.
\(^8\) Ibid. p. 144.
\(^9\) Ibid. p. 144.
Divide your bibliography into primary sources (texts you are analysing) and secondary sources (works discussing the texts or their context).

Primary:


Secondary:


Potter, George Reuben, ‘Swift and Natural Science’, *Philological Quarterly*, 20 (1941), 97-118.
Academic Honesty and Integrity

The University views academic integrity as one of the foundations of academic development. A key part of this is the acknowledgement of the work of others. You must always be sure that you credit ideas, data, information, quotations and illustrations to their original author. Not to do so is plagiarism: the repetition or paraphrasing of someone else’s work without proper acknowledgement.

The University expects students to conduct their studies with exemplary standards of academic honesty and will penalise students who submit work, or parts of work, that have been:

- plagiarised;
- completed with others for individual assessment (collusion);
- previously submitted for assessment, including self-plagiarism;
- prepared by others;
- supplied to another for copying.

Plagiarism and collusion

Plagiarism is used as a general term to describe taking and using another’s thoughts and writings as one’s own. Examples of forms of plagiarism include:

- the verbatim (word for word) copying of another’s work without appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement;
- the close paraphrasing of another’s work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation, without appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement;
- unacknowledged quotation of phrases from another’s work;
- the deliberate and detailed presentation of another’s concept as one’s own;
- reproduction of a student’s own work when it has been previously submitted and marked but is presented as original material (self-plagiarism).

Any student who prepares or produces work with others and then submits it for assessment as if it were the product of his/her individual efforts (collusion) will be penalised. Unless specifically instructed otherwise, all work you submit for assessment should be your own and should not have been previously submitted for assessment either at Leicester or elsewhere.

See also www.le.ac.uk/sas/assessments/plagiarism

Penalties

The University regards plagiarism and collusion as very serious offences and so they are subject to strict penalties. The penalties that departments are authorised to apply are defined in the Regulations governing student discipline (see www2.le.ac.uk/offices/sas2/regulations/general-regulations-for-taught-programmes, paragraphs 11.63 to 11.78).

Avoiding Plagiarism and Poor Academic Practice

Check the Learning Development website for guidance on how to avoid plagiarism www2.le.ac.uk/offices/ld/resources/study/plagiarism-tutorial

If you are in any doubt about what constitutes good practice, ask your personal/academic tutors for advice or make an appointment with Learning Development for individual advice. You can book an appointment online by visiting: www.le.ac.uk/succeedinyourstudies

Remember that the Department requires that you upload all coursework to Turnitin, plagiarism checking software that will automatically identify any uncredited material in your essays.
Assessment and Examinations

Frequently Asked Questions

How will I be assessed?

The majority of our modules are assessed by coursework. There are also modules that require you to do groupwork projects, oral presentations, short exercises, and so on, to help you develop important skills. See module descriptions for details. Remember that you must not submit work for assessment which has already formed part of another assessment either at Leicester or elsewhere.

Do I have to submit non-assessed work?

Although it does not contribute to the overall assessment of the module, non-assessed work plays an important role: tutors are able to assess your progress in a module and, most importantly, you will be able to use feedback in order to improve subsequent work and to prepare for the final coursework or examination.

Where do I submit assessed work in the Department of English?

Assessed work for Department of English (EN modules) should be submitted via Turnitin on Blackboard.

Should I put my name on assessed work?

No! The University has a system of anonymous marking for written examinations and assessed essays, and students must use their original Student ID numbers (printed on the Student Library Card). Students use the same number for the duration of their course. Please do not put your name on your assessed work (even in the file names of electronic work), but use your student number instead.

Must I observe word-limits?

The word limit for written work includes quotations and footnotes but excludes the bibliography. You should ensure that your work keeps to the stated limit. Work exceeding the given limit will be penalised.

When are my assignments due in?

Deadlines for assessed assignments are published on individual modules sites in Blackboard and individual tutors will set deadlines for non-assessed work.

