

	86 - 100	76 - 85	70 - 75	65 - 69	60 - 64	55 - 59	50 - 54
Evidence of fulfilment of all relevant learning outcomes	Overwhelming	Excellent and extensive	Excellent	Very good	Good	Sound	Sound, but with limitations
Response to the question / task	Comprehensive and relevant response	Extensive and relevant response	Excellent and relevant response	Very good and relevant response	Good and relevant response	Sound and mostly relevant response	Sound response but with some irrelevancies
Knowledge and understanding in resource and/or commentary – understanding of relevant subject matter	Comprehensive and exemplary grasp	Outstanding grasp	Excellent grasp	Good grasp	Sound grasp	Sound grasp, some shortcomings in coverage	General grasp with some errors or gaps
Argument and reasoning – clarity of thought, argument, analysis and use of evidence	Exemplary clarity of thought, argument and analysis and use of evidence	Outstanding clarity of thought, argument, analysis and use of evidence	Excellent clarity of thought, argument, analysis and use of evidence	Very good, with clear evidence of analytical thinking	Good, with evidence of analytical thinking	Adequate: some evidence of argument and analysis, but some weaknesses	Some evidence of argument and analysis but limited and inconsistent
Oral presentation – design of presentation including language, structure, tailoring to context, design of audiovisual or other media if appropriate	Exceptional design, superbly tailored to context	Outstanding design, very effectively tailored to context	Excellent design, effectively tailored to context	Very well designed	Well designed	Appropriately designed	Acceptably designed
Skills in the presentation: audibility, pace, timing, engagement with audience, use in practice of audiovisual or other media (as appropriate)	Exceptionally engaging and persuasive	Very engaging, extremely persuasive	Engaging, articulate	Very good, articulate	Good, and fluent	Sound, but some minor flaws	Acceptable, but some flaws
Written rationale/ commentary – reflection, integration of theory and practice	Exceptionally insightful integration, , imaginative and well informed	Exceptional integration, creative and well informed	Excellent integration, creative, and well informed	Very good and well informed integration	Good and informed integration	Sound and informed integration	Sound integration but patchy and occasionally uninformed
Presentation of commentary: clarity, organisation, language and style, referencing	Lucid and exemplary presentation	Fluent and outstanding presentation	Excellent, clear presentation	Very good, clear presentation	Good, clear presentation	Adequate presentation	Adequate presentation but some flaws
Overall impression	Exemplary	Outstanding	Excellent	Very good	Good	Sound	Fair

	45 – 49	40 - 44	35 - 39	30 - 34	10 - 29	0 - 9
Evidence of fulfilment of all relevant learning outcomes	Sufficient but restricted	Just sufficient	Nearly sufficient	Insufficient, but much is covered	Clearly insufficient	None or minimal
Response to the question / task	Sufficient but restricted response	Barely sufficient response	Nearly a sufficient response	Insufficient response	Little response	No response
Knowledge and understanding in resource and/or commentary – understanding of relevant subject matter	Some grasp but many errors and/or gaps in coverage and relevance	Some general understanding but many errors, omissions and misunderstandings	Little grasp with a multitude of errors, misunderstandings and omissions	Barely relevant, largely erroneous	Negligible grasp or relevance with erroneous material	No grasp
Argument and reasoning – clarity of thought, argument, analysis and use of evidence	Some analysis and relevance, but limited	Some analysis and relevance, but very limited	Very little argument or evidence	Minimal argument unsupported by evidence	Incoherent, inaccurate and/or inappropriate	No discernible argument or analysis
Oral presentation – design of presentation including language structure, tailoring to context, design of audiovisual or other media if appropriate	Some acceptable design, structure and tailoring to context, but significant weaknesses	Some acceptable design, structure and tailoring to context, but generally poor	Poor – lack of adequate design	Very poorly designed	Thoroughly inadequate design, indifferent to context	Barely comprehensible, no connection to context
Skills in the presentation: audibility, pace, timing, engagement with audience, use in practice of audiovisual or other media as appropriate	Adequate, generally comprehensible, but weak	Just adequate and comprehensible, but very weak	Inadequate	Inadequate and shoddy	Inadequate in every respect	Barely comprehensible
Written rationale/ commentary – reflection, integration of theory and practice	Patchy integration - some relevant reflection but limited	Just adequate integration – limited evidence of relevant reflection	Inadequate integration – little evidence of relevant reflection	Inadequate integration – very little evidence of relevant reflection	Minimal integration	No integration
Presentation of commentary: clarity, organisation, language and style, referencing	Basically acceptable presentation, but with flaws	Just acceptable presentation, but a number of flaws	Poor presentation	A multitude of flaws in presentation	Unacceptable presentation; largely incomprehensible	Insufficient evidence
Overall impression	Weak	Very weak	Poor	Very poor	Unacceptable	Unacceptable

