

# **SENATE SCALES – Undergraduate Level**

1. Coursework
2. Dissertations
3. Oral Presentations

# UEA SENATE SCALE: COURSEWORK

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
<b>90-100%</b> Exemplary 1 <sup>st</sup>  <i>Coursework is 'exemplary' in most areas</i>	Learning outcomes have been met to an exemplary standard showing creativity and innovation. 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 degree-level submission.	Exemplary presentation: clear, logical, imaginative, creative and original. Almost flawless.	Highly effective and sustained arguments, demonstrating exemplary level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates. Addresses all aspects of the assignment to exemplary standard.	Work 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 self-reflection.	Exemplary use of sources/case studies and/or evidence. Demonstrates impressive command of data or literature, drawing on a very broad range of material and/or examining the topic in considerable detail. Demonstrates an exemplary sensitivity to the limits/limitations of evidence.	Exemplary in all respects. Outstanding bibliography with academic referencing conventions employed accurately, consistently and according to established practice within the discipline.	Exemplary standard of written English. Written communication, including use of subject-specific language, is of highest standard that can be reasonably expected from a degree-level submission.
<b>80-89%</b> High 1 <sup>st</sup>  <i>Coursework is strong in most areas and may be exemplary in some</i>	Learning outcomes have been met to a very high standard. 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.	Coherent and articulate 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 high standard.	Work demonstrates a very high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts, and theory to good effect. High level of self-reflection.	Work 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 high level of awareness of, and sensitivity to, the limits of evidence.	A very high standard of referencing throughout. Bibliography conforms to a very high standard.	A very high standard of written English
<b>70-79%</b> 1 <sup>st</sup>  <i>Coursework is strong in most areas</i>	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 few areas.	A high standard of presentation: clear, logical and few errors.	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 assignment to a high standard.	Work demonstrates a high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts, theory to good effect. High level of self-reflection.	Work demonstrates a strong command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail. The submission shows awareness of the limits/limitations of evidence.	A high standard of referencing throughout. Bibliography conforms to a high standard, though there may be a number of small errors	A high standard of written English

# UEA SENATE SCALE: COURSEWORK

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
<b>60-69%</b> Pass 2(i)  <i>Coursework is '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. Attains a good level of scholarship, but lacks sophistication of a 1 <sup>st</sup> class piece.	A good standard of presentation: clear, mostly logical, and errors are mostly very minor.	The work 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 assignment.	The work 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.	The student draws on a good range of material but lacks the breadth of engagement with the secondary literature required to achieve a 1 <sup>st</sup> class mark. Good use of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail. Partial awareness of the limits of evidence.	A good standard of referencing, though a few errors or inconsistencies may be present. Good bibliography but possibly containing technical errors, some minor, some more serious.	A good standard of written English, with only minor errors present
<b>50-59%</b> Pass 2(ii)  <i>Coursework is 'good' in some areas but only satisfactory in others. Good intellectual engagement but execution flawed.</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. Standard of scholarship likely to be undermined by poor linkage of issues/themes, poor use of evidence, unsubstantiated claims etc.	A satisfactory standard achieved: mostly clear, some evidence of logical progression. Some minor inaccuracies.	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 assignment.	Conscientious work and attentive to subject matter and/or task set, but balanced more towards a descriptive rather than a critical, analytical treatment.	Draws on a satisfactory but relatively limited 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.	Referencing satisfactory on the whole, though some inconsistencies or instances of poor/limited citation may be present. Satisfactory bibliography but likely to reveal some weaknesses in composition and use of referencing conventions.	A reasonable standard of written English, though a number of errors may be present.
<b>40-49%</b> Pass 3 <sup>rd</sup>  <i>Coursework is only satisfactory in most areas and weak in some others. Modest evidence of intellectual engagement.</i>	Learning outcomes have been met to the minimum required level. Understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues and/or standards is only adequate. Standard of scholarship undermined by poorly constructed ideas, arguments, use of evidence, partial response to the question etc.	Barely satisfactory standard of presentation. Some inaccuracies /errors may be of a more serious nature.	Work shows some understanding of the topic and some relevant knowledge, but its treatment is basic, unimaginative, and superficial and the student's grasp of key concepts is weak. Arguments employed are poorly evidenced and/or contain flaws.	Narrow range of data and/or literature employed is very limited. May be mostly limited to material provided in lectures/seminars.	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 submission 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.	Citations present, but referencing is poor, suggesting that little effort has been made to follow guidance. Bibliography barely adequate. Many errors, some serious, revealing limited awareness of mechanics of scholarship.	A barely satisfactory standard of written English; a number of serious errors may be present; Poorly structured and written, with poor attention to vocabulary and grammar.

