

Faculty of Humanities & Social Sciences: Generic Assessment Criteria for use on all Undergraduate courses from AY 2025/26 onwards

Implementation notes and instructions

Implementation notes

- a) These assessment criteria apply only to assessments that are marked subjectively—that is, where professional judgment is used to evaluate the quality of a learner’s response. These criteria do not apply to objectively marked assessments, such as multiple-choice tests or tasks with definitive right or wrong answers.
- b) These assessment criteria only apply to work that has followed the assessment brief/is on task.
- c) These assessment criteria do not apply to ‘pass/fail’ assessments.
- d) These assessment criteria should be applied using a best fit approach—students are not required to meet every bullet point within a grade band to achieve that grade. Instead, assessors should consider which grade banding most accurately reflects the overall quality of the work.
- e) In most cases, assessments will be graded holistically and therefore any assigned weightings should be considered as indicative rather than absolute. Consider whether, at a course level, weightings could be used to differentiate expectations at each level of study (e.g. the weighting attached to criticality may increase from L4/first year to L6/final year).

Implementation instructions (developing specific assessment criteria)

- a) Where course/department templates do not exist, unit convenors must select the criteria relevant to their specific assessment and related learning outcomes to create specific assessment criteria (i.e. choose the assessment criteria that most effectively demonstrate how a student meets the learning outcomes related to the assessment).
- b) Unit convenors must contextualise the definition of each relevant criterion to reflect the nature and expectations of the assessment task (relative to the level of study).
- c) Where course or department templates have been devised for specific assessment types (e.g. essays, reports, presentations), unit convenors should use these templates and contextualise the definition as per point (b) above.
- d) The grade descriptors must not be amended.
- e) Unit convenors should think about how students can be supported to engage with the specific assessment criteria in the context of the specific assessment (e.g. exemplars, formative assessment, etc.).

Subject Knowledge & Understanding

The ability to select and integrate a broad range of reliable and relevant sources, appropriate to the level of study. This may involve:

- Demonstrating engagement with both taught and independently sourced material drawing on a range of perspectives to develop a broad and well-informed understanding of the topic.
- Clearly identifying when external sources are being used (whether quoted, paraphrased, or summarise) so the reader can distinguish between the writer's own ideas and those of others.
- Using this knowledge purposefully to support explanation, interpretation, or exploration of ideas.

First (85-100%) EXCEPTIONAL

- Demonstrates exceptional familiarity with both taught and independently sourced material, drawing on a wide range of perspectives. Selects an extensive and diverse range of highly reliable and authoritative sources, with outstanding relevance to the topic.
- External sources are consistently integrated with exceptional clarity, making it easy to distinguish between the writer's voice and that of others.
- Shows a comprehensive understanding through clear, nuanced, and accurate explanation or interpretation of complex ideas.

First (70-84%) ADVANCED

- Demonstrates excellent familiarity with taught and independently sourced material, including a wide range of perspectives. Selects a well-judged and highly relevant range of reliable sources aligned to the topic and purpose.
- External sources are clearly identified throughout, with only minor lapses in clarity when distinguishing them from the writer's own ideas.
- Shows an advanced understanding through clear, accurate and thoughtful explanation or interpretation of key ideas.

2:1 (60-69%) PROFICIENT

- Demonstrates very good familiarity with taught and independently sourced material. Selects a very good range of generally reliable and relevant sources, though some may be more generic or less precisely aligned.
- External sources are generally identified clearly, though occasional ambiguity may make it harder to tell which ideas are original.

- Shows a proficient understanding through mostly clear and accurate explanation or interpretation of key ideas.

2:2 (50-59%) DEVELOPING

- Demonstrates sound familiarity with taught material, with some use of independently sourced content. Selects a limited or uneven range of sources, with occasional issues of reliability or relevance.
- Clarity in identifying external sources is inconsistent; in some places, it is unclear where external ideas have been used or how they relate to the writer's own thinking.
- Shows a developing but uneven understanding of key ideas; explanations or interpretations are sometimes clear and accurate but may lack depth or consistency.

3rd (40-49%) EMERGING

- Demonstrates basic familiarity with taught content. Selects a small number of sources, some of which may be weak, outdated, or only loosely relevant, though there is some engagement with appropriate material.
- Identification of external sources is frequently unclear or incomplete, making it difficult to follow the distinction between original ideas and those from others.
- Shows an emerging and often superficial understanding of key ideas; explanations are basic and may be unclear or incomplete.

Marginal Fail (35-39%) LIMITED

- Demonstrates limited familiarity with taught content. Shows minimal evidence of appropriate reading; sources are often irrelevant, inappropriate, or missing.
- Identification of external sources is minimal or unclear; ideas from others are often poorly integrated or indistinguishable from the writer's own thinking.
- Shows a limited and often confused understanding; explanations are unclear, inaccurate, or largely disconnected from the topic.

