

**Grading Guidance for Level 4** (Year 1 / Part 1) Narrative version (based on the University grading guidance)

| Descriptor                           | Fail - Inadequate / Unsatisfactory<br>0-18%  | Fail Poor / Inadequate<br>19-39%   | Pass (3 <sup>rd</sup> ) Rudimentary / Very weak<br>40-49%   | Pass (2:2) Competent / Adequate<br>50-59%   | Pass (2:1) Very Good / Capable<br>60-69%  | Pass (1 <sup>st</sup> ) Excellent / Very Good<br>70-85%   | Pass (1 <sup>st</sup> ) Outstanding / Exceptional<br>86-100%  |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Knowledge &amp; Understanding</b> | Very little knowledge of subject and its underlying concepts   | Some knowledge of subject and its underlying concepts  | Rudimentary knowledge of subject and its underlying concepts  | Competent knowledge of subject and its underlying concepts  | Good knowledge of subject and its underlying concepts   | Comprehensive knowledge of subject and its underlying concepts  | Exceptional knowledge of subject and its underlying concepts  |
| <b>Evaluation &amp; Analysis</b>     | Inadequate ability to evaluate concepts/theories and/or interpret different approaches/problem solving; little or no evidence of critical reflection | Limited ability to evaluate concepts/theories and/or interpret different approaches/problem solving; little or no evidence of critical reflection. | Weak / Poor ability to evaluate concepts/theories and/or interpret different approaches/problem solving; over reliance upon description as a substitute for analysis; limited evidence of critical reflection | Competent ability to evaluate concepts/theories and/or interpret evidence and different approaches/problem solving. Reasonable evidence of critical reflection. | Good at evaluating concepts/ theories and/or interpreting evidence and different approaches/problem solving through critical reflection | Demonstrates excellent ability in evaluating concepts/theories and/or interpreting evidence and different approaches/ problem solving through critical reflection | Demonstrates outstanding ability in evaluating concepts/theories and/or interpreting evidence and different approaches/ problem solving through critical reflection |
| <b>Communication</b>                 | Inadequate ability to communicate accurately, reliably, and structure arguments  | Limited ability to consistently communicate accurately, and structure arguments  | Weak / Poor ability to communicate accurately, reliably, and structure arguments  | Competent ability to communicate and structure arguments, demonstrating knowledge of subject and its underlying concepts;                                       | Good at communicating accurately, reliably and in structuring sound arguments   | Demonstrates excellent ability in communicating accurately, reliably, and structuring coherent arguments  | Demonstrates outstanding ability in communicating accurately and reliably, contextualising knowledge and structuring sustained and coherent arguments               |

**Grading Guidance for Level 4 (Year 1 / Part 1) Narrative version (based on the University grading guidance)**

| Descriptor  | Fail - Inadequate / Unsatisfactory<br>0-18%              | Fail Poor / Inadequate<br>19-39%  | Pass (3 <sup>rd</sup> ) Rudimentary / Very weak<br>40-49%  | Pass (2:2) Competent / Adequate<br>50-59%   | Pass (2:1) Very Good / Capable<br>60-69%   | Pass (1 <sup>st</sup> ) Excellent/ Very Good<br>70-85%  | Pass (1 <sup>st</sup> ) Outstanding / Exceptional<br>86-100%  |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Presentation</b>   | Presentation is very poor and in an inappropriate format | <p>Presentation sometimes follows Harvard rules; is awkwardly structured, sometimes coherent; wording/grammar is inadequate in places.</p> <p><b>Extras for slide/posters</b><br/>awkward or inconsistent layout; unoriginal or copied design; excessive detail OR essential details omitted.</p> <p><b>Extras for speech</b><br/>delivery is inaudible or unintelligible; remote or indifferent; excessively fast OR slow.</p> | <p>Presentation is rudimentary and generally follows Harvard rules; is adequately structured, often coherent; wording/grammar is inadequate in places.</p> <p><b>Extras for slide/posters</b> -- some loose ends in layout; somewhat pedestrian design; far too detailed OR important details omitted.</p> <p><b>Extras for speech</b> -- delivery is monotonous or halting; somewhat awkward and shy; clearly rushed OR dragging.</p> | <p>Presentation is competent and mostly follows Harvard rules with occasional exceptions; is adequately structured, often coherent; wording/grammar is generally correct with occasional slips.</p> <p><b>Extras for slide/posters</b> -- a few loose ends in layout; ordinary but solid design; somewhat too detailed OR sketchy.</p> <p><b>Extras for speech</b> -- delivery is often smooth; somewhat uncommunicative and reserved; Noticeably speedy OR slow.</p> | <p>Presentation is very good / capable and follows Harvard rules with occasional exceptions; is clearly structured, normally coherent; wording/grammar is generally correct with occasional slips.</p> <p><b>Extras for slide/posters</b> -- clear and consistent layout; ordinary but solid design; a little less OR more detail needed.</p> <p><b>Extras for speech</b> -- delivery is mostly smooth; generally communicative and direct; slightly speedy OR a little leisurely.</p> | <p>Presentation is excellent and consistently follows Harvard rules; is clearly structured, mostly coherent, correct/competent in wording/grammar.</p> <p><b>Extras for slide/posters</b> -- clear and consistent layout; thoughtful and clever design; appropriate level of detail.</p> <p><b>Extras for speech</b> -- delivery is smooth; communicative and direct; at a proper pace.</p> | <p>Presentation is outstanding and consistently follows Harvard rules; is sophisticatedly structured, perfectly coherent, pithy/precise in wording/grammar.</p> <p><b>Extras for slide/posters</b> -- polished and aesthetic layout; ingenious and inventive design; optimal level of details.</p> <p><b>Extras for speech</b> -- delivery is eloquent and engaging; and on time.</p> |
| <b>Citation &amp; referencing</b>   | Citation and referencing is very poor or absent.         | Citation and referencing shows some consistency and accuracy but many deficiencies are apparent.  | Citation and referencing generally follows Harvard rules but several errors are present.   | Citation and referencing generally follows Harvard rules with some errors.  | Citation and referencing mostly follows Harvard rules with very few errors.  | Citation & referencing is accurate and follows Harvard rules with an occasional slip.   | Citation and referencing fully follows Harvard rules with no apparent errors.   |
| <b>This qualitative rubric will not result in a score. However, it is a valuable feedback/feedforward mechanism for students, writers and assessors</b> |  |   |  |   |  |   |   |