

Words for Writing Assessment Criteria

The following two tables suggest useful adjectives you can use when writing assessment criteria. They are indicative and you may wish to develop your own taxonomy based upon good practice in your subject group.

Adjectives for use in rubric descriptors - Manchester Metropolitan University

The table of adjectives is intended to provide an indication of the language commonly used to differentiate performance across a level.

Mark Range	Descriptors
0%-19%	Absent/none, lacking, formless, detrimental
20%-34%	Erroneous/wrong, missing, extremely limited, inappropriate, insufficient, incoherent, unstructured
35%-39%	Incomplete, inadequate, inconsistent, derivative, contradictory, superficial, irrelevant, limited
40%-49%	Satisfactory, sufficient, adequate, descriptive,
50%-59%	Clear, confident, consistent, thoughtful, accurate, careful, congruent, coherent
60%-69%	Fluent, thorough, analytical, precise, rigorous
70%-85%	Persuasive, sophisticated, original, reflective, ambitious, meticulous, critical, convincing, unexpected
86%-100%	Creative, insightful, illuminating, inspiring, exciting, authoritative

Examples to be used, or avoided, according to marking range - University of Manchester

Range	Use	Avoid
0-9	Profoundly inadequate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Highly Deficient 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wrong ▪ Rubbish ▪ Weak ▪ Poor
10-19	Severely inadequate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Very Deficient ▪ Incomplete 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wrong ▪ Rubbish ▪ Weak ▪ Poor
20-29	Inadequate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Deficient ▪ Some attempt ▪ Confused 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wrong ▪ Rubbish ▪ Weak ▪ Poor
30-39	Insufficient <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Partial ▪ Some awareness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wrong ▪ Rubbish ▪ Weak ▪ Poor
40-49	Sufficient <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adequate ▪ Basic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Weak ▪ Poor
50-59	Good <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clear ▪ Fair ▪ Competent ▪ Reasonable ▪ Coherent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Very Good ▪ Excellent ▪ Adequate ▪ Moderate ▪ Descriptive ▪ Basic
60-69	Very Good <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sound ▪ Effective 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good ▪ Excellent ▪ Outstanding ▪ Authoritative
70-79	Excellent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Detailed ▪ Compelling ▪ Lucid 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Accurate ▪ Good ▪ Very Good ▪ Outstanding ▪ Authoritative
80-89	Outstanding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sophisticated ▪ Innovative ▪ Insightful ▪ Ambitious ▪ Perceptive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good ▪ Very Good ▪ Excellent ▪ Comprehensive

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advanced 	
90-100	<p>Exceptional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Authoritative ▪ Very Advanced 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good ▪ Very Good ▪ Excellent ▪ Perfect ▪ Flawless ▪ Publishable ▪ Complete

References

Manchester Metropolitan University (n.d.). 'Appendix 2: reference list of descriptive terms'. Policies and Procedures for the Management of Assessment, Assessment Grading, Criteria and Marking. Online at:

https://www.mmu.ac.uk/academic/casqe/regulations/docs/assessment_procedures.pdf

University of Manchester (2018). 'Framework for the design and use of grade descriptors'. Online at: <http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=28916>