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Welcome/Introduction

Welcome to the School of Arts. We hope that you find your time studying in Leicester both inspiring and enjoyable.

This programme guide has been produced for all taught postgraduate students studying a degree in the discipline of English. It therefore includes information about our MA programmes in Creative Writing, English Language and Linguistics, English Studies, Modern Literature (and Creative Writing) and Victorian Studies. This programme guide is designed for use during the academic year 2017/18; revised versions will be issued in subsequent years.

This Programme Guide will give you all the information you need to present your work at the standard postgraduate study requires. You should 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 to illustrate these principles in practice. Alongside these notes, you should also find further details on assessment and the marking process, as well as links to e-reading lists and module pages. We also include tables of marking criteria to show the ways in which different types of work are graded, and information on the university regulations on submitted work. We hope that this guide proves accessible and helpful, but please do not forget that your seminar tutors and Personal Tutor are always available to give you further advice.

On behalf of everyone in the School of Arts, I wish you an enjoyable and successful year.

Dr Julian North

Director of Taught Postgraduate Studies

September 2017

Postgraduate Student Handbook

This guide should be read in conjunction with the School of Arts Taught Postgraduate Student Handbook which can be found on the School’s website. It is vital that you follow all instructions contained in both books to give you the best chance of success in your studies.
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. The only exception to this is your dissertation.
- If your piece of work does not meet all the Department’s requirements, it will not be accepted as examinable material.
- 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 all subject to moderation. 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:

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.
- Put your student number, not your name, on the dissertation.
- Front cover of your dissertation should bear same details as title page, i.e.

  DISSERTATION TITLE
  
  MA in [Degree Title]
  
  University of Leicester
  
  2017
  
  CANDIDATE NUMBER (NOT NAME)

- Current full-time students and Year Two part-time students are required to submit two copies of their dissertation, word-processed and soft bound (also called ‘perfect bound’), by 28 September 2018. Year One part-time students will be required to submit the same by 30 September 2019.
- Students should complete a Dissertations Deposit Agreement (click for further 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 via the relevant Blackboard site.
• 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.

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

---

6 Potter, ‘Swift and Natural Science’, p. 163.
8 Ibid. p. 144.
9 Ibid. p. 144.

---
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Academic Honesty and Plagiarism

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.

Avoiding Plagiarism and Poor Academic Practice

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.

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 online Student Handbook for link to current regulations).

The School requires that you upload all assessed work for content modules to Turnitin; plagiarism checking software that will automatically identify any uncredited material in your essays. Submission information for each module is shown on Blackboard.
Attendance

If you are absent you should inform your tutor (see staff contact list above) and also email SchoolofArts@le.ac.uk using English Absence in the title and include the date/s, time/s, module/s and tutor name/s for the classes you missed. The office will then note this on the Attendance Management System which will prevent your being sent absence messages when you are ill.

Assessment and Examinations

Senate Regulation 7.10 dictates that all summative work which contributes towards the calculation of a student’s degree classification shall be subject to a system of moderation by an internal examiner. The School of Arts has adopted moderation as its marking practice; work is marked by a first marker. A second marker (moderator) receives a full set of marks of the work and a sample of work (of the first marker) against which to test the robustness of the marking.

Moderators within the School should all observe the following principles:

The moderator must make one of three recommendations; that the marking has been carried out fairly and to the appropriate standards; that the marks for the cohort, or for a particular marker/s, should be raised or lowered by a stated figure; that the whole submission, or the submission marked by a particular marker/s, should be re-marked.

a. Moderators base their judgements on their reading of a sample of scripts from each marker.
b. Graphs showing the distribution of marks will be made available as an aid to this judgement, but marks should not be changed purely on the basis of this evidence.
c. Moderators must not adjust the marks for individual scripts.
d. In the event of a re-mark, the 21-day requirement for the return of work to students will be suspended, and students notified of this.

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?

Assessed work 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. A list of relevant assignment deadlines is also made available further on in this Programme Guide. If you are in any doubt about your assignment deadline, please contact your tutor or the School Office.

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 (50) 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 still be permitted to do this via Turnitin on Blackboard, although it will be subject to lateness penalties. You should also notify the School Office via email that you have submitted your assignment after the deadline. University Regulations permit taught postgraduate students to submit a piece of work up to nine days after the deadline. Anything submitted more than nine days after the deadline will be deemed as a non-submission and will be subject to a mark of 0 (with the opportunity to resubmit at a later stage for the purposes of progression, as outlined below under ‘What happens if I fail?’).

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. Please refer to the guidance on mitigating circumstances in the Taught Postgraduate Student Handbook.

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 the 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.