# UEA SENATE SCALE: COURSEWORK

Marks awarded in the range below indicate that the candidate has failed to achieve the standards required for a pass mark on this occasion. It is recommended that students receiving marks in this range meet with their adviser 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.  
Work representing unsafe practice in professional schools will be marked as a fail.

Classification	Learning outcomes & scholarship	Presentation	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
<b>35-39%</b> Marginal Fail  <i>Coursework is barely 'satisfactory' in a few 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. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in several areas.	Unsatisfactory standard, lacking sufficient clarity, and a logical progression, with serious errors/inaccuracies.	The submission contains some material of merit, but it is only a partial attempt to address the question and fails to answer the question fully or in a robust manner with few (and mostly unsuccessful) attempts to construct argument(s). Poor understanding of key issues or concepts	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 a very limited range of sources. No real attempt to assess evidence. Examples are occasionally provided but are poorly chosen and employed. Entirely lacking in sophistication or finesse. The submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in wider reading and a limited confidence/ability in the choice and use of evidence.	Citations present but very limited. Referencing is very poor. Bibliography is either omitted, partial or poorly structured. Guidance not followed. Many serious errors, revealing very limited awareness of mechanics of scholarship.	Unsatisfactory standard of written English; too many serious errors present. Weaknesses undermine clarity of meaning. Text occasionally incomprehensible. Includes significant flaws in spelling, grammar, and basic sentence/paragraph composition
<b>20-34%</b> Fail  <i>Coursework is weak in most areas.</i>	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 poor standard of presentation, lacking sufficient clarity, and a sufficiently logical progression, with many serious inaccuracies.	Little material of merit or relevance, revealing a lack of understanding of key issues or concepts. Fails to address most aspects of the task or question set. Work lacks any sustained argument(s).	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, those that are, being very poorly employed. Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citation almost or entirely absent. Guidance largely ignored. Bibliography omitted or very poorly assembled. Awareness of mechanics of scholarship very weak.	A poor standard of written English. . Includes serious flaws in spelling, grammar, and basic sentence/paragraph composition
<b>10-19%</b> Fail  <i>Coursework is very weak in most areas.</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. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with weaknesses in all areas.	Little evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation. Many serious errors/inaccuracies.	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).	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.	Citations absent. Guidance entirely ignored. No bibliography that could merit description as such. Work shows no real attempt to apply the mechanics of scholarship.	A very poor standard of written English throughout with little care taken in the composition of proper sentences or paragraphs.

## UEA SENATE SCALE: COURSEWORK

<p><b>0-9%</b> Fail</p> <p><i>Coursework is very weak in all areas.</i></p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>No evidence that any thought has been given to the standard of presentation.</p>	<p>No understanding is demonstrated. Arguments notable for their complete absence.</p>	<p>The treatment is wholly descriptive</p>	<p>Evidence absent Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.</p>	<p>Citation entirely absent. Bibliography omitted. Application of the mechanics of scholarship entirely absent.</p>	<p>Incomprehensible. No attempt to compose proper sentences or paragraphs.</p>
---	---	---	--	--	---	---	--

