

Marking Criteria			
Document type:	Other		
Document number:	ACA-182	Version:	02
Department:	Academy		
Approved by:	Senate	Date approved:	03/06/2026
Effective from:	01/09/2026	Review date:	01/09/2029
Publication:	SOAS website		
Related documents:			
Documents replaced:	TLE-182-01 Marking Criteria		
<p><i>Note: All policies must be read in conjunction with all other SOAS policy, procedure and guidance documents. Printed copies of policies may not be the most up to date, therefore please refer to the policy pages on the SOAS external website or intranet for the latest version.</i></p>			

This document provides the assessment criteria and marking policies to be applied to all taught undergraduate and postgraduate programmes at SOAS.

Contents

1. Marking Categories	2
2. Percentage Marks.....	3
3. Marking Rubrics.....	4
4. Applying Bloom’s Taxonomy.....	4
5. Additional Criteria	5
6. Awarding Gaps	6
7. Academic Referencing	6
8. Further Criteria from Professional Governing Bodies	7
9. Exemption: Language Acquisition Degree Programmes	8
10. Marking Criteria FHEQ Levels.....	8
11. FHEQ Level 4 Undergraduate Assessment Criteria	9
12. FHEQ Level 5 Undergraduate Assessment Criteria	10
13. FHEQ Level 6 Undergraduate Assessment Criteria	11
14. FHEQ Level 7 Postgraduate Assessment Criteria	12

1. Marking Categories

- 1.1. The Marking Criteria (competence standards) for all SOAS undergraduate and postgraduate programmes draw upon the following minimum core criteria.
- 1.2. These criteria have been adapted from the four categories of skill and knowledge identified within the QAA¹ Framework for Higher Education Qualifications of UK degree awarding bodies; knowledge, intellectual skills, subject-based skills and transferable skills.

QAA Categories	Criteria	Description To what level does the student...
Knowledge	Theoretical and conceptual knowledge	demonstrate critical and comprehensive knowledge of theory and concepts.
	Use of source material	integrate source material into their assignments with criticality, rigour and cohesion.
Intellectual Skills	Critical argumentation	formulate a robust and persuasive critical argument or case.
	Application of knowledge	apply knowledge to the task assignment with criticality, rigour and cohesion.
Subject-based Skills	Application of subject specialist skills	use and apply key academic, professional and technical skills as appropriate to the disciplinary field, assignment and context.
Transferrable Skills	Independence, organisation and adaptability	work with independence, organisation and adaptability.
	Expression (writing, speech, visual languages, performance, calculations, etc.)	express themselves coherently, persuasively and appropriately for the task assignment

¹ Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) (2024) *The frameworks for higher education qualifications of UK degree-awarding bodies*. Available at: qaa.ac.uk (Accessed: 28 April 2026).

- 1.3. These minimum core criteria form a part of the University’s core academic standards and should be applied to all assignments. As such, they would not usually be subject to modification. It is expected that programmes are designed inclusively through an EDI lens and with criteria and FHEQ levels in mind. Programme design and assessment strategies are approved at CQAC. Modification to approved design can be requested at module and programme level. Modifications may be granted through committee decision provided FHEQ levels and the meeting of programme ILOs are not compromised by those modifications.
- 1.4. The language use in an assignment must be of a sufficient standard to permit assessment of the above criteria.

2. Percentage Marks

- 2.1. Criteria have been provided for Level 4 (first year undergraduate), Level 5 (second year undergraduate), Level 6 (final year undergraduate) and Level 7 (postgraduate Master’s level), guided by QAA FHEQ Levels² and Bloom’s Taxonomy³. Pass mark percentages (40% for undergraduate and 50% for postgraduate) identify the minimum level of competency we would expect for the FHEQ Level. Higher percentages denote performance where this is surpassed and lower percentages where the minimum competency level is not met.