Course Details

Programme and Module Specifications

View the programme and module specifications for your course as follows:

MA Creative Writing
MA English Studies
MA English Language and Linguistics
MA English Language and Linguistics (via Distance Learning)
MA Modern Literature (and Creative Writing)
MA Victorian Studies

In the programme specification you will find a summary of the aims of your course of study and its learning outcomes, alongside details of its teaching and learning methods and means of assessment. The programme specification also identifies the core modules that make up the course and any choice of optional modules. Each module has its own specification that formally records that module’s aims, teaching and learning methods, assessment components and their percentage weighting.

A list of module specifications can be found here.

You can read more about our MA programmes on our University website:

MA Creative Writing
MA English Studies
MA English Language and Linguistics
MA Modern Literature (and Creative Writing)
MA Victorian Studies

Assignment Submission Dates

Assignments must be submitted by 12 noon on the date below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>MODULE TITLE</th>
<th>ASSIGNMENT TYPE</th>
<th>SUBMISSION DEADLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EN7232</td>
<td>English Language and Linguistics Research Methods</td>
<td>Portfolio 1</td>
<td>01 November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7031</td>
<td>Modern Literature and Theory I</td>
<td>Essay 1</td>
<td>15 November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7223</td>
<td>Editing and Textual Cultures</td>
<td>Critical Review (2000 words)</td>
<td>15 November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7115</td>
<td>Multilingualism</td>
<td>Project plan</td>
<td>20 November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7232</td>
<td>English Language and Linguistics Research Methods</td>
<td>Portfolio 2</td>
<td>22 November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7312</td>
<td>Grammar Awareness</td>
<td>Grammar Test</td>
<td>05 December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7312</td>
<td>Grammar Awareness</td>
<td>Grammar Test</td>
<td>05 December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODE</td>
<td>MODULE TITLE</td>
<td>ASSIGNMENT TYPE</td>
<td>SUBMISSION DEADLINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7232</td>
<td>English Language and Linguistics Research Methods</td>
<td>Portfolio 3</td>
<td>11 December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7001</td>
<td>Bibliography, Research Methods and Writing Skills I</td>
<td>Bibliography submission</td>
<td>13 December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7115</td>
<td>Multilingualism</td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>08 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7310</td>
<td>Second Language Teaching</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>08 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7001</td>
<td>Bibliography, Research Methods and Writing Skills I</td>
<td>2,000-word written critical review</td>
<td>10 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7308</td>
<td>Communicative Language Teaching in Action</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>15 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7040</td>
<td>Research Methods in Creative Writing</td>
<td>2000 word essay</td>
<td>17 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7040</td>
<td>Research Methods in Creative Writing</td>
<td>3000 word piece of Creative Writing</td>
<td>17 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7223</td>
<td>Editing and Textual Cultures</td>
<td>Written Assignment (3000 words)</td>
<td>17 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7031</td>
<td>Modern Literature and Theory I</td>
<td>Essay 2</td>
<td>24 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7041</td>
<td>Styles: Advanced Creative Writing Workshop 1</td>
<td>Reflective Commentary</td>
<td>24 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7041</td>
<td>Styles: Advanced Creative Writing Workshop 1</td>
<td>Summative Portfolio of Creative Writing</td>
<td>24 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7126</td>
<td>Women in Literature, Culture and Society, 1850-1900</td>
<td>4,000 word essay</td>
<td>24 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7133</td>
<td>Poetry Writing and Contemporary Poetry</td>
<td>2,000-word essay</td>
<td>24 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7133</td>
<td>Poetry Writing and Contemporary Poetry</td>
<td>Portfolio of 4-6 poems</td>
<td>24 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7134</td>
<td>Literature and Gender: Deviant Bodies and Dissident Desires</td>
<td>4,000-word essay</td>
<td>24 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7225</td>
<td>Journeys, 1500-1700</td>
<td>4,000-word essay</td>
<td>24 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7303</td>
<td>Technology Enhanced Language Learning</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>29 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7305</td>
<td>Continuing Professional Development for English Language Teachers</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>29 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7314</td>
<td>Language in Society</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>29 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7316</td>
<td>Psychological Issues in Language Learning</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>29 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module Code</td>
<td>Module Title</td>
<td>Assessment Details</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7042</td>
<td>Applications: Publishing, Teaching and Other Stories</td>
<td>Summative work of 4000 words or equivalent</td>
<td>02 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7043</td>
<td>Substances: Advanced Creative Workshop 2</td>
<td>Creative Writing Portfolio, 3500 words</td>
<td>02 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7043</td>
<td>Substances: Advanced Creative Workshop 2</td>
<td>Reflective Commentary, 1500 words</td>
<td>02 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7124</td>
<td>Evolution and Entropy: The Sciences in Victorian Literature</td>
<td>4,000-word essay</td>
<td>02 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7128</td>
<td>The Brontës</td>
<td>4,000-word essay</td>
<td>02 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7132</td>
<td>Literature and Exile: American Writers in Paris</td>
<td>4000-word essay</td>
<td>02 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7135</td>
<td>Writing Fiction</td>
<td>4000-word piece of creative writing</td>
<td>02 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7135</td>
<td>Writing Fiction</td>
<td>Reflective Commentary</td>
<td>02 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7139</td>
<td>Literature and Cultural Identity: Contemporary Caribbean Writing</td>
<td>4,000-word essay</td>
<td>02 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7233</td>
<td>Gender, Language and Discourse</td>
<td>Essay (3,500 words)</td>
<td>02 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7239</td>
<td>World Englishes</td>
<td>4,000-word essay</td>
<td>02 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7042</td>
<td>Applications: Publishing, Teaching and Other Stories</td>
<td>Oral Presentation or Workshop</td>
<td>02 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7224</td>
<td>Cities of Words</td>
<td>5,000 word essay</td>
<td>02 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7226</td>
<td>Journeys, 1700-1830</td>
<td>4,000-word essay</td>
<td>02 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7222</td>
<td>The English Country House in Literature (MAVS/MAES)</td>
<td>4000-word essay</td>
<td>16 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7021</td>
<td>Approaches to Victorian Literature and Culture</td>
<td>5000-word essay</td>
<td>23 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN7215</td>
<td>The English Country House in Literature</td>
<td>5000 word essay</td>
<td>23 May 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Module Information and Reading Lists**

