

SENATE MARKING SCALE (MASTERS LEVEL): ORAL PRESENTATIONS

	Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentational standard	Projection, language and spoken English	Argument & understanding	Organisation & structure	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence
Distinction	90-100% Distinction (Upper Range)	Significant learning outcomes are met at an exemplary standard showing creativity, inventiveness, independence of judgement and consistent evidence of originality of thought and expression. Demonstrates an exemplary understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains the highest standards of scholarship that can be expected of a Masters level presentation.	Exemplary oral presentation: exceptionally clear, logical, imaginative, creative and original. Almost flawless in delivery. Exemplary use of visual aids (slides, hand-outs etc). Conveys even the most difficult/complex issues clearly and concisely. Exemplary in terms of audience engagement. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level presentation. In the case of group presentation: Exemplary level of planning, choreography and group-level coordination.	Exemplary standard of spoken English and diverse vocabulary. Exemplary use of discipline-specific terminology and/or technical language. Exemplary voice projection and body language/eye contact. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level presentation.	Highly effective arguments, demonstrating exemplary, deeply impressive understanding of the theoretical or empirical aspects of the topic and associated issues/debates. Addresses all aspects of the assignment to exemplary standard. Key points are rigorously argued and convincingly presented with exemplary use of supporting evidence. Questions handled with impressive 'aplomb'. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level presentation.	Exemplary structure with clear, logical progression. Organisation exemplary. Presentation has razor-sharp focus and sense of purpose. Time management excellent. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level presentation.	Presentation demonstrates exemplary standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Exemplary in its use of ideas, concepts and theory. Exemplary analysis of data. Exemplary level of self-reflection. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level presentation.	Exemplary use of sources/case studies and/or evidence. Demonstrates deeply impressive command of data or literature, drawing on an exemplary range of material/evidence and/or examining the topic in considerable detail. Demonstrates an exemplary sensitivity to the limits/limitations of evidence. Conforms to the highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a Masters level presentation.
Distinction	80-89% Distinction (Middle Range)	Significant learning outcomes have been fully met to a very high standard. The presentation shows clear signs of perceptiveness and some originality of thought and expression. Demonstrates a strong understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a very high level of scholarship, though small potential improvements can be readily identified.	A very high standard of presentation: clear, logical and few errors. The delivery, whilst not exemplary, is lively, with excellent use of visual aids (if appropriate) and some evidence of practice and choreography. Encouraged group participation and discussion. In the case of group presentation: Very high level of planning, choreography and group-level coordination.	A very high standard of spoken English. Very good breadth of vocabulary. Very good use of discipline-specific terminology. Good voice projection and eye contact/use of body language.	Coherent, articulate and resourcefully constructed arguments, demonstrating a very high level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Has addressed most or all aspects of the assignment to a very high standard. Questions handled very well and with ease.	Structure clear and well-suited to topic. Whilst not entirely without flaws, there is evidence of careful planning and attention to detail. Logical progression. Time management very good.	Presentation demonstrates a very high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts and theory to good effect. Very high level of self-reflection.	Presentation demonstrates a very strong command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail. Also demonstrates a very high level of awareness of, and sensitivity to, the limits of evidence.
Distinction	70-79% Distinction	Significant learning outcomes have been fully met to a high standard. Demonstrates a strong understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains an impressive level of scholarship, though there may be scope for improvement in a number of areas.	A high standard of presentation: clear, logical and few errors.	A high standard of spoken English. Good breadth of vocabulary. Good use of discipline-specific terminology. Good voice projection and eye contact/use of body language.	Coherent and articulate arguments, demonstrating a high level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Has addressed most or all aspects of the presentation topic to a high standard. Questions handled very well.	Structure clear and well-suited to topic. Whilst there is evidence of careful planning and attention to detail, there is some scope for refinement. Logical progression. Time management good.	Presentation demonstrates a high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts and theory to good effect. High level of self-reflection.	Presentation demonstrates a strong command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail. The presentation shows awareness of, the limits/limitations of evidence.

