

UEA SENATE SCALE: ORAL PRESENTATION

Classification	Learning outcomes	Presentation	Projection, language and spoken English	Argument & understanding	Organisation & structure	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence
90-100% Exemplary^{1st} <i>Presentation exemplary in most areas.</i>	Learning outcomes met to an exemplary standard. Demonstrates an exemplary understanding of link between theory and practice..	Exemplary: clear, logical, imaginative, creative and original. Almost flawless. Very high level of choreography. Almost flawless in delivery. Encouraged group participation and discussion and responded to questions with considerable flair and authority. Exemplary use of visual aids. Time management exemplary.	Exemplary standard of spoken English and diverse vocabulary. Exemplary use of discipline-specific terminology and language. Exemplary voice projection/eye contact/body language.	Highly effective arguments; deeply impressive level of understanding. Key points are rigorously argued and convincingly presented, with exemplary use of supporting evidence.	Exemplary structure with clear, logical progression. Organisation exemplary. Presentation has razor-sharp focus and sense of purpose.	Demonstrates exemplary standard of criticality. Exemplary in its analysis of ideas, concepts & theory. Where appropriate, the latter are applied in a sophisticated manner.	Exemplary use of case studies/evidence. Impressive command of data/literature. Draws on very broad range of material. Examines the topic in considerable detail. Exemplary academic underpinnings.
80-89% High 1st <i>Presentation strong in all areas and may be exemplary in one or two.</i>	Learning outcomes met to a very high standard. Demonstrates a very strong understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards.	A very high standard achieved: clear, logical, 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 and responded well to questions. Very good use of visual aids. Time management very good.	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 and effective argument(s) are presented. Demonstrates a very high level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates.	Structure clear and well-suited to topic. Whilst not entirely without flaws, there is evidence of careful planning and attention to detail. Logical progression.	Work demonstrates a very high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts, theory to very good effect.	Work demonstrates an excellent command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail. Sound academic underpinnings.
70-79% 1st <i>Presentation strong in most areas.</i>	Learning outcomes fully met to a high standard. Demonstrates a strong understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards.	A high standard achieved: clear, logical, few errors. The delivery - whilst not exemplary - is lively, with good use of visual aids (if appropriate) and some evidence of practice and choreography. Encouraged group participation. Responses to questions are sound, but could be more incisive. Good use of visual aids. Time management good, but use of time could have been improved upon.	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 effective argument(s) are presented, but some scope for improvement. Demonstrates a high level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates.	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.	Work demonstrates a high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts, theory to good effect, though there is some scope for improvement.	Work demonstrates a good command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail. Some minor gaps may be identifiable, but no major omissions.

UEA SENATE SCALE: ORAL PRESENTATION

Classification	Learning outcomes	Presentation	Projection, language and spoken English	Argument & understanding	Organisation & structure	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence
60-69% Pass 2(i) <i>Presentation good in most areas and strong in some.</i>	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.	A good standard of presentation: clear, mostly logical, and errors are mostly minor. Whilst lacking some finesse, the presentation is clear and lively. Makes appropriate use of visual aids. Time management good. Makes some attempt to engage the audience and responds well to questions.	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.	Most points are illustrated with relevant examples, though they may not always contribute convincingly to the argument(s) made. Evidence of insight and an understanding of the subject context.	Structure generally clear and there is logical progression. Whilst the presentation shows evidence of care in its planning, needs more careful 'honing', and clearer focus.	The work contains some good examples of critical analysis and but limited originality and creativity in use of ideas, concepts, case studies etc.	Draws on good range of material but lacks the breadth of engagement with the secondary literature required to achieve 1 st class mark. Good use of evidence. Issues mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail.
50-59% Pass 2(ii) <i>Presentation is good in some areas but only satisfactory in others.</i>	Learning outcomes have been met satisfactorily. Some have been met to a good standard. Demonstrates some understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards.	A satisfactory standard achieved: mostly clear, some evidence of logical progression. Competent but lacks dynamism or creativity/imagination; rather 'stagey' in its delivery. More or less to time, though some parts may have been slightly rushed. Makes some attempt to engage the audience, though responses to questions of limited sophistication or authoritativeness.	Satisfactory standard of spoken English & vocabulary. Some discipline-specific terminology and language are used, mostly accurately. Voice projection/eye contact/body language are satisfactory.	Competent work, with evidence of engagement in the relevant issues, but little flair and only occasional insight. Gaps in understanding and knowledge; may not have addressed all aspects of the assignment.	Generally accurate and relevant but some gaps and or irrelevant material. Not always clear or logical.	Conscientious work and attentive to subject matter and/or task set, but balanced more towards a descriptive rather than a critical, analytical treatment. Some illustrative material, but not consistently critically evaluated.	Relatively limited range of sources. Some assessment of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in detail. Some use of examples. Treatment of data or literature is basically sound but narrow.
40-49% Pass 3 rd <i>Presentation is only satisfactory in most areas and weak in some.</i>	Most learning outcomes have been met to a satisfactory level. Understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is barely adequate.	Barely satisfactory standard of presentation. Some errors of more serious nature. Not always easy to follow. Unimaginative and un-engaging. Lacks dynamism or flair – conveys meaning, but is sometimes unclear, muddled or clumsy. Uncomfortable responding to questions and little attempt at engaging audience. Poor time management: slightly under/over time.	Standard of spoken English and vocabulary is only just 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 understanding of the topic and some relevant knowledge, but its treatment is very basic, unimaginative, and superficial and the student's grasp of key concepts is quite weak. Arguments employed are poorly evidenced and/or contain flaws.	Material fairly disorganised with poor sense of 'mission' or key points the student wished to convey.	Narrow range of data and/or literature employed. A fairly superficial level of interpretation and generally derivative and lacking criticality in its use of evidence and/or sources.	Draws on a narrow range of sources. Mostly limited to material in lectures/seminars. Little attempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided but are poorly chosen/employed. Limited level of engagement in wider reading.