FHEQ Level 4	80%+ (Strong Pass)	79-70% (Strong Pass)	69-60% (Strong Pass)	59-50% (Pass)	49-40% (pass)	39-20% (Fail)	19-0% (Fail)
FHEQ Level 5	80%+ (1)	79-70% (1)	69-60% (2.1)	59-50% (2.2)	49-40% (3)	39-20% (Fail)	19-0% (Fail)
FHEQ Level 6	80%+ (1)	79-70% (1)	69-60% (2.1)	59-50% (2.2)	49-40% (3)	39-20% (Fail)	19-0% (Fail)
FHEA Level 7	80%+ (Distinction)	79-70% (Distinction)	69-60% (Merit)	59-50% (Pass)	49-40% (Fail)	39-20% (Fail)	19-0% (Fail)

² Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) (2024) *The frameworks for higher education qualifications of UK degree-awarding bodies*. Available at: qaa.ac.uk (Accessed: 28 April 2026).

³ Anderson, L.W., Krathwohl, D.R., Airasian, P.W., Cruikshank, K.A., Mayer, R.E., Pintrich, P.R., Raths, J. and Wirrock, M.C. (2001) *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. 2nd Edition. London: Longman.

- 2.2. While 80% is the benchmark for the highest grading available (First for undergraduate or Distinction for postgraduate), it is expected that for exceptional work the full spectrum of percentage marks from 80%-100% would be applied where appropriate.
- 2.3. Programme teams should carefully consider expectations at those higher percentage levels to ensure students are appropriately rewarded for outstanding work.

3. Marking Rubrics

- 3.1. Marking rubrics should be created for each assignment and guided by SOAS Marking Rubric guidance and the Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) of the module. ILOs should be aligned to FHEQ Levels and disciplinary benchmarks and Bloom's Taxonomy.
- 3.2. ILOs identify what students will be able to do upon successful completion of the module. These should be aligned to both FHEQ Levels and disciplinary benchmarks and Bloom's Taxonomy. Marking rubrics identify how those abilities will be judged using standard descriptors and should be closely aligned to the ILOs.

4. Applying Bloom's Taxonomy

- 4.1. ILOs and Marking rubrics should reflect the required level of learning and skill for the FHEQ level drawing on Bloom's taxonomy so more complex higher-order skills such as creating something appearing at higher FHEQ levels and the simpler skills such as recalling and grasping meaning at the lower FHEQ levels.
- 4.2. The Bloom's Taxonomy Verb Table (page 5) identifies key skills and activities and skills we associate with these levels of educational achievement. These skills are to be critically applied in combination with FHEQ expectations and the nature of the subject material.
- 4.3. Examples:
 - While 'explain' is generally a lower-order skill, some theoretical and conceptual knowledge may be so advanced that simply explaining it could be interpreted as a higher FHEQ level.
 - While 'analyse' is generally seen at mid to higher levels in relation to more complex problems or theories, students at lower FHEQ levels may be expected to analyse when it comes to more basic concepts and straightforward contexts.

4.4. The below table is therefore a valuable guide aligned with QAA frameworks to pitch requirements at the appropriate FHEQ level, but it is to be critically applied by subject experts in the design of modules and marking rubrics.

Bloom’s Taxonomy Verb Table⁴

Create	Use existing knowledge and information to create something new Verbs: Invent, develop, design, compose, construct, generate, modify
Evaluate	Make Judgements based upon analysis Verbs: Assess, judge, defend, critique, recommend, prioritise, appraise
Analyse	Explore relationships, causes and connection Verbs: Categorise, compare, contrast, differentiate, distinguish
Apply	Use knowledge in new contexts Verbs: Practice, implement, calculate, use illustrate, operate, predict
Understand	Grasp the meaning of something Verbs: Explain, report, describe summarise, paraphrase, illustrate
Remember	Retain and recall information Verbs: List, repeat, duplicate, identify, reiterate, duplicate, outline

5. Additional Criteria

5.1. The minimum core criteria intentionally do not include standards concerning the presentational aspects of the work, such as spelling and punctuation in written assignments; nor do they include the criteria for certain specialist assignments (e.g. musical performance). Departments select additional criteria for certain assignments, as appropriate to the ILOs being assessed on that occasion. Such additional criteria are not standard to all modules, but they are part of the competence standards for the specific module and assignments.

- expectations of an extremely high level of appropriate spelling/grammar/punctuation accuracy that goes beyond the usual assessment of communicative competence through coherence, cohesion and style criteria. [LO1.1][MK1.2][AP1.3]
- other skills as appropriate to the form of assessment (e.g. quality of accent, pronunciation, diction and other vocal qualities for an assessment involving speech)

⁴ Anderson, L.W., Krathwohl, D.R., Airasian, P.W., Cruikshank, K.A., Mayer, R.E., Pintrich, P.R., Raths, J. and Wirrock, M.C. (2001) *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. 2nd Edition. London: Longman.