SENATE MARKING SCALE (MASTERS LEVEL): ORAL PRESENTATIONS

	Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentational standard	Projection, language and spoken English	Argument & understanding	Organisation & structure	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence
Merit	65-69% High Merit	Significant learning outcomes have been met to a good standard. Demonstrates a good understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a good level of scholarship, but lacks sophistication of distinction.	A good standard of presentation: clear, mostly logical, and errors are mostly very minor.	A good standard of spoken English and vocabulary. Good use of disciplinary terminology and language. Voice projection and eye contact/body language are better than average, though some room for improvement.	The presentation shows a good grasp of the subject and contains evidence of insight. Though it may lack finesse, it is thorough, clear and shows an understanding of the subject/topic. Has addressed most or all aspects of the presentation topic. Lacks intellectual independence required for a distinction. Questions handled well most of the time.	Structure clear and there is logical progression. Whilst the presentation shows evidence of care in its planning, needs more careful 'honing', and clearer focus.	Presentation contains some good examples of critical analysis but limited originality and creativity in use of ideas, concepts, case studies etc. Good level of self-reflection though some scope for development.	Presentation draws on a good range of material but lacks breadth of engagement with the secondary literature required for a distinction. Judicious use of sources and evidence appropriate to the discipline. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Partial awareness of the limits of evidence.
Merit	60-64% Merit	Significant learning outcomes have been met, mostly to a good standard. Demonstrates understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a good level of scholarship and demonstrates clear evidence of engagement in the discipline that lifts it above the merely 'competent'. Exceeds the requirements of a Pass.	A good standard of presentation: clear, mostly logical, and errors are mostly very minor. There may be occasional and relatively minor flaws in structure.	A good standard of spoken English and vocabulary. Good use of disciplinary terminology and language. Voice projection and eye contact/body language are better than average, though some room for improvement.	The presentation contains evidence of insight. Though it may lack finesse, it is thorough, clear and shows an understanding of the subject context. Has addressed most or all aspects of the presentation topic. Capable of responding to most questions in a competent manner.	Structure mostly clear and there is, for the most part, a logical progression. Whilst the presentation shows evidence of care in its planning, needs more careful 'honing', and a clearer focus. Falls some way short of the standard required for a distinction.	Presentation contains some good examples of critical analysis but limited originality and creativity in use of ideas, concepts, case studies etc. Good level of self-reflection, but plenty of scope for development.	The student draws on a good range of material but lacks breadth of engagement with the secondary literature. Mostly good use of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Partial awareness of the limits of evidence.
Pass	55-59% Pass	Significant learning outcomes have been met satisfactorily. Some may have been met to a good standard. Demonstrates a satisfactory understanding of the subject and some understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Standard of scholarship likely to be undermined by poor linkage of issues/themes, poor use of evidence, unsubstantiated claims.	A competent standard achieved: mostly clear, some evidence of logical progression. Some minor inaccuracies. There may be a number of flaws in structure, some of them serious.	Satisfactory standard of spoken English and vocabulary. Some discipline-specific terminology and language are used, mostly accurately. Voice projection/eye contact/body language are no more than satisfactory.	Competent work, with evidence of engagement in the relevant issues, but little originality and only occasional insight. Gaps in understanding and knowledge; may not have addressed all aspects of the presentation topic. Responses to questions very variable, struggled with some.	Generally accurate and relevant but some gaps and or irrelevant material. Not always clear or logical.	Presentation is attentive to subject matter and/or task set, but balanced more towards a descriptive rather than a critical, analytical treatment.	Draws on a satisfactory range of sources. Some assessment of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Some use of examples. Treatment of data or literature is basically sound but too narrow in scope and underdeveloped. Understanding of the limits of evidence not fully articulated or understood.

SENATE MARKING SCALE (MASTERS LEVEL): ORAL PRESENTATIONS

	Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentational standard	Projection, language and spoken English	Argument & understanding	Organisation & structure	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence
Pass	50-54% Pass	Significant learning outcomes have been met satisfactorily. Demonstrates a barely satisfactory understanding of the subject. Some understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards, but falls well short of the standard required for a Merit. Standard of scholarship likely to be undermined by poor linkage of issues/themes, poor use of evidence, unsubstantiated claims etc. Overall conception lacks ambition. A narrow pass in which there is plenty of scope for improvement.	A barely satisfactory standard achieved. Mostly clear, some evidence of logical progression. Some more significant inaccuracies. There may be a number of flaws in structure, some of them of a more fundamental nature. A narrow pass.	Standard of spoken English and vocabulary is adequate for a pass. Use of discipline-specific terminology and language lacks precision and may be flawed. Use of voice projection and eye contact/use of body language are poor - considerable scope for improvement.	Work shows some evidence of engagement in the relevant issues, but may be rather crude in its interpretation and argumentative purpose/focus. Little originality and only occasional insight. Gaps in understanding and knowledge; may not have addressed all aspects of the presentation topic. A narrow pass. Answered most questions but some responses not convincing.	Material fairly disorganised with poor sense of 'mission' or key points the student wished to convey. A narrow pass.	Work is attentive to the subject matter and/or task set but is mostly descriptive rather critical or analytical. It may contain some useful observations, but insights offered are very limited in scope and sophistication. A narrow pass.	Barely satisfactory range of sources. Some assessment of evidence, but the latter may be simplistic and partial. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Some use of examples, but not necessarily well-chosen or employed. Treatment of data or literature is basically sound but too narrow in scope and underdeveloped. Some evidence of the limits of evidence, but these may not always be properly articulated or understood. A narrow pass.
Work representing unsafe practice in professional Schools will be marked as a fail.								
Fail	40-49% Fail	Presentation fails to demonstrate achievement of the learning outcomes. Some understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is present but lacks the sophistication required for a Pass. Standard of scholarship undermined by poorly constructed ideas, arguments, use of evidence, partial response to the question etc. There may be some evidence of reflection but it is partial and lacks insight expected at Masters level.	Presentation fails to meet the presentational standard required for a Pass at Masters level. Some errors may be of a more serious nature. Work rushed to completion.	Standard of spoken English and vocabulary falls below the standard required for a pass. Use of discipline-specific terminology and language is inaccurate. Voice projection and use of body language are poor. The student should consider seeking additional support in the development of their spoken English. Fails to achieve the standard required of a Pass at Masters level.	Presentation shows some understanding of the topic and some relevant knowledge, but its treatment is basic, unimaginative and superficial and construction of arguments lacks the sophistication required of a Pass at Masters level. Grasp of key concepts is weak. Arguments employed are poorly evidenced and/or contain flaws. Very few convincing answers to questions. Fails to achieve the standard required of a Pass at Masters level.	The presentation is badly prepared. Structurally weak, muddled, lacking incoherence. Little sense of focus or sense of 'mission'. Fails to achieve the standard required of a Pass at Masters level.	Range of data and/or literature employed is very limited and too narrow. Over-reliance on material provided on Blackboard or in lectures/seminars. Fails to achieve the standard required of a Pass at Masters level.	Draws on a limited range of sources. Little attempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided but are poorly chosen or employed. Lacking in sophistication or finesse. The presentation reflects a limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence/ability in the use of evidence. Limits of evidence very poorly articulated or understood. Presentation lacks the evidential base required for a Pass at Masters level.

