

E-Quip Mark Scheme – a Tutor’s Guide

90% above	A++
85-89%	A+
80-84%	A
75-79%	A-
70-74%	B+
65-69%	B
60-64%	B-
50-59%	C
UNDER 50%	FAIL

Grade Guide Principles

These grade bands are derived from the following criteria with maximum percentage marks given.

Exceptionally, for one element outperforming the maximum percentage in the grade band, a higher percentage may be given, (subject of course to the uppermost ceiling in the top band).

The lowest grade in the band will be compared analytically with the uppermost grade in the band below before making an assessment decision (and vice versa).

A to A++ (80% plus)

1. an excellent understanding of the scope and rationale of the assignment; (10%)
2. a fluent and balanced introduction giving a transparent and complete overview of the task in hand. (5%)
3. a body of evidence, wide and appropriate in extent, both with persuasive evaluations and reasoned conclusions, all coherently presented; (10%)
4. a critical insightful engagement with the relevant primary sources; (10%)
5. an exploration of the underlying or tacit assumptions in the literature and other sources, their strengths and weaknesses; (10%)
6. a very good understanding of the integration of theoria with praxis in the assignment task; (10%)
7. demonstrably original or insightful analysis of the assignment topic with critical skills of evaluation throughout; (15%)
8. an ability to come to a reasoned conclusion based on a critical assessment of many different points of view; (15%)
9. correctly cited sources referenced in footnotes (not inline to the text) and a comprehensive bibliography at the end of the assignment; (5%)
10. flair, stylish and a lucid use of English with correct UK spelling, grammar and punctuation, using headings and subheadings as appropriate. (10%)

B to A- (65% to 79%)

1. a good understanding of the scope and rationale of the assignment but with some elements missing; (8%)
2. an introduction giving an overview of the approach to the task in hand but insufficiently comprehensive. (4%)
3. a body of evidence, evaluation and reasoned conclusion, for the most part coherently presented; (8%)
4. an engagement with the relevant primary sources but sometimes with shallow understanding and analysis; (8%)
5. a basic exploration of the underlying or tacit assumptions in the literature and other sources; (8%)
6. some awareness of the integration of theoria with praxis in the assignment task; (8%)
7. occasional original or insightful analysis of the topic but with often underdeveloped critical skills of evaluation; (12%)
8. an ability to come to a reasoned conclusion but based on an incomplete assessment of different points of view; (10%)
9. correctly cited sources, albeit narrow in range, referenced in footnotes (not inline to the text) and a fairly complete bibliography at the end of the assignment; (5%)
10. reasonably accurate command of written English with mostly correct UK spelling, grammar and punctuation; headings and subheadings sometimes lacking. (8%)

C to B- (50% to 64%)

1. a fair understanding of the scope and rationale of the assignment but too narrowly focussed and with content extraneous to the question; (7%)
2. a very basic introduction giving an overview of the task in hand but without much indication of the direction in which the work will proceed. (3%)
3. a narrowly conceived body of evidence, evaluation and reasoned conclusion, sometimes incoherently presented and without much structured argument; (7%)
4. some relevant primary sources cited but without much critical engagement; (6%)
5. a partial awareness only of the underlying or tacit assumptions in the literature and other sources leading to relatively uncritical conclusions; (7%)
6. theoria and praxis are present in the assignment task but poorly integrated; (6%)
7. some original or insightful analysis of the topic with very basic critical skills of evaluation in play; (10%)
8. a reasoned conclusion is present but difficult to identify clearly and somewhat lacking in a critical assessment of different points of view; (8%)
9. source material is limited albeit correctly referenced in footnotes (not inline to the text) and a modest bibliography at the end of the assignment; (4%)

10. the use of English is intelligible but often leaves a lot to be desired in terms of correct UK spelling, grammar, punctuation and the use of appropriate headings and subheadings. (6%)

FAIL (under 50%)

1. a poor understanding of the scope and rationale of the assignment; (6%)
2. little or no introduction given as an overview of the approach to the task in hand. (2%)
3. often statements are made without substantive justification from evidence. (6%)
4. critical skills are largely absent, and arguments, (such as they exist), are incoherently or inconsistently presented; (5%)
5. there is little to no exploration of the underlying or tacit assumptions in the literature and other sources; (6%)
6. a very poor presentation of either theoria or praxis in the assignment task; (5%)
7. there is almost no original thought or argumentation in the assignment; (7%)
8. statements are made as personal positions with little or no critical depth and awareness of other approaches; (6%)
9. sources are rarely correctly referenced in footnotes (or not at all) and the bibliography is stunted with little bearing on the question in hand. (3%)
10. the use of English is pedestrian, poorly expressed and littered with incorrect UK spelling, poor grammar and erratic or erroneous punctuation. Headings and subheadings have not been intelligently used (4%)

A student who fails an assignment may resit with the necessary support.

Archpriest Gregory Hallam, Dean of Studies

29 August 2026 / The Beheading of the Forerunner