UEA SENATE SCALE: ORAL PRESENTATION

Marks awarded in the range below indicate that the candidate has failed to achieve the standards required for a pass mark. It is recommended that students receiving marks in this range should meet with their advisor or the marker to review the factors that may have influenced the mark and ways in which their performance might be enhanced in subsequent assessments.

Classification	Learning outcomes	Presentation	Projection, language and spoken English	Argument & understanding	Organisation & structure	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence
35-39% Marginal Fail <i>Presentation is barely satisfactory in some areas and weak in most others.</i>	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.	Unsatisfactory standard: lacks clarity, and logical progression, with serious errors/inaccuracies. Delivery is clumsy, or muddled or even incomprehensible. Unimaginative and un-engaging. Very little evidence of 'practise' prior to delivery. Fails to respond adequately to questions. No attempt to engage audience. Poor time management, - significantly under/over time.	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.	Contains some material of merit, but only a partial attempt to address question/topic. Few attempts to construct argument(s). Poor understanding of key issues or concepts.	Structurally weak, muddled, lacking incoherence. Little sense of 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.	Draws on very limited range of sources. No real attempt to assess evidence. Examples occasionally provided but poorly chosen/employed. Very limited engagement in wider reading and little understanding of how to select and use evidence.
20-34% Fail <i>Presentation is weak in most areas. Poor engagement.</i>	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.	Very poor standard of presentation, lacking sufficient clarity, and a sufficiently logical progression, with many serious inaccuracies. Little awareness is demonstrated of the 'purpose' of the oral presentation and the techniques required in delivering it.	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.	Little material of merit or relevance, revealing a paucity of understanding of key issues or concepts. Fails to address most aspects of the task or question set. Work lacks any sustained argument(s).	Disorganised and incoherent. No obvious or apparent focus or sense of 'mission'.	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 etc. No attempt to assess evidence. Examples rarely provided & very poorly employed. Submission reflects a very limited engagement in study.
10-19% Fail <i>Presentation is very weak in most areas. Very poor engagement.</i>	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.	Little evidence of care or serious thought being 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.	No material of merit or relevance, revealing a complete lack of understanding of key issues or concepts. Fails to address all aspects of the task or question set. No attempt to construct argument(s).	Totally disorganised and incoherent. No obvious or apparent focus or sense of 'mission'.	The treatment is wholly descriptive. No evidence of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic.	Almost complete absence of evidence. Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.
0-9% Fail <i>Presentation is very weak in all areas. Almost total lack of engagement.</i>	Lacks any understanding of learning outcomes. No understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards.	Very poor standard of presentation which has not been informed, in any meaningful way, by any of the guidance provided.	Standard of spoken English totally inadequate for an oral exercise at degree level. Remedial intervention essential. Hardly any knowledge demonstrated.	Understanding and/or arguments either entirely absent or barely discernible.	Difficult to discern any organisation or structure.	The treatment is wholly descriptive.	Evidence absent. Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.