- the demonstration of specific knowledge or abilities relevant to the assignment/examination (e.g. practical skills in archaeology or playing a musical instrument)
- Collaboration and teamwork
- Ethical and critical use of AI

5.2. The department must provide students with information about any additional criteria which may be used to mark a particular assignment through the marking rubric. SOAS Graduate Attributes | SOAS should be consulted in this process.

6. Awarding Gaps

6.1. In line with commitments to social justice and the reduction of awarding gaps in higher education, it is recognised that additional criteria of this kind may contribute to inequality. This is particularly associated with the 'hidden curriculum', where culturally loaded and inconsistently applied expectations can influence assessment, both consciously and unconsciously.

6.2. Additional criteria should only be separately assessed and detailed explicitly in marking rubrics when they are integral to the specific nature of the assessment strategy and aligned to a named ILO as a subject-specialist requirement.

6.3. Examples:

- Precision of spelling, grammar, pronunciation and vocal quality may require specific mention in language learning modules where it is the language quality which is the main focus, or in assessment which requires precision expertise, such as journalism or tailoring a podcast for specific audience impact.
- Where such skills are not specific to the task assignment or subject-based skills, spelling, grammar, pronunciation and vocal quality are already included in the central criteria under notions of 'coherence,' 'cohesion,' 'rigour' and 'accuracy'. They should be implicitly assessed along with other aspects of the work under their contribution to those requirements rather than as separate explicit criteria.

7. Academic Referencing

7.1. The accuracy and consistency of in-text and post-text academic referencing should be considered when evaluating rigour, style and cohesion. Academic Referencing is a key assessment activity linked to academic integrity and any potential misconduct reviews.

- 7.2. Work must not be penalised for minor inaccuracies when this can be interpreted as a slip rather than an error or integrity breach. If accurate referencing is part of the assessment, it must be clearly identified in the marking rubric and aligned to the module learning outcomes where appropriate. Any marks removed for referencing errors must be clearly articulated in the student's feedback.

Integrity Breach	The student has used source material without attribution to the original source or has referenced in such a way that may constitute academic misconduct, such as using exact wording but not indicating the material is a direct quotation.
Error	The student appears to not fully understand how, or be able, to apply referencing to the required level of skill for the FHEQ level. Inaccuracies are significant and a threat to academic evidence and argumentation.
Slip	There is evidence the student understands and can apply referencing to the required level of skill for the FHEQ level but that they occasionally slip in the execution of their referencing system. Minor inaccuracies do not undermine the strength of the academic integrity, argument or evidence.

8. Further Criteria from Professional Governing Bodies

- 8.1. The above has been designed in line with FHEQ Levels and Categories as defined in the 'Framework for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree Awarding Bodies' (QAA 2024). It is further expected that assessment criteria and marking rubrics will be designed and marked in alignment with:
- QAA Subject Benchmark guidance
 - Standards defined by subject specific professional governing bodies and frameworks (e.g. British Psychological Society or CEFR levels for Language Acquisition courses) should also be used.

9. Exemption: Language Acquisition Degree Programmes

- 9.1. SOAS English language entry requirements correspond to CEFR levels B2 and C1 of English language proficiency on entry to the degree programme. The marking criteria in this document applies to assessments produced in the English language where this base level of communicative proficiency can be expected.
- 9.2. For language acquisition degrees, students enter their degree programme with potentially zero proficiency in the target language. Students may start at beginner CEFR level of 0-A1 and rise potentially to CEFR level B2 and equivalent in the target language.
- 9.3. CEFR B2 and equivalent is therefore the intended exit level in the target language to be achieved in the final year of a full undergraduate language acquisition degree programme and does not denote the entry level of proficiency in the target language.
- 9.4. In recognition of this, for language acquisition degree programmes and modules:
 - Target language proficiency outcomes and assessment will require their own separate marking criteria to reflect the appropriate CEFR level expected at each stage of study. They are exempt from the below criteria tables but will continue to reflect FHEQ levels and subject benchmark statements.
 - Assignments within language acquisition programmes and modules which are written and assessed in the English language must continue to adhere to the below criteria. Examples may be assignments which involve language analysis or cultural debate in the English language rather than performance of the target language proficiency.