COMMON AWARDS ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AT LEVEL 5

ORAL PRESENTATIONS AND COMMENTARY

	86 - 100	76 - 85	70 - 75	65 - 69	60 - 64	55 - 59	50 - 54
Evidence of fulfilment of all relevant learning outcomes	Overwhelming	Excellent and extensive	Excellent	Very good	Good	Sound	Sound, but with limitations
Response to the question / task	Comprehensive and relevant response	Extensive and relevant response	Excellent and relevant response	Very good and relevant response	Good and relevant response	Sound and mostly relevant response	Sound response but with some irrelevancies
Knowledge and understanding in resource and/or commentary – understanding of relevant subject matter	Comprehensive, insightful and exemplary grasp	Outstanding and insightful grasp	Excellent grasp	Good grasp	Sound grasp	Sound grasp, some shortcomings in coverage	General grasp with some errors or gaps
Argument and reasoning – clarity of thought, argument, analysis and use of evidence	Exemplary clarity and independence of thought; exemplary argument and analysis and use of evidence	Outstanding clarity and independence of thought; outstanding argument, analysis and use of evidence; evidence of critical judgement	Excellent clarity of thought, argument, analysis and use of evidence; evidence of critical judgement	Very good, with clear evidence of critical analysis	Good, with evidence of critical analysis	Adequate: some evidence of argument and analysis, but some weaknesses	Some evidence of argument and analysis but limited and inconsistent
Oral presentation – design of presentation including language, structure, tailoring to context, design of audiovisual or other media if appropriate	Exceptional design, superbly tailored to context	Outstanding design, very effectively tailored to context	Excellent design, effectively tailored to context	Very well designed	Well designed	Appropriately designed	Acceptably designed
Skills in the presentation: audibility, pace, timing, engagement with audience, use in practice of audiovisual or other media (as appropriate)	Exceptionally engaging and, persuasive	Very engaging, extremely persuasive	Engaging, articulate	Very good, articulate	Good, and fluent	Sound, but some minor flaws	Acceptable, but some flaws
Written rationale/ commentary – reflection, integration of theory and practice	Exceptionally insightful integration, independently conceived, imaginative and well informed	Exceptional integration, independently conceived, creative and well informed	Excellent integration, creative, and well informed	Very good and well informed integration	Good and informed integration	Sound and informed integration	Sound integration but patchy and occasionally uninformed
Presentation of commentary: clarity, organisation, language and style, referencing	Lucid and exemplary presentation	Fluent and outstanding presentation	Excellent, clear presentation	Very good, clear presentation	Good, clear presentation	Adequate presentation	Adequate presentation but some flaws
Overall impression	Exemplary	Outstanding	Excellent	Very good	Good	Sound	Fair