# UEA SENATE SCALE: DISSERTATIONS

Classification	Learning outcomes/scholarship	Presentation	Methodology	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
<b>90-100%</b> <b>Exemplary 1<sup>st</sup></b> <i>Dissertation is 'exemplary' in most areas</i>	Learning outcomes are met to exemplary standard. Dissertation demonstrates an exemplary understanding of link between theory and practice and related issues/standards. Attains highest standards of scholarship that can reasonably be expected of a degree-level submission.	Exemplary presentation: clear, logical, imaginative, creative and original. Almost flawless.	Underpinned by a sophisticated methodology. Demonstrates exemplary sensitivity in the use of quantitative and/or qualitative methods. Research tools employed are of exemplary standard. Exemplary awareness of research ethics.	Highly effective and sustained arguments, demonstrating a detailed and impressive level of understanding of the topic and associated issues/debates.	Work demonstrates an exemplary standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Exemplary in its use of ideas, concepts, theory. Limitations in the research or incomplete conclusions are recognised and explained. Exemplary level of self-reflection.	Exemplary use of case studies and evidence. Demonstrates impressive command of data or literature, drawing on a very broad range of material and/or examining the topic in considerable detail.	Exemplary in all respects. Outstanding bibliography.	Exemplary standard of written English. Use of subject-specific language is of the highest standard one can reasonably expect in a degree level submission. Vocabulary exemplary.
<b>80-89%</b> <b>High 1<sup>st</sup></b> <i>Dissertation is strong in most areas and may be exemplary in some</i>	Learning outcomes have been met to a very high standard. Demonstrates a strong understanding of link between theory & practice and practice-related issues and/or standards. Attains a very high level of scholarship, though potential improvements can be identified.	A very high standard of presentation: clear, logical and few errors.	The dissertation is underpinned by a sound methodology. Demonstrates a very high level of skill and sensitivity in the use of quantitative and/or qualitative methods. Research tools employed are of a very high standard. High level of awareness of research ethics.	Coherent and articulate 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.	Dissertation 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.	Work 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 high level of awareness of, and sensitivity to, the limits of evidence.	A very high standard of referencing throughout. Bibliography conforms to a very high standard.	A very high standard of written English. Vocabulary of a very high standard.
<b>70-79%</b> <b>1<sup>st</sup></b> <i>Dissertation is strong in most areas.</i>	Learning outcomes have been fully met to a high standard. Dissertation demonstrates a strong understanding of link between theory & practice and related issues and/or standards. Attains a high level of scholarship, though there may be scope for improvement in a few areas.	A high standard of presentation: clear, logical and few errors. Errors present are mostly of a minor nature.	The dissertation is underpinned by a sound methodology. Demonstrates a high level of skill and sensitivity in the use of quantitative and/or qualitative methods. Research tools employed are of a high standard. High level of awareness of research ethics.	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 assignment to a high standard.	Work demonstrates a high standard of critical analysis and/or originality and creativity. Employs ideas, concepts, and theory to good effect. Limitations in the research or incomplete conclusions are mostly recognised and some attempt is made to explain them.	Work demonstrates a good command of data or literature, drawing on a broad range of material and/or examining the topic in some detail.	A high standard of referencing throughout. Bibliography conforms to a high standard, though there may be a number of small errors.	A high standard of written English is demonstrated. Text may reveal some limitations in use of a wide vocabulary.