Are there any deadlines or penalties?

The University places the utmost importance on adherence to deadlines for assessed work (see www.le.ac.uk/sas/assessments/late-submission). The penalty is a deduction of 10 marks for the first day, and 5 marks for each subsequent day of non-submission, until the mark for a bare pass is reached. It is expected that students will adhere to deadlines for non-assessed essays in the same way.

If you do need to submit a piece of work after the submission deadline, you will need to take it to the reception desk in Att 1514; you must complete and sign a ‘Late Submission of Assessed Work’ form to accompany any late work.

What if I can’t meet an essay deadline?

It is very important that you keep to assignment deadlines, as a system of penalties for late submission operates (see above). We do not offer any extensions on assessed work. However, if you cannot complete your work because of problems as illness, bereavement, or major personal difficulties, you may be eligible to claim for mitigating circumstances. You cannot apply for mitigating circumstances
on the grounds of lack of organisation, or because you’re too busy doing something else, or for failing to back up an electronic copy of your work adequately. The procedures for claiming for mitigating circumstances are available at www2.le.ac.uk/offices/sas2/regulations/mitigation.

What happens if I fail?
If you do not have a mark of at least 50% for each taught module, you will be offered one opportunity only to resit this work, usually in summer period. For a resit or resubmitted piece of work, the maximum mark is 50. Students following the 60-credit dissertation route are entitled to resit up to 60 credits of the taught modules: if you fail more than that at the first attempt you will not be able to write your dissertation or complete the course. Students following the 90-credit dissertation route are entitled to resit up to 45 credits of the taught modules.

How can I improve my essay marks?
For a general description of the characteristics of work which would be considered for a grade of Merit or Distinction, please see the later tables in this Guide. It is vital that you read through (and act upon) any feedback given to you. Should you require any additional feedback you may consult with your Personal Tutor who will provide feedback on your performance in examinations. For non-assessed essays you may consult with your module tutor during his or her office hours (times are on the tutors’ office doors) or contact your tutor to make an alternative appointment (send an email or drop a note into the staff pigeonholes in Att 1514). A further useful resource is the Learning Development team (www2.le.ac.uk/offices/ld).

What happens if I have problems with my work?
If you are experiencing problems that you are unable to solve for yourself it is important to report them promptly. If the problems are strictly academic (i.e. you are experiencing difficulties with the course content or with modes of assessment such as essay writing) your module tutor would be the most likely reference point. Failing that you should contact your Personal Tutor. Learning Development and the English Language Teaching Unit provide a wide range of services: please see their web pages www2.le.ac.uk/offices/ld and www2.le.ac.uk/offices/eltu.

If your problems arise from illness or personal/family circumstances you should see your Personal Tutor. It may be appropriate to consult the Victoria Park Health Centre (203 Victoria Park Road, telephone 0116 215 1105) or the Counselling Service (0116 2231780 or email counselling@le.ac.uk). If your problems are likely to affect assessed work, it is very important to provide the Department with written evidence at the time they occur.

What happens if I have provided medical or special case evidence?
We do not change your marks or set a lower attainment level. If there are mitigating circumstances:

- you may be eligible for extra support from the AccessAbility Centre (http://www.le.ac.uk/accessability/) or from Welfare (http://www.le.ac.uk/welfare/)
- you may be allowed to sit your exams in a separate room under different circumstances (e.g. using a computer or with extra time to allow for breaks)
- you may be offered a sit (for full marks) instead of a resit (for a maximum of 50) for missed or failed elements
- you may be able to avoid being disciplined by the College for poor attendance
### Marking Criteria