Fail (0-34%) INADEQUATE

- Demonstrates no meaningful familiarity with taught content. No evidence of appropriate reading; sources are absent or entirely unrelated to the topic.
- No attempt is made to identify external sources; ideas from others are either missing or presented without any indication of their origin.
- Shows minimal or no understanding; explanations or interpretations are missing or wholly unrelated.

Criticality

The ability to think clearly and logically about information, theories, concepts, principles, data, and practices to develop reasoned responses and deepen understanding. This may include:

- Analysing – examining ideas or information to understand how meaning is constructed and how elements relate to one another.
- Evaluating – assessing the strength, relevance, or credibility of evidence, arguments, or perspectives.
- Contextualising – relating ideas to broader academic, professional, or real-world contexts.
- Synthesising – combining different ideas or sources to generate new insights or connections.
- Arguing – presenting structured, coherent reasoning supported by appropriate evidence.

First (85-100%) EXCEPTIONAL

- Analyses complex ideas with clarity and depth, identifying subtle patterns and assumptions.
- Demonstrates exceptional judgement in discussing evidence, clearly identifying its strengths, limitations, and broader implications.
- Connects theories and methods to wider academic or real-world contexts with precision.
- Combines ideas from multiple sources to form sophisticated and insightful connections.
- Develops exceptionally clear and insightful arguments, supported by strong reasoning, well-chosen evidence, and thoughtful engagement with multiple perspectives.

First (70-84%) ADVANCED

- Analyses ideas clearly, identifying key components and relationships.
- Demonstrates excellent judgement in discussing evidence, clearly identifying its strengths, limitations, and broader implications.
- Relates theories and methods to broader contexts with confidence.
- Combines ideas from multiple sources clearly and effectively, with purposeful connections.
- Develops clear and convincing arguments, using strong reasoning and relevant evidence, and considered engagement with multiple perspectives.

2:1 (60-69%) PROFICIENT

- Engages with ideas clearly and thoughtfully, showing strong understanding of how meaning is conveyed and how ideas relate to one another.
- Engages with evidence thoughtfully, recognising both its strengths and potential weaknesses.
- Shows awareness of broader academic or practical contexts.
- Combines ideas from several sources with clarity, showing a very good ability to relate concepts.
- Develops coherent arguments with very good reasoning and appropriate evidence, and clear engagement with multiple perspectives.

2:2 (50-59%) DEVELOPING

- Identifies key ideas and shows some engagement with meaning, though responses may remain surface-level or largely descriptive.
- Refers to evidence with some insight, though the discussion of its quality or relevance may be uneven.
- Makes a sound attempt to relate ideas to wider contexts.
- Combines ideas from sources with some connections, though these may be broad or not fully explored.
- Develops arguments with some reasoning and evidence, though the quality of reasoning varies, and engagement is limited to a small number of perspectives.

3rd (40-49%) EMERGING

- Describes ideas with minimal insight into how they convey meaning or connect with each other.
- Rarely questions the quality or significance of the evidence presented.
- Shows emerging awareness of context, but connections are vague.
- Combines ideas inconsistently or superficially, with weak or unclear links.
- Arguments are present but with minimal reasoning and limited or unclear support. Engagement with other perspectives is limited.

Marginal Fail (35-39%) LIMITED

- Presents ideas with little attempt to explore meaning or make interpretive links.
- Describes evidence without questioning its value, reliability, or relevance.
- Provides very little context for theories or methods.
- Uses sources in a disjointed way, with minimal connection between ideas.
- Arguments are very weak and demonstrate a minimal or unclear position with little to no reasoning or evidence

Fail (0-34%) INADEQUATE

- Misunderstands or misrepresents ideas; no meaningful engagement with content is evident.
- Fails to question the quality or significance of the evidence presented.
- Lacks any contextual awareness.
- Fails to connect ideas; work is entirely descriptive.
- Arguments are missing or incoherent.

Application of Theoretical Knowledge & Understanding

The ability to purposefully use theoretical knowledge and conceptual understanding in a variety of contexts, including real-world, abstract, and hypothetical situations. This may include:

- Demonstrating awareness of the relationship between theory and practice, including how each informs and shapes the other.
- Applying knowledge and understanding to address problems, make decisions, or complete tasks.
- Integrating and adapting theoretical models or frameworks to suit specific purposes or contexts.

First (85-100%) EXCEPTIONAL

- Demonstrates deep insight into the relationship between theory and practice, showing comprehensive understanding.
- Applies knowledge seamlessly to solve complex problems or complete tasks across real-world, abstract, and hypothetical scenarios.
- Integrates and adapts theoretical or conceptual models with creativity and sophistication, tailored expertly to context.

First (70-84%) ADVANCED

- Demonstrates an advanced understanding of how theory informs practice and vice versa.
- Applies knowledge confidently to solve problems or complete tasks in real-world, abstract, and hypothetical scenarios.
- Integrates and adapts theoretical or conceptual models effectively and appropriately to a range of contexts.