	45 – 49	40 - 44	35 - 39	30 - 34	10 - 29	0 - 9
Evidence of fulfilment of all relevant learning outcomes	Sufficient but restricted	Just sufficient	Nearly sufficient	Insufficient, but much is covered	Clearly insufficient	None or minimal
Response to the question / task	Sufficient but restricted response	Barely sufficient response	Nearly a sufficient response	Insufficient response	Little response	No response
Knowledge and understanding in resource and/or commentary – understanding of relevant subject matter	Some grasp but many errors and/or gaps in coverage and relevance	Some general understanding but many errors, omissions and misunderstandings	Little grasp with a multitude of errors, misunderstandings and omissions	Barely relevant, largely erroneous	Negligible grasp or relevance with erroneous material	No grasp
Argument and reasoning – clarity of thought, argument, analysis and use of evidence	Some analysis and relevance, but limited	Some analysis and relevance, but very limited	Very little argument or evidence	Minimal argument unsupported by evidence	Incoherent, inaccurate and/or inappropriate	No discernible argument or analysis
Oral presentation – design of presentation including language structure, tailoring to context, design of audiovisual or other media if appropriate	Some acceptable design, structure and tailoring to context, but significant weaknesses	Some acceptable design, structure and tailoring to context, but generally poor	Poor – lack of adequate design	Very poorly designed	Thoroughly inadequate design, indifferent to context	Barely comprehensible, no connection to context
Skills in the presentation: audibility, pace, timing, engagement with audience, use in practice of audiovisual or other media as appropriate	Adequate, generally comprehensible, but weak	Just adequate and comprehensible, but very weak	Inadequate	Inadequate and shoddy	Inadequate in every respect	Barely comprehensible
Written rationale/ commentary – reflection, integration of theory and practice	Patchy integration - some relevant reflection but limited	Just adequate integration – limited evidence of relevant reflection	Inadequate integration – little evidence of relevant reflection	Inadequate integration – very little evidence of relevant reflection	Minimal integration	No integration
Presentation of commentary: clarity, organisation, language and style, referencing	Basically acceptable presentation, but with flaws	Just acceptable presentation, but a number of flaws	Poor presentation	A multitude of flaws in presentation	Unacceptable presentation; largely incomprehensible	Insufficient evidence
Overall impression	Weak	Very weak	Poor	Very poor	Unacceptable	Unacceptable

COMMON AWARDS ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AT LEVEL 6

ORAL PRESENTATIONS AND COMMENTARY

	86 - 100	76 - 85	70 - 75	65 - 69	60 - 64	55 - 59	50 - 54
Evidence of fulfilment of all relevant learning outcomes	Overwhelming	Excellent and extensive	Excellent	Very good	Good	Sound	Sound, but with limitations
Response to the question / task	Comprehensive and relevant response	Extensive and relevant response	Excellent and relevant response	Very good and relevant response	Good and relevant response	Sound and mostly relevant response	Sound response but with some irrelevancies
Knowledge and understanding in resource and/or commentary – understanding of relevant subject matter	Comprehensive, sophisticated and exemplary grasp	Outstanding and insightful grasp	Excellent grasp	Good grasp	Sound grasp	Sound grasp, some shortcomings in coverage	General grasp with some errors or gaps
Argument and reasoning – clarity of thought, argument, analysis and use of evidence	Exemplary clarity, independence and originality of thought; exemplary argument and analysis and use of evidence	Outstanding clarity and independence of thought; outstanding argument, analysis and use of evidence; evidence of critical judgement	Excellent clarity of thought, argument, analysis and use of evidence; evidence of critical judgement	Very good, with clear evidence of critical analysis	Good, with evidence of critical analysis	Adequate: some evidence of argument and analysis, but some weaknesses	Some evidence of argument and analysis but limited and inconsistent
Oral presentation – design of presentation including language, structure, tailoring to context, design of audiovisual or other media if appropriate	Exceptional design, superbly tailored to context	Outstanding design, very effectively tailored to context	Excellent design, effectively tailored to context	Very well designed	Well designed	Appropriately designed	Acceptably designed
Skills in the presentation: audibility, pace, timing, engagement with audience, use in practice of audiovisual or other media (as appropriate)	Exceptionally engaging and, persuasive	Very engaging, extremely persuasive	Engaging, articulate	Very good, articulate	Good, and fluent	Sound, but some minor flaws	Acceptable, but some flaws
Written rationale/ commentary – reflection, integration of theory and practice	Exceptionally insightful integration, independently conceived, imaginative and well informed	Exceptional integration, independently conceived, creative and well informed	Excellent integration, creative, and well informed	Very good and well informed integration	Good and informed integration	Sound and informed integration	Sound integration but patchy and occasionally uninformed
Presentation of commentary: clarity, organisation, language and style, referencing	Lucid and exemplary presentation	Fluent and outstanding presentation	Excellent, clear presentation	Very good, clear presentation	Good, clear presentation	Adequate presentation	Adequate presentation but some flaws
Overall impression	Exemplary	Outstanding	Excellent	Very good	Good	Sound	Fair