**EN7001 Bibliography Presentation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Merit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of academic referencing conventions</strong></td>
<td>Minor errors in the majority of entries/major systematic errors</td>
<td>Minor errors in the minority of entries/minor systematic errors</td>
<td>Minor errors in a small minority of entries</td>
<td>Virtually faultless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range of sources</strong></td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Evidence of breadth</td>
<td>Very wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance and appropriateness of sources</strong></td>
<td>The minority of items relevant and appropriate</td>
<td>The majority of items relevant and appropriate</td>
<td>A very large majority of items relevant and appropriate</td>
<td>All items very relevant and appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale and procedures for selection</strong></td>
<td>Unsatisfactory rationale and procedures</td>
<td>Satisfactory rationale and procedures</td>
<td>Very good rationale, thorough procedures</td>
<td>Sophisticated and clear rationale, very thorough procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarity of presentation</strong></td>
<td>Lacking in coherence</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Coherent</td>
<td>Lucid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Distinction:** 70+ | Excellent coverage of relevant materials  
Sophisticated analysis of concepts and arguments  
Marked independence of thinking  
Excellent organization and illustration of materials  
Excellent range of reference to the appropriate materials  
Clear academic writing in a discriminating register  
Near-faultless presentation in accordance with the appropriate academic conventions. |
| **Merit:** 60–69  | Thorough coverage of relevant materials  
A very good standard of analysis of concepts and arguments  
Substantial evidence of independent thinking  
Very clear and effective organization and illustration of materials  
Wide range of reference to the appropriate materials  
Clear academic writing in an appropriate register  
Very good presentation in accordance with appropriate academic conventions with evidence of careful proofreading and correction. |
| Pass: 50–59 | Fair coverage of relevant materials, but with some gaps  
Evidence of critical analysis of concepts and arguments  
Some evidence of independent thinking  
Sound organization and illustration of materials  
A fair range of reference to the appropriate materials, but with some significant omissions  
Writing in an academic register with satisfactory levels of precision and clarity  
Good presentation in accordance with appropriate academic conventions, but evidence of insufficiently thorough proof-reading and of some shortcomings in referencing, bibliography, citation and matters of style. |
|---|---|
| Fail: below 50 | Significant oversights in the coverage of relevant materials  
Little critical analysis of concepts and arguments  
Little evidence of independent thinking  
Weakly conceived, with a lack of clarity and purpose in the organization and illustration of the materials  
Writing in an inappropriate register, with lack of clarity and precision  
Inaccurate presentation, evidence of weak or inconsistent use of academic conventions, poor proof-reading and serious problems with referencing, bibliography, citation, formatting or style.  