For all modules please follow the links below for information on module content and reading lists.

**EN7001: Bibliography, Research Methods and Writing Skills I**

Module description

E-Reading List: [http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/en7001.html](http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/en7001.html)

**EN7021: Approaches to Victorian Literature and Culture**

Module description

E-Reading List: TBC

**EN7022: Dissertation (Victorian Studies)**

Module description
EN7031: Modern Literature and Theory I
Module description
E-Reading List: http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/en7031.html

EN7032: Modern Literature and Theory II
Module description
E-Reading List: http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/en7032.html

EN7033: Critical Dissertation (Modern Literature)
Module description

EN7034: Creative Dissertation (Modern Literature (and Creative Writing)
Module description

EN7040: Research Methods in Creative Writing
Module description
E-Reading List: http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/en7040.html

EN7041: Styles: Advanced Creative Writing Workshop 1
Module description
E-Reading List: http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/en7041.html

EN7042: Applications: Publishing, Teaching and Other Stories
Module description
E-Reading List: http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/en7042.html

EN7043: Substances: Advanced Creative Workshop 2
Module description
E-Reading List: http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/en7043.html

EN7044: Dissertation in Creative Writing
Module description

EN7115: Multilingualism
Module description
E-Reading List: http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/en7115.html

EN7124: Evolution and Entropy: The Sciences in Victorian Literature
Module description
E-Reading List: TBC

EN7126: Women in Literature, Culture and Society, 1850-1900
Module description
EN7128: The Brontës
Module description
E-Reading List: http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/en7128.html

EN7132: Literature and Exile: American Writers in Paris
Module description
E-Reading List: http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/en7132.html

EN7133: Poetry Writing and Contemporary Poetry
Module description
E-Reading List: TBC

EN7134: Literature and Gender: Deviant Bodies and Dissident Desires
Module description
E-Reading List: http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/en7134.html

EN7135: Writing Fiction
Module description
E-Reading List: http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/en7135.html

EN7139: Literature and Cultural Identity: Contemporary Caribbean Writing
Module description
E-Reading List: http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/en7139.html

EN7215: The English Country House in Literature
Module description
E-Reading List: TBC

EN7222: The English Country House in Literature (MAVS/MAES)
Module description
E-Reading List: TBC

EN7223: Editing and Textual Cultures
Module description
E-Reading List: http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/en7223.html

EN7224: Cities of Words
Module description
E-Reading List: http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/en7224.html

EN7225: Journeys, 1500-1700
Module description
E-Reading List: http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/en7225.html
EN7226: Journeys, 1700-1830
Module description
E-Reading List: http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/lists/21A5D87D-16A3-BF5F-9989-EF2595892539.html

EN7227: Dissertation - 60 Credits (MA ES)
Module description

EN7228: Dissertation - 90 Credits (MA ES)
Module description

EN7232: English Language and Linguistics Research Methods
Module description
E-Reading List: http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/en7232.html