	45 – 49	40 - 44	35 - 39	30 - 34	10 - 29	0 - 9
Evidence of fulfilment of all relevant learning outcomes	Sufficient but restricted	Just sufficient	Nearly sufficient	Insufficient, but much is covered	Clearly insufficient	None or minimal
Response to the question / task	Sufficient but restricted response	Barely sufficient response	Nearly a sufficient response	Insufficient response	Little response	No response
Knowledge and understanding in resource and/or commentary – understanding of relevant subject matter	Some grasp but many errors and/or gaps in coverage and relevance	Some general understanding but many errors, omissions and misunderstandings	Little grasp with a multitude of errors, misunderstandings and omissions	Barely relevant, largely erroneous	Negligible grasp or relevance with erroneous material	No grasp
Argument and reasoning – clarity of thought, argument, analysis and use of evidence	Some analysis and relevance, but limited	Some analysis and relevance, but very limited	Very little argument or evidence	Minimal argument unsupported by evidence	Incoherent, inaccurate and/or inappropriate	No discernible argument or analysis
Oral presentation – design of presentation including language structure, tailoring to context, design of audiovisual or other media if appropriate	Some acceptable design, structure and tailoring to context, but significant weaknesses	Some acceptable design, structure and tailoring to context, but generally poor	Poor – lack of adequate design	Very poorly designed	Thoroughly inadequate design, indifferent to context	Barely comprehensible, no connection to context
Skills in the presentation: audibility, pace, timing, engagement with audience, use in practice of audiovisual or other media as appropriate	Adequate, generally comprehensible, but weak	Just adequate and comprehensible, but very weak	Inadequate	Inadequate and shoddy	Inadequate in every respect	Barely comprehensible
Written rationale/ commentary – reflection, integration of theory and practice	Patchy integration - some relevant reflection but limited	Just adequate integration – limited evidence of relevant reflection	Inadequate integration – little evidence of relevant reflection	Inadequate integration – very little evidence of relevant reflection	Minimal integration	No integration
Presentation of commentary: clarity, organisation, language and style, referencing	Basically acceptable presentation, but with flaws	Just acceptable presentation, but a number of flaws	Poor presentation	A multitude of flaws in presentation	Unacceptable presentation; largely incomprehensible	Insufficient evidence
Overall impression	Weak	Very weak	Poor	Very poor	Unacceptable	Unacceptable

