

Digital edition: assessment criteria

Your project will be assessed on the following:

1. The edition, including:

- the website as a whole (navigation, looks, coherence, lack of technical issues)
- the 'reading text' (textual accuracy, readability, navigation)
- any contextual commentary and/or bibliographic analysis (depth, scope, relevance and focus, persuasiveness of arguments: see standard English Literature guidelines below).
- where relevant any encoding, e.g. rendered in TEI/XML (depth, consistency, adherence to standards).

2. The reflective essay:

- The persuasiveness of the rationale for this edition and the choice of your source (why this text? why this source or edition?)
- The ability to reflect on and rationalise the use of a digital platform (what are the arguments for, and perhaps against, digital editing?)
- The effective use of context: referring to digital humanities and the critical context of the specific text/author/topic/period/genre
- The ability to detail the work that has gone into creating the project, including the processes and the various decisions made.

These criteria will also be related to the English Literature general marking criteria (see below).

See also:

- 'GUIDELINES FOR NEW PROJECT,' *18thConnect*:
<http://www.18thconnect.org/about/scholarship/peer-review/>
- 'Creating and Documenting Electronic Texts. A Guide to Good Practice,' *Oxford Text Archive*:
<http://ota.ox.ac.uk/documents/creating/cdet/index.html>

Grade	Knowledge	Presentation/expression	Argument
1 Outstanding 80+ Exceptional 75 Excellent 70	Work that shows comprehensive knowledge of primary texts and their relevant context. This knowledge extends in some directions well beyond what is 'prescribed' by the module documentation, lectures and seminars.	Work that follows the appropriate academic conventions accurately. Its tone and register are flexible and well-judged, and it presents sophisticated and complex ideas confidently, clearly and engagingly.	Work whose argument is well-structured to reflect a process of thought and enquiry that combines into a whole to reach a conclusion that is persuasive and may be surprising. It shows ability to read and interpret primary sources sensitively and critically in order to develop its argument. It reads secondary sources sceptically and critically, entering debate with them and using them as a springboard to launch its own interpretations. It demonstrates a sophisticated critical interrogation of the assigned question/topic. Outstanding work will throw a new and original light on the issue/text(s) under discussion.
2.1 Very good 65+ Good 60+	Work that shows a good knowledge of the primary text(s) and the relevant context. It has a good foundation in the prescribed reading and builds on ideas put forward in lectures and seminars. It shows evidence of reading in relevant and worthwhile secondary sources.	Work that follows appropriate academic conventions well. It is fluently written and expresses arguments and ideas clearly in an appropriate academic register. It is properly paragraphed and integrates quotations correctly.	Work whose argument is well-structured and leads to a clear conclusion. It supports its argument with quotation and, where appropriate, close reading. It recognises the existence of alternative points of view and debates with and develops points made in secondary sources. It shows evidence of real critical engagement with texts.
2.2 Competent 55+ Acceptable 50+	Work that shows familiarity with the main features of the primary text(s). Refers to relevant secondary sources.	Work that follows academic conventions well and without systematic errors. It is clearly expressed and shows an intention to emulate an appropriate academic register. It is properly paragraphed. There may be weaknesses in expression and presentation.	Work that contains relevant but basic points that accumulate to reach a point of view about the question/topic. Its points are supported by quotation, but do not demonstrate a very penetrating critical response.
3 Poor 45+ Barely Competent 40+	Work that shows faulty and inaccurate knowledge of the primary text(s). Secondary sources are unreliable and of little or no academic value.	Academic conventions poorly observed. Difficulty in expressing ideas in an appropriate register. Frequent errors in punctuation and syntax. Quotations improperly integrated, leading to syntactic chaos.	Work that addresses the question/topic in an elementary way and with little understanding. Little or no relevant reference to the primary text(s) or supporting evidence from them.

<p>F Unacceptable 0 - 39</p> <p>[Work can also fail for rubric infringement, non-submission or submission after cut-off date or without an agreed extension, non-submission on Turnitin, or because of unfair practice.]</p>	<p>Work that shows little or no first hand knowledge of the texts and what has been argued about them by others.</p>	<p>Work that makes little attempt to observe the academic conventions for the type of assessment concerned. It shows a poor command of written English (syntax, register, punctuation and spelling) so that it fails to communicate effectively.</p>	<p>Work that has no structured argument and shows little evidence that the student can distinguish between points that are relevant and those that are irrelevant to the requirements of the assessment. It shows little or no understanding of how either primary or secondary texts should be used in constructing an argument.</p>
--	--	--	---