EN7233: Gender, Language and Discourse
Module description
E-Reading List: http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/en7233.html

EN7238: Dissertation 90 Credits (English Language and Linguistics)
Module description

EN7239: World Englishes
Module description

EN7301: Language Testing and Assessment I
Module description
E-Reading List: TBC

EN7302: Materials Design and Development
Module description
E-Reading List: http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/lists/ED3439A4-5B1B-99C8-0E84-1C8144E4F317.html

EN7303: Technology Enhanced Language Learning
Module description
E-Reading List: TBC

EN7304: Intercultural Communication
Module description
E-Reading List: TBC

EN7305: Continuing Professional Development for English Language Teachers
Module description
E-Reading List: TBC
EN7306: Corpus Linguistics
Module description
E-Reading List

EN7308: Communicative Language Teaching in Action
Module description
E-Reading List: [http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/lists/F2F81A54-5D9B-6C18-6DB6-745B69C593D3.html](http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/lists/F2F81A54-5D9B-6C18-6DB6-745B69C593D3.html)

EN7309: Reflections on Language Learning & Teaching
Module description
E-Reading List: TBC

EN7310: Second Language Teaching
Module description

EN7311: Second Language Learning
Module description
E-Reading List: [http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/lists/E332EB2F-23EA-DBB2-AA3E-759B60918A38.html](http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/lists/E332EB2F-23EA-DBB2-AA3E-759B60918A38.html)

EN7312: Grammar Awareness
Module description
E-Reading List: [http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/en7312.html](http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/en7312.html)

EN7313: Phonology and Pronunciation
Module description
E-Reading List: [http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/ed7045.html](http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/ed7045.html)

EN7314: Language in Society
Module description
E-Reading List: [http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/ed7046.html](http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/ed7046.html)

EN7315: Discourse Analysis
Module description
E-Reading List: [http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/ed7047.html](http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/ed7047.html)

EN7316: Psychological Issues in Language Learning
Module description
E-Reading List: TBC

HS7499: Victorian Society
Module description
E-Reading List: [http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/hs7499.html](http://readinglists.le.ac.uk/modules/hs7499.html)
Departmental Prizes

The Department offers a number of undergraduate prizes which are awarded after our Midsummer Board of Examiners meeting at the end of each academic year. Details of these can be found here [http://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/english/prizes](http://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/english/prizes).

The English Society

Who we are

The English Society is one of the best-established academic societies at the University; we are united by both academic interest and the desire to have a well-rounded, sociable university experience. Membership is currently on a yearly basis and is priced at £5. This entitles members to reduced prices on events and trips organised and produced by the Society.

Our aims

The aim of the Society is to hold social events where students from different year groups can get to know each other whilst having fun in a relaxed atmosphere. Previous events include our massive Fresher’s Bar Crawl, paintballing, trips to Amsterdam, Christmas and Hallowe’en parties, theatre trips across the country, and more!

We pride ourselves on providing a range of varied social events in order to appeal to as many of our members as possible. Non-members are always welcome and we encourage links to be made with other departments. We also support the English department by attending optional lectures and running peer support academic workshops. A representative also sits on the Student-Staff Committee to foster a mutually beneficial link between the School of English and the Society.

Always improving

We are keen to improve the English Society continually and to nurture its growing success, so we welcome suggestions and comments throughout the academic year. Our number one priority this year is to bring together our members for the most enjoyable and inclusive year yet as a society.

We are keen to find students who are dedicated and committed enough to take over the society: we want our legacy to continue! If you would like to get involved or make a suggestion drop us a line at su-english@le.ac.uk. We look forward to hearing from you!

Requirements and Degree Classifications

Academic Obligations: A Summary Statement

Students joining the School of Arts undertake:

- to attend, and swipe into, all seminars, classes, and tutorials. Classes start on the hour and finish 10 minutes before the published end time to allow time for travel to the next class
- to attend, and swipe into, all 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. You also need to send a brief explanatory message to SchoolofArts@le.ac.uk
- to perform all 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
- 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 July resit period, if required
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**

The structure of English PGT degrees shall be 120 taught credits and a 60 credit dissertation or research project (with the exception of English Studies MA students and English Language and Linguistics students who may opt for the 90-credit dissertation, who will undertake 90 taught credits).

Students should observe Senate Regulation 6: Regulations governing taught postgraduate programmes for full details. The following regarding progression and award will be of particular significance to all students:

**Progression requirements**

6.27 The progress of each student shall be considered by a Board of Examiners at the end of the taught component of the programme. The Board of Examiners shall determine whether a student is permitted to progress to the dissertation or research project. Where the structure of a programme is such that a student has already begun work on his/her dissertation or research project, the Board of Examiners shall determine whether the student may continue with this work.