10. Marking Criteria FHEQ Levels

- 10.1. Subsequent pages offer descriptors which define the level required for a certain grade to be awarded across seven different ten-percent brackets. The tables do not explicitly differentiate performance at higher and lower ends (i.e. 90%+ or 10%-).
- 10.2. While this differentiation is not defined here, it is expected that programme teams will apply use of the full marking spectrum.
- 10.3. To ensure outstanding performance is suitably recognised, there should be clear collective understanding of what differentiates percentages at those higher levels and why percentages have been awarded for exceptional work.

- 10.4. This should be established under university regulations and processes at programme and module levels, such as during standardisation and moderation processes, and clearly and transparently communicated to staff applying criteria and students receiving grades.
- 10.5. While a higher percentage (above 80% or 90%) does not change the degree classification from a first or distinction (above 70%), the percentage is stated on transcripts and therefore plays a role in student opportunity and outcomes beyond SOAS.

11. FHEQ Level 4 Undergraduate Assessment Criteria

- 11.1. Undergraduate: The guidelines below reflect the standards of work expected at FHEQ Level 4, first year of undergraduate study. At level 4, percentage grades do not translate into final outcome grades of degree classifications. Degree classifications have therefore not been denoted within the table as outcomes contribute to progression to level 5, not degree outcome.
- 11.2. Holders of a Certificate of Higher Education will have a sound knowledge of the basic concepts of a subject. They will be able to communicate accurately and will have the qualities needed for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility.
- 11.3. Holders will be able to evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems related to their area(s) of study and/or work, drawing on the basic concepts of their subject.

Categories	80%+ (Strong Pass)	79-70% (Strong Pass)	69-60% (Strong Pass)	59-50% (Pass)	49-40% (pass)	39-20% (Fail)	19-0% (Fail)
Theoretical and Conceptual Knowledge	Critical with breadth and depth of analysis	Critical with some breadth and/or depth of analysis	Mostly critical with some depth and breadth of analysis	Mostly descriptive with some criticality, depth and breadth	Some depth and breadth and limited criticality	Little relevance, criticality, depth or breadth	Lack of relevance, criticality, depth or breadth
Use of Source Material	Critical with consistent rigour and cohesion	Critical and mostly rigorous and cohesive	Some criticality with inconsistent rigour and cohesion	Relevant with limited criticality, rigour and cohesion	Mostly relevant with some criticality and limited rigour or cohesion	Little relevance, criticality, rigour or cohesion	Lack of relevance, criticality or cohesion
Critical Argumentation	Critical, Robust and persuasive discussion	Critical and persuasive and mostly rigorous	Mostly critical, persuasive and rigorous	Mostly descriptive with some criticality, persuasion and rigour	Mostly descriptive with limited criticality, persuasion or rigour	Little argumentation, criticality, persuasion or rigour	Lack of argumentation, criticality, persuasion or rigour
Application of knowledge to task	Critical and ethical with consistent rigour and cohesion	Critical and ethical with mostly consistent rigour and cohesion	Mostly critical and ethical with some rigour and cohesion	Some criticality, rigour and cohesion	Mostly relevant with limited criticality, rigour and cohesion	Little relevance, criticality, rigour or cohesion	Lack of relevance, criticality, rigour and cohesion

Academic, professional and technical skills are undertaken:	Critical, Independent and accurate	Critical and accurate with some independence	Inconsistent criticality, accuracy and independence	Some criticality and accuracy with limited independence	Limited criticality, accuracy and independence	Little criticality, accuracy or independence	Lack of criticality, accuracy or independence
Independence, Organisation and adaptability	Independent and organised	Organised with some degree of independence	mostly organised and independent	Some organisation and independence	Limited organisation and independence	Little organisation and independence	Lack of organisation and independence
Expression	Coherent, persuasive and consistent stylistic cohesion	Coherently, persuasive and mostly cohesive	Coherent with some persuasion persuasive and inconsistent cohesion	Coherent with some persuasion and cohesion	Mostly coherent with limited persuasion or cohesion	Little coherence, persuasion or cohesion	Lack of coherence, persuasion and cohesion

12. FHEQ Level 5 Undergraduate Assessment Criteria

- 12.1. Undergraduate: The guidelines below reflect the standards of work expected at FHEQ Level 5, second year of undergraduate study.
- 12.2. Holders of qualifications at this level will have knowledge and critical understanding of the well-established principles of their area(s) of study, and of the way in which those principles have developed. Through this, they will have learned to analyse and apply appropriate approaches and theories in their disciplines to solve problems.

