

Marking Criteria: Critical Review of an Article

	Summary of key points and arguments	Structure and content of presentation	Knowledge; level of critical and independent thinking
Top 1: 90+ Outstanding. Scores very highly on all criteria	Highlights, clearly summarises and critiques the key arguments. Clearly and succinctly presents the supporting data. Presentation is excellent: consistent and without errors.	The presentation has a very clear direction and focus. It demonstrates excellent contextualised knowledge and understanding of the author's aims and objectives and how the author demonstrates this using the archaeological data. It summarises the article clearly and succinctly and skilfully critiques the approach, arguments and conclusions. Demonstrates, critical engagement with the relevant theoretical, conceptual or topical themes covered in the module.	Excellent knowledge and understanding of the archaeological context and theoretical perspectives underpinning the article. A comprehensive and outstanding understanding of the topic. Excellent critical analysis and signs of independent and creative thinking.
High 1: 80+ Extremely high quality; scores very highly on all or almost all criteria.	Highlights, clearly summarises and critiques the key arguments. Clearly and succinctly presents the supporting data. Presentation is excellent: consistent and without errors.	The presentation has a very clear direction and focus. It demonstrates very good contextualised knowledge and understanding of the author's aims and objectives and how the author demonstrates this using the archaeological data. It summarises the article clearly and succinctly and clearly critiques the approach, arguments and conclusions. Demonstrates, critical engagement with the relevant theoretical, conceptual or topical themes covered in the module.	The level of knowledge and understanding of the archaeological context and theoretical perspectives underpinning the article should be thoughtful and well-considered. Very good critical analysis and signs of independent and creative thinking.
Good 1st: 70-79 Very high quality; scores highly on most criteria	Highlights, clearly summarises and critiques the key arguments. Clearly and succinctly presents the supporting data. Presentation is excellent: consistent and without errors	The presentation has a very clear direction, focus and aim. It demonstrates good contextualised knowledge and understanding of the author's aims and objectives and how the author demonstrates this using the archaeological data. It summarises the article clearly and succinctly and critiques the approach, arguments and conclusions. Demonstrates critical engagement with the relevant theoretical, conceptual or topical themes covered in the module.	Very good level of knowledge and understanding of the archaeological context and theoretical perspectives underpinning the article. Good critical analysis and signs of independent and creative thinking.

Marking Criteria: Critical Review of an Article

2.1: 60-69 Competent and effective work, which shows many or some of these qualities.	Clearly summarises and critiques the key arguments. Clearly presents the supporting data. Presentation is good: consistent and without errors	The presentation has clear direction, focus and aim. It demonstrates good knowledge and understanding of the author's aims and objectives and how the author demonstrates this using the archaeological data. It summarises the article clearly and succinctly and discusses the approach, arguments and conclusions. Demonstrates engagement with the relevant theoretical, conceptual or topical themes covered in the module.	Good level of knowledge and understanding of the archaeological context and theoretical perspectives underpinning the article. Good analysis and some signs of independent thinking.
2.2: 50-59 Satisfactory and fairly competent work, which shows many or at least some of these qualities	Summarises the key arguments and presents the supporting data. Presentation may have some errors.	The presentation lacks a clear direction but the information contained is relevant, though not necessarily in-depth. There may be some errors. Attempts to explain the approach, arguments and conclusions of the article, but may lack clarity.	Demonstrates some knowledge and understanding of the archaeological context and theoretical perspectives underpinning the article, although this may not be particularly broad or comprehensive. Largely descriptive rather than analytical.
3rd class: 40-49 Adequate or fair for an honours degree. Some or of all these qualities.	Satisfactory, but the presentation of the article (arguments and data) is limited in scope. Presentation may have errors and inconsistencies.	The presentation has no clear direction and some of the information presented is repetitive or irrelevant. Does not explain the approach, arguments and conclusions of the article clearly and is limited in scope and depth. May contain errors and misunderstandings.	An adequate level of knowledge, but student is not sufficiently well-informed. Material is presented with no evidence for critical engagement or analysis.
Close fail: 30-39% Unsatisfactory.	Insufficient engagement with the primary source. Presentation is inconsistent and/or missing.	The presentation has no direction or focus and much of the information presented is repetitive or irrelevant. Does not explain the approach, arguments and conclusions of the article and is very limited in scope. May contain errors and misunderstandings.	Student shows insufficient knowledge and understanding. Limited signs of engagement with the article. No sign of critical thought.
Clear fail: 20-29% Very poor.	Limited engagement with the primary source. Presentation is inconsistent	The presentation is limited in scope and contains significant errors and misunderstandings.	Student has little or no real understanding of the topic. No sign of critical thought.

Marking Criteria: Critical Review of an Article

Bad fail: 0-19 Completely unacceptable.	Very limited, if any, engagement with the primary source.	The presentation is limited in scope and contains significant errors and misunderstandings, misrepresenting the article. There is very little material of relevance.	No knowledge or understanding and no critical thought.
---	---	--	--