6.28 In making progression decisions for students on MA, MSc, LLM, MEM, and MBA programmes, a Board of Examiners shall adopt the following progression requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taught Module Credits Failed at First Attempt</th>
<th>Progression Rule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 30 credits</td>
<td>A student will proceed to, or continue with, the dissertation or research project and is entitled to re-sit failed modules up to the maximum credit value set out in paragraph 6.23 above, at the earliest opportunity. If, after reassessment, a student has any module mark of &lt; 40%, Grade ‘F’, s/he will not be allowed to continue work on the dissertation or research project and shall be considered at the next meeting of the Board of Examiners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45 credits</td>
<td>A student will proceed to or continue with, the dissertation or research project and is entitled to re-sit failed modules up to the maximum credit value set out in paragraph 6.23 above, at the earliest opportunity. If, after reassessment, a student has more than 30 credits of failed modules, or any module mark of &lt; 40%, Grade ‘F’, s/he will not be allowed to continue work on the dissertation or research project and shall be considered at the next meeting of the Board of Examiners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Criteria for and classification of awards

#### 6.30 A Postgraduate Certificate, a Postgraduate Diploma and a Masters degree may be awarded with pass, merit, or distinction. In all cases classification is determined either on the basis of an overall credit weighted average or preponderance of credits, whichever leads to the better result for a student. The following descriptors apply:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass</strong></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><strong>Merit</strong></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><strong>Distinction</strong></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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the relevant literature, theory, methodologies, practices, and tools, and shown excellent clarity, focus and cogency in communication.

6.31 For a Postgraduate Certificate, a student must have attempted every assessment component for each of the taught modules, unless mitigating circumstances have been accepted, and have achieved the following thresholds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Taught modules</th>
<th>Failed credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate</td>
<td>A credit-weighted average mark of at least 50%, or at least 45 credits at 50%, grade ‘C’, or above</td>
<td>No more than 15 credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade ‘D’, and no module mark &lt; 40%, grade ‘F’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate with Merit</td>
<td>A credit-weighted average mark of at least 60%, or at least 45 credits at 60%, grade ‘B’ or above</td>
<td>No credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade ‘D’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate with Distinction</td>
<td>A credit-weighted average mark of at least 70%, or at least 45 credits at 70%, grade ‘A’ or above</td>
<td>No credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade ‘D’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.32 Where a Postgraduate Certificate is to be awarded as an intermediate award and a student has attempted taught modules to a value greater than 60 credits, the thresholds set out in 6.31 above shall be applied to the 60 credits identified to meet the criteria for the award of a Postgraduate Certificate.

6.33 For a Postgraduate Diploma, a student must have attempted every assessment component for each of the modules of the taught modules, unless mitigating circumstances have been accepted, and have achieved the following thresholds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Taught modules</th>
<th>Failed credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma</td>
<td>A credit-weighted average mark of at least 50%, or at least 90 credits at 50%, grade ‘C’, or above</td>
<td>No more than 30 credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade ‘D’, and no module mark &lt; 40%, grade ‘F’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma with Merit</td>
<td>A credit-weighted average mark of at least 60%, or at least 90 credits at 60%, grade ‘B’ or above</td>
<td>No more than 15 credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade ‘D’ and no mark &lt;40%, grade ‘F’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma with Distinction</td>
<td>A credit-weighted average mark of at least 70%, or at least 90 credits at 70%, grade ‘A’ or above</td>
<td>No credits with a mark of less than 50%, grades ‘D’ or ‘F’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.34 Where a Postgraduate Diploma is to be awarded as an intermediate award and a student has attempted taught modules to a value greater than 120 credits, the thresholds set out in 6.32 above shall be applied to the 120 credits identified to meet the criteria for the award of a Postgraduate Diploma.