**N.B.** Work of whatever level with this kind of inaccurate presentation will be referred for correction. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>DISTINCTION</strong></th>
<th><strong>MERIT</strong></th>
<th><strong>PASS</strong></th>
<th><strong>FAIL</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge, and relevance of content</td>
<td>Evidence of systematic, independently-minded reading and thought. Directly relevant to the nuances of the topic</td>
<td>Evidence of careful and resourceful reading and thought. Directly relevant to the topic</td>
<td>Evidence of some careful reading and thought. Mainly relevant to the topic</td>
<td>Significant gaps in reading and thought. Often irrelevant to the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical analysis and evaluation of material</td>
<td>Subtle, detailed and independent-minded analysis. Confident and balanced evaluation</td>
<td>Detailed and thorough analysis. Clear effort made to weigh up evidence carefully</td>
<td>Usually thorough analysis, going into some detail. Some effort made to weigh evidence</td>
<td>Limited or superficial analysis. Tendency to describe rather than evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity and range of expression</td>
<td>Highly articulate, fluent, wide-ranging expression with strong command of critical language and/or proper terminology</td>
<td>Clear expression, generally fluent, very good command of critical language and/or proper terminology</td>
<td>Some minor losses of clarity. Largely accurate use of critical language and/or terminology</td>
<td>Flaws in clarity at times. Limited expression. Problems with accurate use of critical language and/or terminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace and timing</td>
<td>Excellent time keeping and excellent delivery pace</td>
<td>Good time keeping and well paced delivery</td>
<td>An ability to keep to agreed time and an attempt to keep the delivery paced</td>
<td>Unable to keep to agreed time; issues with delivery pace severe enough to affect audience’s comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness to audience (specialist/non-specialist)</td>
<td>Expertly adjusted to cater to all present, with well-judged levels of explanation.</td>
<td>Well-adjusted to the needs of the majority of the audience, with suitable levels of explanation.</td>
<td>Attention given to explaining terms and contexts likely to be unfamiliar to the audience.</td>
<td>Not adapted to the levels of knowledge of the majority of the audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement/ rapport with audience</td>
<td>Excellent ability to establish eye-contact (in-person) or tone of voice (pre-recorded), to directly address and to engage the audience</td>
<td>Very good ability to establish eye-contact (in-person) or tone of voice (pre-recorded), to directly address and to engage the audience</td>
<td>Good ability to establish eye-contact (in-person) or tone of voice (pre-recorded), to directly address and to engage the audience</td>
<td>Limited ability to establish eye-contact (in-person) or tone of voice (pre-recorded), to directly address and to engage the audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of handout, visual and other aids</td>
<td>Highly confident use of aids, which are fully integrated, thoroughly relevant to the presentation, and entirely clear</td>
<td>Assured use of aids, which are well integrated, directly relevant to the presentation and very clear</td>
<td>Satisfactory use of aids, which are largely well integrated, relevant to the presentation or clear</td>
<td>Limited confidence in use of aids, which are not always well integrated, relevant to the presentation or clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Questions (if applicable)</td>
<td>Direct and thoughtful responses, revealing broader subject knowledge and/or clear sense of potential challenges for research</td>
<td>Direct responses, indicating good knowledge of subject material and/or awareness of potential challenges.</td>
<td>Satisfactory responses, indicating questions and their implications for work were understood</td>
<td>Responses indicate significant gaps in understanding of subject / lack of appreciation of challenges for research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Coursework and Critical Dissertations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Distinction:** 70+ | Comprehensive coverage of relevant issues  
Independent and effective research  
Sophisticated analysis of texts and concepts  
Marked independence of thinking  
Excellent organization and illustration of arguments  
Excellent range of reference to the appropriate primary and secondary sources  
Clear and lucid academic writing in a discriminating register  
Near-faultless presentation in accordance with the appropriate academic conventions. |
| **Merit:** 60–69 | Thorough coverage of relevant issues  
Substantial evidence of effective research  
A very good standard of analysis of texts and concepts  
Substantial evidence of independent thinking  
Very clear and effective organization and illustration of arguments  
Wide range of reference to the appropriate primary and secondary sources  
Clear academic writing in an appropriate register  
Very good presentation in accordance with appropriate academic conventions with evidence of careful proofreading and correction. |
| **Pass:** 50–59 | Fair coverage of relevant issues, but with some gaps  
Evidence of research  
Evidence of critical analysis of texts and concepts  
Some evidence of independent thinking  
Sound organization and illustration of arguments  
A fair range of reference to the appropriate primary and secondary sources, but with some significant omissions  
Writing in an academic register with satisfactory levels of precision and clarity  
Good presentation in accordance with appropriate academic conventions, but evidence of insufficiently thorough proof-reading and of some shortcomings in referencing, bibliography, citation and matters of style. |
| **Fail:** below 50 | Significant oversights in the coverage of relevant issues  
Very little evidence of research  
Little critical analysis of texts and concepts  
Little evidence of independent thinking  
Weakly conceived, with a lack of clarity and purpose in the organization and illustration of the argument  
A limited range of reference to primary and secondary sources  
Writing in an inappropriate register, with lack of clarity and precision  
Inaccurate presentation, evidence of weak or inconsistent use of academic conventions, poor proof-reading and serious problems with referencing, bibliography, citation, formatting or style. |