# UEA SENATE SCALE: DISSERTATIONS

Classification	Learning outcomes/scholarship	Presentation	Methodology	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
<b>60-69%</b> 2(i) <i>Dissertation is 'good' in most areas and strong in some.</i>	Most 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 a 1 <sup>st</sup> class piece.	Good standard of presentation: clear, mostly logical, though lacking the 'flair' of 1 <sup>st</sup> class submission. Errors mostly of a minor nature, but some may be more substantive.	Some weaknesses in methodology or use of research tools, but good attempt at the research process. Competent use of quantitative & qualitative methods. Research tools of good standard, though may lack sophistication. Good awareness of research ethics.	Dissertation 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 assignment.	Contains some good examples of critical analysis but limited originality/creativity in use of ideas, concepts, case studies etc. Although there may be some awareness of the limitations of research, awareness of reasons for these and their implications is variable.	The student draws on a good range of material but lacks the breadth of engagement with the secondary literature required to achieve a 1 <sup>st</sup> class mark. Good use of evidence. Topics are mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail.	A good standard of referencing, though some minor errors or inconsistencies may be present. Good bibliography, but lacking slightly in either breadth or depth.	A good standard of written English is demonstrated, with only minor errors present. Vocabulary demonstrates a rather limited range.
<b>50-59%</b> 2(ii) <i>Dissertation is 'good' in some areas but only satisfactory in others. Good intellectual engagement but execution flawed.</i>	Most 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/standards. Standard of scholarship likely to be undermined by poor linkage of issues/themes, poor use of evidence, unsubstantiated claims etc.	A satisfactory standard achieved: mostly clear, some evidence of logical progression. Some minor inaccuracies.	Methodology approach is basically sound but under-developed and lacking in sophistication. Research tools employed are satisfactory but lack finesse. Data retrieved may be of limited, breadth veracity or reliability. Only a basic awareness of issues associated with us of qualitative/qualitative data. Awareness of research ethics limited.	Arguments are presented but lack contextualisation. Competent work, with evidence of engagement in the relevant issues, but little flair and only occasional insight. Gaps in knowledge and understanding	Diligent execution. Conscientious and attentive to subject matter but balanced more towards a descriptive rather than a critical, analytical treatment. Awareness of the dissertation's limitations is demonstrated but at a basic level.	Satisfactory but relatively limited 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 sound but underdeveloped.	Referencing satisfactory on the whole, though some inconsistencies or instances of poor/limited citation may be present. Satisfactory bibliography	A reasonable standard of written English, though a number of errors may be present. Vocabulary reveals a lack of development.
<b>40-49%</b> 3 <sup>rd</sup> <i>Dissertation is only satisfactory in most areas and weak in some others. Modest evidence of intellectual engagement.</i>	Most learning outcomes have been met to a satisfactory level. Understanding of link between theory and practice and practice-related issues/standards is barely adequate. Standard of scholarship undermined by poorly constructed ideas, arguments, use of evidence, partial response to the question etc.	Poor standard of presentation. Some errors & inaccuracies may be of a more serious nature. Work has been rushed to completion.	Methodological approach is barely adequate and flawed in some areas. Research tool simplistic and under-developed. Data may be of very limited breadth or reliability. Very little awareness of issues associated with us of qualitative/qualitative data. Awareness of research ethics barely satisfactory.	Arguments employed are poorly evidenced and/or flawed. Work shows some understanding of topic and relevant knowledge, but its treatment is basic. Grasp of key concepts is weak	Narrow range of data and/or literature employed. Mostly limited to material provided in lectures/seminars. Little awareness of the dissertation's limitations or the implications of conclusions/recommendations.	Limited, modest range of sources. Little attempt to assess evidence. Examples are provided but are poorly chosen or employed. Lacking in sophistication or finesse. Limited level of engagement.	Citations present, but referencing is poor. Little attempt to follow guidance. Bibliography barely adequate.	A barely satisfactory standard of written English; a number of serious errors present. Poorly structured and poor vocabulary and grammar. Vocabulary reveals major shortcomings