6.36 For a Masters programme with a structure of 120 credits of taught modules and a dissertation/research project of 60 credits, a student must have attempted every assessment component for each of the taught modules, unless mitigating circumstances have been accepted, and have achieved the following thresholds:
### Award | Taught modules | Failed credit
--- | --- | ---
Master’s Degree | A dissertation/project mark of at least 50% (grade C) and Either:  
  a) an overall credit-weighted average mark of at least 50% or  
  b) at least 90 credits at 50% or above from the taught modules, (grade C) | No more than 30 credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade ‘D’, and no module mark < 40%, grade ‘F’

Master’s Degree with Merit | A dissertation/project mark of at least 60% (grade B) and Either:  
  a) an overall credit-weighted average mark of at least 60% or  
  b) at least 60 credits at 60% or above from the taught modules, (grade B) | No more than 15 credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade ‘D’, and no module mark < 40%, grade ‘F’

Master’s Degree with Distinction | A dissertation/project mark of at least 70% (grade A) and Either:  
  a) an overall credit-weighted average mark of at least 70% or  
  b) at least 60 credits at 70% or above from the taught modules, (grade A) | No 30 credits with a mark of less than 50%, grades ‘D’ or ‘F’

6.37. For a Masters programme with a structure of 90 credits of taught modules and a dissertation/research project of 90 credits, a student must have attempted every assessment component for each of the taught modules, unless mitigating circumstances have been accepted, and have achieved the following thresholds:

### Award | Taught modules | Failed credit
--- | --- | ---
Master’s Degree | A dissertation/project mark of at least 50% (grade C) and Either:  
  a) an overall credit-weighted average mark of at least 50% or  
  b) at least 90 credits at 50% or above from the taught modules, (grade C) | No more than 30 credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade ‘D’, and no module mark < 40%, grade ‘F’

Master’s Degree with Merit | A dissertation/project mark of at least 60% (grade B) and Either:  
  a) an overall credit-weighted average mark of at least 60% or  | No more than 15 credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade ‘D’, and no module mark < 40%, grade ‘F’
| Master’s Degree with Distinction | A dissertation/project mark of at least 70% (grade A) and Either: a) an overall credit-weighted average mark of at least 70% or b) at least 45 credits at 70% or above from the taught modules, (grade A) | No 30 credits with a mark of less than 50%, grades ‘D’ or ‘F’ |
Marking Criteria
Creative Writing
Marking Criteria for Written Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>Merit</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style</strong></td>
<td>Full control and excellent, precise and original innovative handling of language; stylistically very strong; excellent use and innovative control of observed detail.</td>
<td>Overall control and very assured handling of language; stylistically strong; and very good use and control of observed detail.</td>
<td>Sound control and for the most part assured handling of language; stylistically sound; for the most part, assured use and control of observed detail.</td>
<td>Poor control and incompetent handling of language; stylistically weak; stylistically weak; poor use and control of observed detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voice/Point of View</strong></td>
<td>Full control of narrative/lyric voice and dialogue; excellent and original handling of tone, register and point of view.</td>
<td>Overall good control of narrative/lyric voice and dialogue; very assured 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>Limited control of narrative/lyric voice and (where relevant) dialogue; poor handling of tone, register and point of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure and Form</strong></td>
<td>Excellent and innovative handling of form; full control of structure; excellent, imaginative organisation</td>
<td>Very good, and in places original, handling of form; overall good control of structure; very good, coherent organisation of material</td>
<td>Sound, for the most part assured handling of form; good control of structure; competent, mainly coherent organisation of material</td>
<td>Poor, incompetent handling of form; limited control of structure; poor, incoherent organisation of material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation</strong></td>
<td>Excellent, impeccable presentation; formatting of professional standard</td>
<td>Very good presentation with very few errors; formatting correct</td>
<td>Good presentation with not many errors; formatting for the most part correct</td>
<td>Poor presentation with many and/or major errors; formatting incorrect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Reflective Commentaries on Creative Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>Merit</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process (including editing, redrafting and response to feedback)</strong></td>
<td>Excellent: editing process fully explained; very perceptive in identifying and responding to issues raised; very detailed, in-depth discussion of choices made; evidence of very intelligent and productive response to, and engagement with, feedback</td>
<td>Very good: editing process mostly explained; perceptive in identifying and responding to issues raised; detailed about the choices made; evidence of intelligent and productive response to feedback</td>
<td>Good: editing process competently, if not fully, explained; perceptive in identifying and responding to some issues; some detail in discussion of choices made; evidence of adequate, if limited, response to feedback</td>
<td>Poor: editing process inadequately explained; identifies few issues and little evidence of appropriate response; insufficiently detailed about choices made; insufficient evidence of response to feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research (including reading and contextualisation)</strong></td>
<td>Excellent: Wholly convincing and very perceptive in relating work to a good range of existing literature (and, where appropriate, criticism); excellent and in-depth discussion of the wider research context</td>
<td>Very good: mainly convincing and perceptive in relating work to fair range of existing literature (and, where appropriate, criticism); detailed and extensive discussion of a wider research context</td>
<td>Good: some cogency and perceptiveness in relating work to some existing literature (and, where appropriate, criticism); some evidence of a wider research context</td>
<td>Poor: insubstantial and unconvincing in relating work to existing literature or criticism; little evidence of wider research context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Between Process and Research</strong></td>
<td>Excellent, perceptive and wholly discussion of the ways in which process and research informed each other</td>
<td>Very good discussion of the ways in which process and research informed each other</td>
<td>Good, if not thorough, discussion of the ways in which process and research informed each other</td>
<td>Poor: insubstantial and unconvincing discussion of the ways in which process and research informed each other</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+ | 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. |
# Oral Presentation Marking Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DISTINCTION</th>
<th>MERIT</th>
<th>PASS</th>
<th>FAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall structure and coherence</strong></td>
<td>Very meticulous, coherent and clear structure. Skilful and subtle signposting</td>
<td>Orderly, coherent and clear structure. Systematic signposting</td>
<td>Fairly clear and coherent structure. Substantial effort made in signposting</td>
<td>Some evidence of structuring, but frequently muddled and incoherent. Inconsistent signposting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarity and range of expression</strong></td>
<td>Highly articulate, fluent, wide-ranging expression with strong command of language and voices; very clear and audible throughout</td>
<td>Clear expression, generally fluent, very good command of language and voices; clear and audible throughout</td>
<td>Some minor losses of clarity. Overall control of language and voices. Clear and audible for much of the presentation</td>
<td>Flaws in clarity at times. Limited expression. Problems with control of language and voices. Problems with clarity and audibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pace and timing</strong></td>
<td>Excellent time keeping and excellent delivery pace</td>
<td>Very 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><strong>Engagement/ rapport with audience</strong></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><strong>Choice of material and suitability of performance style</strong></td>
<td>Excellently matched performance style with content; excellent content for oral performance</td>
<td>Very good match between performance style and content; very well-chosen content for oral performance</td>
<td>Overall, good match between performance style and content; well-chosen content for oral performance</td>
<td>Mismatch between performance style and content; poorly chosen content for oral performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of handout, visual and other aids (where relevant)</strong></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 and 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><strong>Response to Questions (if applicable)</strong></td>
<td>Direct and thoughtful responses, revealing excellent knowledge and/or clear sense of potential challenges</td>
<td>Direct responses, indicating very 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>
### English Language and Linguistics