Undergraduate	80%+ (1)	79-70% (1)	69-60% (2.1)	59-50% (2.2)	49-40% (3)	39-20% (Fail)	19-0% (Fail)
Theoretical and Conceptual Knowledge	Critical and comprehensive	Critical with breadth and depth	Mostly critical some depth and breadth	Mostly critical and limited depth and breadth	Relevant with limited criticality, depth and breadth	Some relevance with little criticality, depth and breadth	Lack of relevance, criticality, depth and breadth
Use of Source Material	Critical, ethical and rigorous	Consistently critical and ethical with some inconsistencies in rigour	Mostly critical and ethical with some rigour	Mostly descriptive some critically and inconsistencies in rigour	Descriptive with limited criticality and rigour	Little relevance criticality or rigour	Lack of relevance, criticality and rigour
Critical Argument	Robust, persuasive and creative	Robust and persuasive with some creativity	Persuasive with inconsistent cohesion	Coherent with some critical. persuasion and cohesion	Mostly coherent with limited criticality, persuasion or cohesion	Limited coherence, persuasion or cohesion	Lack of coherence persuasion or cohesion
Application of Knowledge	Critical, rigorous, ethical and creative	Critical, rigorous and ethical with some creativity	Criticality with inconsistencies in rigour and cohesion	Inconsistencies in criticality, rigour and cohesion	Some criticality, rigour and cohesion	Limited criticality, rigour and cohesion	Lack of criticality, rigour and cohesion
Academic, professional and technical	Independent flexible and accurate	Independent and accurate with some flexibility	Mostly accurate and independent with some flexibility	Some accuracy with limited independence and flexibility	Limited accuracy, independence and flexibility	Little accuracy, independence or flexibility	Lack of accuracy, independence and flexibility

Independence, Organisation and adaptability	Independent and organised with some adaptability	Mostly independent and organised with some adaptability	Mostly organised with some independence and adaptability	Some degree of organisation with limited independence and adaptability	Limited organisation, independence or adaptability	Little organisation, independence or adaptability	Lack of organisation, independence or adaptability
Expression	Coherent, persuasive and stylistically creative	Coherent and persuasive with stylistic cohesion	Coherent with stylistic cohesion and some persuasion	Coherent with some persuasion and inconsistent cohesion	Mostly coherent with limited persuasion and inconsistent cohesion	Limited coherence, persuasion or cohesion	Lack of coherence, persuasion or cohesion

13. FHEQ Level 6 Undergraduate Assessment Criteria

- 13.1. Undergraduate: The guidelines below reflect the standards of work expected at FHEQ Level 6, final year of undergraduate study.
- 13.2. Holders of a bachelor's degree with honours will have a systematic understanding of key aspects of their field of study, including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of defined aspects of a discipline.
- 13.3. They will also be able to apply the methods and techniques that they have learned to review, consolidate, extend and apply their knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects.