SENATE MARKING SCALE (MASTERS LEVEL): ORAL PRESENTATIONS

	Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentational standard	Projection, language and spoken English	Argument & understanding	Organisation & structure	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence
Fail	30-39% Fail	Insufficient demonstration of learning outcomes to justify a pass grade. Understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is not sufficient for a Pass. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in several areas. Limited evidence of reflection.	Poor standard, lacking sufficient clarity, and a logical progression, with serious errors/inaccuracies.	Standard of spoken English and vocabulary falls below the standard required for a pass. Use of discipline-specific terminology and language is inaccurate. Voice projection and use of body language are poor. The student should seek additional support in the development of their spoken English.	The presentation contains some material of merit, but it is only a partial attempt to address the key issues, with a lack of robustness and with few (and mostly unsuccessful) attempts to construct argument(s). Poor understanding of key issues or concepts. Almost no convincing answers to questions.	Mostly disorganised and incoherent. No obvious or apparent focus or sense of 'mission'.	The treatment is mostly descriptive. Whilst the work contains some evidence of criticality or analysis, it is too limited or partial or lacking in depth to justify a pass at Masters level.	Draws on a very limited range of sources. No real attempt to assess evidence. Examples are occasionally provided but are poorly chosen and employed. The presentation reflects a very limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence/ability in the choice and use of evidence.
Fail	20-29% Fail	One or two learning outcomes have been met in a limited way. Understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is considerably below that required for a pass. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in many areas. Very limited evidence of reflection.	Very poor standard of presentation, lacking sufficient clarity, and a sufficiently logical progression, with many serious inaccuracies.	Standard of spoken English and vocabulary is very poor. Use of discipline-specific terminology and language is inaccurate. No awareness of voice projection and body language. The student should seek additional support in the development of their spoken English.	Little material of merit or relevance, revealing a paucity of understanding of key issues or concepts. Fails to address most aspects of the task set or the topic of the presentation. Presentation lacks any focused or sustained argument(s). Answers to questions mostly superficial.	Very disorganised and mostly incoherent. No obvious or apparent focus or sense of 'mission'. Very little evidence of planning in advance.	The treatment is almost wholly descriptive. Contains little evidence of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic.	Draws on minimal range of sources. Rarely goes beyond paraphrasing bits of lecture notes or easily accessible web sources. No attempt to assess evidence. Examples are very rarely provided and those that are very poorly employed. Presentation reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.
Fail	10-19% Fail	The work submitted will have very limited relevance to any of the stated learning outcomes. Understanding of link between theory and practice is very weak. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in all areas. Reflection almost entirely lacking.	Little evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation. Many serious errors/inaccuracies.	Spoken English and vocabulary cause for major concern: may require remedial intervention. Use of discipline-specific terms and language suggests major deficiencies in reading/ knowledge. The student should seek additional support in the development of their spoken English.	No material of merit or relevance, revealing a complete lack of understanding of key issues or concepts associated with the topic. Fails to address all aspects of the task or the topic. No attempt to construct argument(s). Answers to questions wholly superficial.	No real evidence of any planning in advance. Organisation or structure almost entirely lacking.	The treatment is wholly descriptive. Very little evidence of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic.	Almost complete absence of evidence. Presentation reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.
Fail	0-9% Fail	Lacks any understanding of learning outcomes. No understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Standard of scholarship very poor throughout. No evidence of reflection.	No evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation.	Standard of spoken English totally inadequate for an oral exercise at Masters level. Hardly any knowledge demonstrated. The student should seek additional support in the development of their spoken English.	No understanding is demonstrated. Arguments notable for their complete absence. No real attempt to answer questions at all.	No organisation or structure. No evidence of any advance planning at all.	The treatment is wholly descriptive. No evidence of any kind of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic.	Evidence wholly absent. Presentation reflects a non-existent or wholly ineffective engagement in study on a more general level.