#### Marking Criteria for Written Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distinction (&gt;70)</th>
<th>Merit (60-69)</th>
<th>Pass (50-59)</th>
<th>Fail (40-49)</th>
<th>Fail (&lt;49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarity of Aims and Argument</strong></td>
<td>Clear and sophisticated aims, with excellent organization and illustration of arguments</td>
<td>Clear aims with effective organization and illustration of arguments</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Weakly conceived, with a lack of clarity and purpose in the organization and illustration of the argument</td>
<td>Organization of material is incoherent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Design</strong></td>
<td>Thoughtful project informed by background reading and making excellent use of data. Clear evaluation of methodological limitations</td>
<td>Thoughtful project design, showing some evidence of background reading and consideration of limitations. Good quality data</td>
<td>Coherently designed project, though not always acting on background reading or methodological limitations to produce good quality data</td>
<td>Insubstantial project design producing little or poor analysis of data. Major methodological limitations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethics (where applicable)</strong></td>
<td>Ethical issues central to all aspects of the project</td>
<td>Careful and informed approach to ethical issues</td>
<td>Some thought given to ethical issues, and conforms to the University guidelines</td>
<td>Does not fully conform to the University guidelines for ethical research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Thinking</strong></td>
<td>Independent approach to project design, evidence selection, and interpretation of results</td>
<td>Substantial evidence of effective research and independent thinking</td>
<td>Evidence of research, with some independent thinking</td>
<td>Little evidence of independent thinking or critical analysis of texts and concepts</td>
<td>Poor and/or derivative use of secondary sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Sophisticated, subtle and probing analysis throughout</td>
<td>Detailed and thorough analysis throughout</td>
<td>Some analysis offered in support of arguments</td>
<td>Little or inaccurate analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge and Accuracy</strong></td>
<td>Near-faultless use of linguistic terminology; extensive knowledge of the field</td>
<td>Accurate use of linguistic terminology; Thorough coverage of the field</td>
<td>Largely accurate use of linguistic terminology. Good coverage of relevant issues</td>
<td>Poor use of linguistic terminology or conventions.</td>
<td>Serious errors in use of linguistic terminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(including linguistic terminology)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Oral Presentation Marking Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge, and relevance of content</th>
<th>Distinction (&gt;70)</th>
<th>Merit (60-69)</th>
<th>Pass (50-59)</th>
<th>Fail (below 49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| Critical analysis and evaluation of material | Subtle, detailed and independent-minded analysis. Confident and balanced evaluation | Detailed and thorough analysis. Clear effort made to weigh up evidence carefully | Usually thorough analysis, going into some detail. Some effort made to weigh evidence | Limited or superficial analysis. Tendency to describe rather than evaluate |