COMMON AWARDS ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AT LEVEL 7

ORAL PRESENTATION AND COMMENTARY

	86 - 100	76 - 85	70 - 75	65 - 69	60 – 64	55 - 59
Evidence of fulfilment of all relevant learning outcomes	Fully satisfied at a consistently high level	Amply satisfied at a high level	Satisfied, many at a high level	Satisfied, some at a high level	Satisfied, many are more than satisfied	Satisfied, some are more than satisfied
Response to the question / task	Comprehensive grasp and original, clear approach	Comprehensive grasp, imaginative approach	Comprehensive grasp and clear approach	Very good grasp	Good grasp	Sound grasp
Knowledge and understanding in presentation and/or commentary – thorough understanding of relevant subject matter	Exemplary depth and breadth of understanding; good engagement with 1 ^o and 2 ^o sources, at forefront of research	Outstanding depth and breadth of understanding; good engagement with 1 ^o and 2 ^o sources, at forefront of research	Excellent depth and breadth of understanding; good engagement with 1 ^o and 2 ^o sources, at forefront of research	Very good depth and breadth of understanding; clear engagement with sources, some at forefront of research	Good depth and breadth of understanding; clear engagement with sources, some at forefront of research	Adequate depth and breadth of understanding; some engagement with key sources, a few at forefront of research
Argument and reasoning in presentation and/or commentary– clarity of thought, argument, analysis and use of evidence	Exceptional analysis and synthesis; creative, insightful and original, with critical depth	Excellent, insightful analysis and synthesis; insightful and original with critical depth	Excellent independent analysis and synthesis; high accuracy and good critical depth	Very good ability to analyse, argue, synthesise information with critical insight	Good ability to analyse, argue, synthesise with some critical insight	Reasonable ability to analyse, argue and synthesise, with some but limited critical insight
Oral presentation – design of presentation including language, structure, tailoring to context, design of audiovisual or other media if appropriate	Exemplary and creative design and tailoring to context	Outstanding and insightful design and tailoring to context	Excellent design and tailoring to context	Very good design, tailored to the context	Good design, tailored to the context	Acceptable design and tailoring to the context
Skills in the presentation: audibility, pace, timing, engagement with audience, use in practice of audiovisual or other media (as appropriate)	Exceptionally engaging and persuasive, highly eloquent	Very engaging, eloquent, extremely persuasive,	Engaging, articulate, persuasive	Very good, articulate	Good and fluent	Adequate, but some minor flaws
Commentary – ability to integrate subject and context	Exceptionally insightful integration, significant and informed by recent scholarship	Exceptional integration, significant and informed by recent scholarship	Excellent integration, informed by some recent scholarship	Very good integration, informed by some recent scholarship	Good integration, with some reference to recent scholarship	Sound integration
Presentation of commentary: clarity, organisation, language and style, referencing	Highest professional standards; lucid, fluent, imaginative and compelling language and style	Professional standards; lucid, fluent and compelling language and style	Very good standards of presentation and organisation; clear and fluent language and style	Well presented and organised; very good and clear use of language	Clear presentation, organisation, style and use of language	Adequate presentation, organization and style
Overall impression	Exemplary	Outstanding	Excellent	Very good	Good	Acceptable

	50 – 54	40 – 49	30 - 39	20 - 29	10 - 19	0 – 9
Evidence of fulfilment of all relevant learning outcomes	Satisfied	Some are satisfied	Few are satisfied	Few, if any, are satisfied	Very few, if any, are satisfied	None are satisfied
Response to the question / task	Limited grasp	Inadequate grasp	Confused response only partly relevant	Little relevance to question / task	Barely discernible relevance	No discernible relevance
Knowledge and understanding in presentation and/or commentary – thorough understanding of relevant subject matter	Adequate breadth and depth of understanding but some gaps; some engagement with key sources	Some grasp of field but patchy and inadequate	Partial and inadequate grasp of field	Severely limited grasp of field	Barely discernible grasp of field	No grasp of field
Argument and reasoning in presentation and/or commentary– clarity of thought, argument, analysis and use of evidence	Some but limited ability to analyse, argue and synthesise, not consistently maintained; some but limited critical insight	Some analysis and argument but significantly limited; mostly descriptive; little critical evaluation; inaccuracies	Almost entirely descriptive, clear inaccuracies, lack of understanding	Lack of clarity, inaccuracies, little understanding	Meaning often unclear, very little understanding	No critical thinking or understanding
Oral presentation – design of presentation including language, structure, tailoring to context, design of audiovisual or other media if appropriate	Broadly adequate design with some tailoring to the context but limitations	Evidence of design but inadequate with clear weaknesses	Poor design, unsound	Very poor design, often inappropriate	Minimal evidence of appropriate design	No apparent design
Skills in the presentation: audibility, pace, timing, engagement with audience, use in practice of audiovisual or other media (as appropriate)	Broadly acceptable, but some flaws	Inadequate - generally comprehensible but some significant flaws.	Inadequate - generally poor with significant flaws	Consistently very poor with many flaws	Barely comprehensible	Incomprehensible
Commentary – ability to integrate subject and context	Adequate integration but some inaccuracies	Little integration, poorly informed, lacking authenticity	Very little integration, unsound	Minimal integration, often inappropriate	No persuasive integration	No integration
Presentation of commentary: clarity, organisation, language and style, referencing	Adequate presentation but with some flaws	Inadequate presentation, generally poor with some significant flaws	Consistently poor presentation with significant flaws	Very poor presentation with many flaws	Very poor presentation with a multitude of flaws	Unacceptable presentation; omissions, errors, irrelevant sources
Overall impression	Adequate	Inadequate on balance	Inadequate	Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Abysmal