# UEA SENATE SCALE: DISSERTATIONS

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 adviser or the marker to review the factors that may have influenced the mark and ways in which their performance might be enhanced in subsequent assessment.								
Classification	Learning outcomes/scholarship	Presentation	Methodology	Argument & understanding	Criticality & analysis	Use of sources and evidence	Academic referencing	Written communication
<b>35-39%</b> Marginal Fail <i>Dissertation is barely 'satisfactory' in a few areas and weak in most others.</i>	Learning outcomes not met to a satisfactory standard. Understanding of link between theory and practice is insufficient for a Pass. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with serious weaknesses in several areas.	Unsatisfactory standard, lacking sufficient clarity, structure. Many serious errors.	Methodological approach is unsound and flawed in too many areas. Research tools under-developed and/or inadequate. Data of insufficient breadth or reliability. Awareness of issues associated with us of qualitative/quantitative data appears to be minimal or non-existent.	Contains some material of merit, but only a partial attempt to address the question. Fails to address research Qs fully. Few (and mostly unsuccessful) attempts to construct argument(s). Poor understanding of key issues or concepts.	The treatment is mostly descriptive. Whilst the work contains occasional evidence of criticality or analysis, it is too limited or partial or lacking in depth to justify a pass. Hardly any awareness of the dissertation's limitations is demonstrated.	A very limited range of sources. No real attempt to assess evidence. Examples are occasionally provided but are poorly chosen or irrelevant. Entirely lacking in sophistication or finesse. Very limited level of engagement.	Citations present but very limited. Referencing is very poor. Bibliography is omitted, partial or poorly assembled. Guidance ignored.	Unsatisfactory standard of written English; too many serious errors present. Weaknesses undermine clarity of meaning. Weak vocabulary.
<b>20-34%</b> Fail <i>Dissertation is weak in most areas.</i>	Learning outcomes have been met in a limited way. Understanding of link between theory and practice is very weak. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with serious weaknesses in most areas.	Very poor standard of presentation. Many serious inaccuracies, errors, and weaknesses in layout.	Dissertation reflects a very poor understanding of what a 'methodology' is. Approach is unsound and flawed at a fundamental level. Research tools under-developed and/or inadequate. Data minimal.	Little material of merit or relevance, revealing a paucity of understanding of key issues or concepts. Work lacks any sustained argument(s).	The treatment is almost wholly descriptive. Contains little evidence of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic. No awareness of the dissertation's limitations.	Draws on minimal range of sources. Simply paraphrasing bits of lecture notes or easily accessible web sources. No attempt to assess evidence. Minimal engagement.	Citation almost or entirely absent. Guidance ignored. Bibliography omitted or very poorly assembled.	A very poor standard of written English. Too many serious errors present. Weaknesses greatly undermine clarity of meaning. Very weak vocabulary.
<b>10-19%</b> Fail <i>Dissertation is very weak in most areas.</i>	The work submitted will have very limited relevance to any of the stated learning outcomes. Standard of scholarship insufficient for a pass, with serious weaknesses in all areas.	Little evidence that any thought has been given to presentation. Many serious errors/inaccuracies	Little understanding of 'methodology' is apparent. Approach is entirely unsound and seriously flawed at a fundamental level. Tools and data unreliable/unsound.	No arguments present. No material of merit or relevance, revealing a complete lack of understanding of key issues or concepts.	The treatment is wholly descriptive. No evidence of a critical or analytical engagement in the topic. No awareness of the dissertation's limitations.	Almost complete absence of evidence. Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citation(s) largely absent. No awareness of good academic practice. Work shows no real attempt to apply the mechanics of scholarship.	A very poor standard of written English. Often incomprehensible. Hardly any evidence of engagement or discipline-specific vocabulary.
<b>0-9%</b> Fail <i>Dissertation is very weak in all areas.</i>	No learning outcomes have been met. Standard of scholarship very weak in all areas. Falls a very long way short of a pass.	No evidence that any thought has been given to presentation.	Nothing that might be described as a 'methodology' is apparent. Total absence of proper research tools or usable data.	No understanding is demonstrated. Arguments notable for their complete absence.	The treatment is wholly descriptive. No awareness of the dissertation's limitations.	Evidence absent Submission reflects a very limited level of engagement in study on a more general level.	Citation entirely absent. Application of the mechanics of scholarship entirely absent.	Incomprehensible. No attempt to compose proper sentences or paragraphs.



# 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
<b>90-100%</b> <b>Exemplary<sup>1st</sup></b>  <b><i>Presentation exemplary in most areas.</i></b>	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.
<b>80-89%</b> <b>High 1<sup>st</sup></b>  <b><i>Presentation strong in all areas and may be exemplary in one or two.</i></b>	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.
<b>70-79%</b> <b>1<sup>st</sup></b>  <b><i>Presentation strong in most areas.</i></b>	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
<b>60-69%</b> Pass 2(i)  <i><b>Presentation good in most areas and strong in some.</b></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 <sup>st</sup> class mark. Good use of evidence. Issues mostly addressed but not always examined in sufficient detail.
<b>50-59%</b> Pass 2(ii)  <i><b>Presentation is good in some areas but only satisfactory in others.</b></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.
<b>40-49%</b> Pass 3 <sup>rd</sup>  <i><b>Presentation is only satisfactory in most areas and weak in some.</b></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
<b>35-39%</b> <b>Marginal Fail</b>  <i><b>Presentation is barely satisfactory in some areas and weak in most others.</b></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.
<b>20-34%</b> <b>Fail</b>  <i><b>Presentation is weak in most areas. Poor engagement.</b></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.
<b>10-19%</b> <b>Fail</b>  <i><b>Presentation is very weak in most areas. Very poor engagement.</b></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.
<b>0-9%</b> <b>Fail</b>  <i><b>Presentation is very weak in all areas. Almost total lack of engagement.</b></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.