**N.B.** Work of whatever level with this kind of inaccurate presentation will be referred for correction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Merit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td>Poor control and incompetent handling of language</td>
<td>Sound control and for the most part assured handling of language</td>
<td>Overall control and very assured handling of language</td>
<td>Full control and excellent, precise and innovative handling of language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observation</strong></td>
<td>Poor use and control of observed detail</td>
<td>For the most part assured use and control of observed detail</td>
<td>Very good use and control of observed detail</td>
<td>Excellent use and innovative control of observed detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voice/Point of View</strong></td>
<td>Limited control of narrative/lyric voice or dialogue; poor handling of tone, register and point of view</td>
<td>Sound control of narrative/lyric voice and dialogue; for the most part assured handling of tone, register and point of view</td>
<td>Overall control of narrative/lyric voice and dialogue; very assured handling of tone, register and point of view</td>
<td>Full control of narrative/lyric voice and dialogue; excellent and original handling of tone, register and point of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form</strong></td>
<td>Poor, incompetent handling of form</td>
<td>Sound, for the most part assured handling of form</td>
<td>Very good, and in places original, handling of form</td>
<td>Excellent and innovative handling of form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td>Limited control of structure; poor, incoherent organisation</td>
<td>Good control of structure; competent, mainly coherent organisation</td>
<td>Overall control of structure; very good, coherent organisation</td>
<td>Full control of structure; excellent, imaginative organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation</strong></td>
<td>Poor presentation with many and/or major errors; formatting incorrect</td>
<td>Good presentation with not many errors; formatting for the most part correct</td>
<td>Very good presentation with very few errors; formatting correct</td>
<td>Excellent, impeccable presentation; formatting of professional, publishable standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of original aims and process of revision</td>
<td>Poor: process inadequately explained; lacks clarity and cogency; identifies few issues and little evidence of appropriate response</td>
<td>Good: process competently, if not fully, explained; some clarity and cogency; competently identifies and responds to some issues</td>
<td>Very good: process mostly explained; mainly lucid and cogent; perceptive in identifying and responding to issues</td>
<td>Excellent: process fully explained; thoroughly lucid and cogent; very perceptive in identifying and responding to issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with significant features (e.g. language, observation, voice, genre, structure, presentation)</td>
<td>Poor: insufficient evidence of engagement with or understanding of significant features</td>
<td>Good: some cogency and perceptiveness in engagement with, and understanding of, some significant features</td>
<td>Very good: mainly cogent and perceptive engagement with, and understanding of, most significant features</td>
<td>Excellent: very cogent and perceptive engagement with, and understanding of, all significant features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situating work in literary (and, where appropriate, critical) context</td>
<td>Poor: Insubstantial and unconvincing in relating work to existing literature or criticism</td>
<td>Good: some cogency and perceptiveness in relating work to some existing literature (and, where appropriate, criticism)</td>
<td>Very good: mainly convincing and perceptive in relating work to fair range of existing literature (and, where appropriate, criticism)</td>
<td>Excellent: Wholly convincing and very perceptive in relating work to a good range of existing literature (and, where appropriate, criticism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to feedback from supervisor (and, where relevant, others)</td>
<td>Poor: Insufficient evidence of genuine creative or intellectual response to feedback</td>
<td>Good: Evidence of adequate, if limited, creative and/or intellectual response to feedback</td>
<td>Very good: Evidence of intelligent and productive creative and/or intellectual response to feedback</td>
<td>Excellent: Evidence of very intelligent and productive creative and intellectual response to feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Requirements and Degree Classifications

Academic Obligations: A Summary Statement

Students joining the Department of English undertake:

- to attend all seminars, classes, and tutorials
- to attend lectures
- if unable for any reason to attend a seminar, class, or tutorial, to provide the relevant tutor with an explanation – preferably in advance – of the reasons for absence
- to attend additional classes in ELTU, as required
- to do all the reading and other preparatory work set by tutors
- to contribute in a well-prepared and constructive manner to seminar discussion
- to produce all written work set by tutors by the deadlines laid down
- to present all written work in a clear and legible form according to the School’s requirements, outlined earlier in this Guide
- if unable to meet a deadline, to seek an extension of time in advance of that deadline from the tutor for whom the work is to be produced
- to ensure that the University has their current term-time and vacation addresses
- to remain in attendance during the full period of each term
- to be available during the September resit period, if required

(see http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/sas2/regulations/responsibilities)

Members of staff undertake:

- to be present to give seminars, classes, tutorials, and lectures
- if unable to be present, to give advance warning where possible
- to mark essays and other written assignments within approximately 21 days
- to be available at regular, stated times to see students about their work
- to provide their students with feedback on their performance in completed modules after the end of each semester

Students who fail to fulfil their academic obligations may be reported to the College Board as negligent in the prosecution of their studies. International students who fail to attend checkpoints will be reported centrally and this may result in the termination of their course and the subsequent reporting to the UK Border Agency, in line with University sponsor obligations.

Students experiencing difficulties or wishing to obtain further advice should consult their tutors or the Head of the School. The Head of the School will inform all students at the beginning of the session about the arrangements for such consultation.
MA Degree Classification

Before any student can be awarded a degree they must have obtained the credit-units for all the modules they have taken. For each piece of assessed work or examination paper the examiners submit an agreed mark. The scale used throughout the University is based on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>70 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>60-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>50-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>49 and below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Postgraduate Certificate, a Postgraduate Diploma and a Master’s degree may be awarded with pass, merit, or distinction, using the following descriptors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>To be awarded a pass a student will have demonstrated achievement of the specified learning outcomes of the programme to a satisfactory standard, demonstrating a critical and substantial understanding of the topic. They will have demonstrated the ability to develop an independent, systematic and logical or insightful argument or evaluation. They will also have demonstrated a significant degree of competence in the appropriate use of the relevant literature, theory, methodologies, practices, and tools and shown evidence of clarity, focus and cogency in communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>To be awarded a merit a student will have demonstrated achievement of the specified learning outcomes of the programme to a very good standard, demonstrating a well-developed, critical and comprehensive understanding of the topic. They will have demonstrated the ability to develop an independent, systematic and logical or insightful argument or evaluation. They will also have demonstrated a high degree of competence in the appropriate use of the relevant literature, theory, methodologies, practices, and tools, and shown a high level of clarity, focus and cogency in communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>To be awarded a distinction a student will have demonstrated achievement of the specified learning outcomes of the programme to an excellent standard, demonstrating a sophisticated, critical and thorough understanding of the topic. They will have demonstrated evidence of originality of thought and the ability to develop an independent, highly systematic and logical or insightful argument or evaluation. They will also have demonstrated excellence in the appropriate use of the relevant literature, theory, methodologies, practices, and tools, and shown excellent clarity, focus and cogency in communication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Department of English uses the following code at the bottom of the scale:

0–49 Fail, (49 and below) is a clear and unalterable fail and the marks down to 0 denote increasing awfulness.
The Department of English uses the following code at the top of the scale within the Distinction band.

**90–100** Work of a truly exceptional standard, demonstrating remarkable originality of thought, profound understanding, and characterized by stylistic clarity and elegance and intellectual rigour. Parts of the work may be of publishable quality.

**80–89** Work of an exceptional standard, demonstrating highly original thought and striking understanding; ideas and argument articulated in a confident, thoughtful manner.

**70–79** Excellent work fulfilling all of the criteria for distinction level work detailed in the Department of English Marking Criteria.

**Scheme of Assessment**

The University’s system for the classification of awards and the rules of progression are defined in the Regulations governing taught postgraduate programmes of study (https://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/sas2/regulations/documents/sr6-taught-postgraduate).

Alternatively, refer to the Student and Academic Services website for information about degree classification and progression: www.le.ac.uk/sas/assessments/pgt-progressionaward