Grade Description Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alpha grade range</th>
<th>Grade point range</th>
<th>Marks range (%)</th>
<th>Brief description</th>
<th>Detailed description of student performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A- to A+          | 3.7 to 4.0       | 85 to 100       | Superior performance, demonstrating superior understanding of the subject matter and use of the concepts. Relatively sophisticated. | A mark within this range may be identified, to a greater or lesser extent, by the:  
  • lucid introduction and conclusions which clearly integrate with the argument and evidence submitted;  
  • very high standard of written and/or statistical analysis;  
  • use of creative examples and reference to possible extensions and applications of theory;  
  • extensive empirical detail used to support the overall argument;  
  • originality of thought; and  
  • critical evaluation of controversies in the literature and the different interpretations of reality, making defensible generalisations and showing awareness of limitations. |
| B- to B+          | 2.5 to 3.6       | 73 to 84        | High performance, | A mark within this range may be identified, to a greater of |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Student Orientation Programme</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segment</td>
<td>Learning with GlobalNxt University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| C- to C+ | 1.7 to 2.4 | 65 to 72 | demonstrating good understanding of the subject matter and use of the concepts. | lesser extent, by:  
- a convincing and generally well-structured argument throughout the work;  
- a generally high standard of written and/or statistical analysis;  
- the inclusion of empirical data that supports the overall argument in some way; and  
- a good, but not extensive appreciation of the controversies in the literature, providing some evidence of critical thinking. |

| C- to C+ | 1.7 to 2.4 | 65 to 72 | Nominally adequate performance, demonstrating an understanding of the subject matter and ability to handle relatively simple problems. | A mark within this range may be identified, to a greater of lesser extent, by:  
- a sometimes clear, but generally *ad hoc* argument;  
- written and/or graphical analysis of a reasonable standard but typically *restating* rather than evaluating;  
- demonstrates some understanding of concepts, theories and issues;  
- no (or limited) reference to controversies in the literature, with discussion not straying too far from the text/courseware;  
- argument that contains unsubstantiated statements and/or includes emotive argument lacking in perspective; and  
- haphazard referencing. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Minimum Mark</th>
<th>Maximum Mark</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| D to D+ | 1.0 to 1.6   | 50 to 64     | Minimally acceptable performance, demonstrating partial familiarity with the subject matter and some capacity to handle relatively simple problems. | A mark within this range may be identified, to a greater or lesser extent, by:  
  - argument(s) poorly thought out and lacking in academic orientation;  
  - written and/or graphical analysis that is sometimes difficult to follow;  
  - the inclusion of several statements which are not adequately supported by empirical data, example or reasoning;  
  - referencing that does not conform to any internationally recognized convention. |
| F     | 0.0          | < 50         | Unacceptable performance. Fail.                                                               | A mark within this range may be identified by its very poor quality. Specific problems include failure to:  
  - understand the question;  
  - identify the problem or issues;  
  - demonstrate basic understanding of theory and concepts;  
  - provide any evidence of having covered the key readings; or write according to the normal conventions with respect to language use, grammar and referencing. |