Undergraduate	80%+ (1)	79-70% (1)	69-60% (2.1)	59-50% (2.2)	49-40% (3)	39-20% (Fail)	19-0% (Fail)
Theoretical and Conceptual Knowledge	Critical, comprehensive and beyond syllabus	Critical and comprehensive with some extension beyond syllabus	Critical with depth and breadth	Mostly critical with some breadth and depth	Limited criticality with some breadth and depth	Little criticality, depth or breadth	Lack of criticality, depth or breadth
Use of Source Material	Critical, ethical, rigorous and creative	Critical, ethical and rigorous with some creativity	Critical and ethical with inconsistencies in rigour	Inconsistencies in criticality, rigour or cohesion	Limited criticality, rigour and cohesion	Little relevance, criticality or rigour	Lack of relevance criticality, and rigour
Critical Argument	Robust, persuasive, creative and original	Robust, nuanced and persuasive with some creativity	Robust, nuanced and persuasive	Informed with limited rigour, nuance or persuasion	Limited criticality or rigour or cohesion	Little criticality rigour or cohesion	Lack of criticality, rigour and cohesion
Application of Knowledge	Critical, rigorous & creative	Critical and Rigorous with some creativity	Critical and cohesive with inconsistencies in rigour	Mostly critical with inconsistencies in rigour and cohesion	Limited criticality, rigour and cohesion	Little criticality, rigour or cohesion	Lack of criticality, rigour or cohesion
Academic, professional and technical	Independent flexible, and creative	Independent flexible and accurate with some creativity	Independent, accurate with some flexibility	Some independence and inconsistent accuracy and flexibility	Limited independence, accuracy or flexibility	Limited independence, accuracy or flexibility	Lack of independence, accuracy or flexibility

Independence, Organisation and adaptability	Proactive, Independent, organised and adaptable.	Independent and organised adaptability with some proactivity	Independent and organised with some adaptability	Some independence, organisation and adaptability	Limited organisation, independence and adaptability	Little organisation, independence and adaptability	Lack of organisation, independence and adaptability
Expression	Coherent, persuasive and stylistically inventive	Coherent and persuasive and stylistically congruent	Coherent and persuasive with and stylistically cohesive	Coherent with inconsistencies in persuasion and style	Coherent with limited persuasion and stylistic cohesion	Little coherence, persuasion cohesion	Lack of coherence, persuasion or cohesion

14. FHEQ Level 7 Postgraduate Assessment Criteria

14.1. Postgraduate: The guidelines below reflect the standards of work expected at FHEQ Level 7, postgraduate study

14.2. Holders of that level will have a systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice. Holders will be able to deal with complex issues - both systematically and creatively, make sound judgements in the absence of complete data, and communicate their conclusions clearly to specialist and non-specialist audiences.

Postgraduate	80%+ (Distinction)	79-70% (Distinction)	69-60% (Merit)	59-50% (Pass)	49-40% (Fail)	39-20% (Fail)	19-0% (Fail)
Theoretical and Conceptual Knowledge	Consistently critical, comprehensive, original & cutting edge	Critical, comprehensive with some originality	Critical and comprehensive	Mostly critical with depth and breadth	Some criticality, depth and breadth	Little criticality relevance, depth and breadth	Lack of criticality, relevance, depth or breadth
Use of Source Material	Critical, ethical, rigorous and creative use of sources	Critical, ethical and rigorous use of sources with some creativity	Critical, ethical and rigorous use of sources	Critical use of sources, with some rigour and ethical awareness	Limited source material with limited criticality and rigour	Limited source material and lack of criticality and rigour	Little to no Integration of source material
Argument	Robust, persuasive and original and inventive	Robust, persuasive and original and well-informed	Robust persuasive and well informed.	Critical argumentation with some persuasion	Limited argumentation, criticality or persuasion	Little argumentation, criticality or persuasion	Lack of argumentation, criticality or persuasion

Application of knowledge to task assignment	Critical and creative and original	Critical and creative with some originality	Critical and with some independence of thought	Critical and appropriate application to task	Limited criticality or application to task	Little criticality or application to task	Lack of criticality or application to task
Academic, professional and technical skills	Independent, accurate, flexible, and innovative	Independent flexible and accurate with some creativity	Independent, accurate and appropriate with some flexibility	Appropriate with inconsistent accuracy and flexibility	Limited accuracy, flexibility or independence	Little accuracy, flexibility or independence	Lack of accuracy, flexibility and independence
Independence, Organisation and adaptability	Independent, and organised with intellectual risk taking and adaptability	Independent and organised with some adaptability and risk taking	Independent and organised with some adaptability	Some degree of independence, organisation and flexibility	Limited independence, organisation or flexibility	Little organisation, independence or flexibility	Lack of organisation, independence and flexibility
Expression	Persuasive, creative and of Publishable quality and style	Persuasive, coherent, cohesive and creative	Persuasive, coherent and stylistically cohesive	Coherent with inconsistent cohesion and style	Limited coherence and stylistic cohesion	Little coherence or stylistic cohesion	Lack of coherence and stylistic cohesion