

Class	Scale	Numerical equivalent	Descriptor	
First	Excellent first	100	<p><b>Exceptional presentation of the highest quality, combining excellence and originality of content with flawlessly fluent and impressively compelling communicational performance.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of considerable original thought and independent research</li> <li>Exceptionally perceptive and accurate analysis of the material</li> <li>Very clear grasp of all relevant contexts</li> <li>Presentation is extremely well structured and clearly argued</li> <li>The presentation is very well paced and entirely audible</li> <li>Excellent interaction with the audience (including, where required, responding to questions which may be complex or difficult with fluent and developed answers)</li> <li>If visual aids are required these are of the highest quality (e.g. handouts, film clips, Powerpoint or similar)</li> <li>The communicational performance is engaging, compelling and of the highest professional standard</li> </ul>	
		94		
	High 1st	88		<p><b>Very high quality presentation which may extend existing debates or interpretations, given with flair and in a highly professional manner.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of original thought and independent research</li> <li>Very perceptive and accurate analysis of the material</li> <li>Very clear grasp of all relevant contexts</li> <li>Presentation is extremely well structured and clearly argued</li> <li>The presentation is very well paced and entirely audible</li> <li>Excellent interaction with the audience (including, where required, responding to questions which may be complex or difficult with developed answers)</li> <li>If visual aids are required these are of very high quality (e.g. handouts, film clips, Powerpoint or similar)</li> <li>The communicational performance is engaging and of a high professional standard</li> </ul>
	Mid 1 <sup>st</sup>	82 78		
Low 1st	74			
Upper second	High 2:1	68	<p><b>High quality presentation demonstrating perceptive analysis presented in a lucid and professional manner.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of some independent research or original thought</li> <li>A largely accurate analysis of the material</li> <li>A clear grasp of most relevant contexts</li> <li>Presentation is generally well structured and clearly argued</li> <li>The presentation is appropriately paced and largely audible</li> <li>Some good interaction with the audience (including, where required, responding to questions with coherent answers)</li> <li>If visual aids are required these are of good quality (e.g. handouts, film clips, Powerpoint or similar)</li> </ul>	
	Mid 2:1	65		
	Low 2:1	62		

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The communicational performance is of a good standard</li> </ul>
<b>Lower second</b>	High 2:2	58	<p><b>Competent presentation containing generally reliable information and generally sound analysis presented in an intelligible but not necessarily especially persuasive or well organised or entirely successful fashion.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited evidence of independent research</li> <li>Largely satisfactory analysis of the material</li> <li>Some grasp of some relevant contexts</li> <li>The presentation is coherently structured but there may be some localised areas of confusion</li> <li>The presentation is intelligible but may not be appropriately paced or entirely audible</li> <li>There is some sound interaction with the audience including, where required, responding to questions but there may be some hesitancy which undermines audience confidence in the quality of the analysis presented</li> <li>If visual aids are required these are generally of acceptable quality but may contain some errors and/or infelicitous aesthetic choices (e.g. handouts, Powerpoint or similar)</li> <li>The communicational performance is of a fair standard</li> </ul>
	Mid 2:2	55	
	Low 2:2	52	
<b>Third</b>	High 3rd	48	<p><b>Presentation of limited quality characterised by some or all of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little or no evidence of independent research</li> <li>Compromised analysis of the material</li> <li>Limited grasp of some relevant contexts</li> <li>The presentation may be incoherently structured</li> <li>The presentation may well not be appropriately paced or may be inaudible in such a way as to impede audience understanding of key points</li> <li>There is limited interaction with the audience including, where required, responding to questions. There may be considerable hesitancy and a sense projected of not really knowing the material well such that audience confidence in the quality of the presentation is significantly undermined.</li> <li>If visual aids are required these may contain numerous errors or omissions or be otherwise limited in quality or some may have been forgotten (e.g. handouts, film clips, Powerpoint or similar).</li> <li>The communicational performance is of limited quality.</li> </ul>
	Mid 3rd	45	
	Low 3rd	42	
<b>Fail</b>	High Fail (sub honours)	38	<p><b>Presentation does not meet standards required for the appropriate stage of an Honours degree:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence of independent research</li> <li>A misleading or very insufficient analysis of the material</li> <li>Little or no grasp of any relevant context</li> <li>The presentation is likely to be very badly structured</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The presentation will be badly paced and may very well be inaudible in such a way as to seriously impede audience understanding of many key points</li> <li>• There is little or no meaningful interaction with the audience including, where required, responding to questions. A sense is projected of not knowing the material well so as to entirely undermine audience confidence in the quality of the presentation.</li> <li>• If visual aids are required these may be absent, seriously inappropriate or contain numerous errors and omissions (e.g. handouts, film clips, Powerpoint or similar).</li> <li>• The communicational performance is of poor quality.</li> </ul>
	Fail	32	Presentation is significantly below the standard required for the appropriate stage of an Honours degree. Some evidence of preparatory study and some knowledge and evidence of understanding and some communicational strengths but also subject to very serious omissions, errors or presentational misjudgments. The presentation may be garbled and inaudible, the visual aids may be missing or of compromisingly low standard and there may be little or no ability to answer questions.
		25	Very poor quality presentation well below the standards required for the appropriate stage of an Honours degree
	Low fail	12	
<b>Zero</b>	Zero	0	Presentation of no merit OR Absent, penalty in some misconduct cases.