| Clarity and range of expression | Highly articulate, fluent, wide-ranging expression with strong command of critical language and/or proper terminology | Clear expression, generally fluent, very good command of critical language and/or proper terminology | Some minor losses of clarity. Largely accurate use of critical language and/or terminology | Flaws in clarity at times. Limited expression. Problems with accurate use of critical language and/or terminology |

| Pace and timing | Excellent time keeping and excellent delivery pace | Good time keeping and well paced delivery | An ability to keep to agreed time and an attempt to keep the delivery paced | Unable to keep to agreed time; issues with delivery pace severe enough to affect audience's comprehension. |

| Appropriateness to audience (specialist/non-specialist) | Expertly adjusted to cater to all present, with well-judged levels of explanation. | Well-adjusted to the needs of the majority of the audience, with suitable levels of explanation. | Attention given to explaining terms and contexts likely to be unfamiliar to the audience. | Not adapted to the levels of knowledge of the majority of the audience. |

<p>| Engagement/rapport with audience | Excellent ability to establish eye-contact (in-person) or tone of voice (pre-recorded), to directly address and to engage the audience | Very good ability to establish eye-contact (in-person) or tone of voice (pre-recorded), to directly address and to engage the audience | Good ability to establish eye-contact (in-person) or tone of voice (pre-recorded), to directly address and to engage the audience | Limited ability to establish eye-contact (in-person) or tone of voice (pre-recorded), to directly address and to engage the audience |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Use of handout, visual and other aids</strong></th>
<th>Highly confident use of aids, which are fully integrated, thoroughly relevant to the presentation, and entirely clear</th>
<th>Assured use of aids, which are well integrated, directly relevant to the presentation and very clear</th>
<th>Satisfactory use of aids, which are largely well integrated, relevant to the presentation and clear</th>
<th>Limited confidence in use of aids, which are not always well integrated, relevant to the presentation or clear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response to Questions (if applicable)</strong></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>
## English Studies

### Marking Criteria for Written Work

<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. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fail: below 50</th>
<th>Significant oversights in the coverage of relevant issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very little evidence of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little critical analysis of texts and concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little evidence of independent thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weakly conceived, with a lack of clarity and purpose in the organization and illustration of the argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A limited range of reference to primary and secondary sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing in an inappropriate register, with lack of clarity and precision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inaccurate presentation, evidence of weak or inconsistent use of academic conventions, poor proof-reading and serious problems with referencing, bibliography, citation, formatting or style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.B. Work of whatever level with this kind of inaccurate presentation will be referred for correction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oral Presentation Marking Criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>DISTINCTION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical analysis and evaluation of material</td>
<td>Subtle, detailed and independent-minded analysis. Confident and balanced evaluation</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace and timing</td>
<td>Excellent time keeping and excellent delivery pace</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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>
</tbody>
</table>
## EN7001 Written Exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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. |
# Modern Literature (and Creative Writing)

## Creative Writing

<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 original 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 original 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>
</tbody>
</table>
## 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>
</tbody>
</table>
## EN7001 Written Exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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. |
## Reflective Commentaries on Creative Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Merit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation of original aims and process of revision</strong></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><strong>Engagement with significant features (e.g. language, observation, voice, genre, structure, presentation)</strong></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><strong>Situating work in literary (and, where appropriate, critical) context</strong></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><strong>Response to feedback from supervisor (and, where relevant, others)</strong></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>
## Oral Presentation Marking Criteria

<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 and 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>
### Victorian Studies

#### Coursework and Dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Distinction: 70+ | Comprehensive coverage of relevant issues  
Indefinite 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. |
## 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>
</tbody>
</table>
**EN7001 Written Exercise**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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. |
# Oral Presentation Marking Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>DISTINCTION</strong></th>
<th><strong>MERIT</strong></th>
<th><strong>PASS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge, and relevance of content</strong></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation of material</strong></td>
<td>Remarkably meticulous and clear structure. Skillful and subtle signposting</td>
<td>Orderly and clear structure. Systematic signposting</td>
<td>Fairly clear structure. Substantial effort made in signposting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical analysis and evaluation of material</strong></td>
<td>Subtle, detailed and independently-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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarity and range of expression</strong></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pace and timing</strong></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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement/rapport with audience</strong></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of handout, visual and other aids</strong></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 and clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response to Questions (if applicable)</strong></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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>