2:1 (60-69%) PROFICIENT

- Demonstrates a proficient understanding of theory-practice relationships, though not always fully developed.
- Applies knowledge in real-world, abstract, and hypothetical scenarios with minimal error.
- Integrates theoretical or conceptual models well, with some adaptation to context, though occasionally implicit.

2:2 (50-59%) DEVELOPING

- Demonstrates a developing understanding of how theory relates to practice.
- Applies knowledge in familiar real-world, abstract, and hypothetical scenarios, though with some inaccuracies.
- Makes sound use of theoretical or conceptual models, with limited adaptation to context.

3rd (40-49%) EMERGING

- Demonstrates an emerging understanding of theory-practice relationships.
- Applies knowledge in simple or familiar real-world and hypothetical scenarios, with weak or inconsistent reference to abstract ideas.
- Attempts to use theoretical or conceptual models, but with limited effectiveness or adaptation.

Marginal Fail (35-39%) LIMITED

- Demonstrates minimal understanding of theory-practice relationships.
- Applies knowledge inconsistently, especially in abstract and hypothetical contexts.
- Rarely uses or connects theoretical or conceptual models appropriately.

Fail (0-34%) INADEQUATE

- Demonstrates no clear understanding of theory-practice relationships.
- Fails to apply knowledge meaningfully in real-world, abstract, or hypothetical contexts.
- Does not use or misuses theoretical or conceptual models.

Reflective Practice

The ability to think about experiences, personal development, and professional practices to improve future actions. This may involve:

- Describing experiences.
- Analysing what happened and why.
- Connecting personal reflections to theories or other experiences.
- Planning future actions based on what has been learned.

First (85-100%) EXCEPTIONAL

- Describes experiences with exceptional clarity and insight.
- Analyses experiences in a way that demonstrates significant personal growth.
- Applies theory in a creative, well-integrated way that shows sophisticated self-awareness and personal development.
- Plans future actions with well-developed insights and clear purpose.

First (70-84%) ADVANCED

- Describes experiences clearly and insightfully.
- Analyses experiences in depth, showing strong personal growth.
- Applies theory effectively to explore personal learning and demonstrate advanced self-awareness.
- Plans future actions with meaningful and well-reasoned insights.

2:1 (60-69%) PROFICIENT

- Describes experiences clearly and in detail.
- Analyses experiences effectively, showing clear personal growth.
- Applies relevant theory to support reflection and demonstrate growing self-awareness.
- Plans future actions with valuable and considered insights.

2:2 (50-59%) DEVELOPING

- Describes experiences beyond surface level.
- Analyses experiences with some reference to theory.
- Begins to apply theory to personal learning and shows developing self-awareness.
- Plans future actions with useful and relevant insights.

3rd (40-49%) EMERGING

- Describes experiences in a basic way, with some limited analysis.
- Uses theory occasionally but not always clearly.

- Makes limited attempts to apply theory and reflect on personal development.
- Plans future actions with a few general insights.

Marginal Fail (35-39%) LIMITED

- Focuses mostly on description, with little or no reflection.
- Uses theory incorrectly or not at all.
- Shows very limited understanding of how theory relates to personal development.
- Provides no clear or useful ideas for future actions.

Fail (0-34%) INADEQUATE

- Only describes events with no reflection or learning.
- Makes no use of theory.
- Shows no evidence of self-awareness or personal development.
- Offers no suggestions for future improvement.

Written Communication

The degree to which the work is effectively structured and articulated. An important aspect of this is the flow of writing. Flow may be determined by:

- Clarity of language: clear and understandable words.
- Concise writing style: being efficient with words by expressing ideas using only the words needed.
- Effective signposting: guiding the reader with headings/ sections/ paragraphs.
- Coherence: making sure all parts of the writing fit together well.
- Accessibility of writing: the composition is appropriate for the intended audience.

First (85-100%) EXCEPTIONAL

- Precise, highly articulate language.
- Writing is consistently concise and purposeful; every word is carefully chosen to enhance meaning, clarity, or impact.
- Sophisticated and highly effective signposting.
- Seamless flow between sections.
- Composition is expertly tailored to the intended audience, enhancing clarity and engagement.

First (70-84%) ADVANCED

- Accurate, clear, and well-controlled language.
- Writing is concise and well-controlled, with clear, deliberate choices that support clarity and avoid unnecessary detail.
- Effective and logical signposting.
- Excellent flow between sections.
- Writing is clearly suited to the intended audience, supporting understanding and purpose.

2:1 (60-69%) PROFICIENT

- Clear language with few ambiguities.
- Writing is mostly to the point, though some parts could be shorter or more focused.
- Mostly effective and logical signposting.
- Very good flow between sections
- Writing is generally appropriate for the audience, with good clarity and tone.

2:2 (50-59%) DEVELOPING

- Generally clear language with some ambiguities.
- Writing sometimes includes extra words or detail that make ideas less clear.
- Inconsistent but occasionally effective signposting.
- Sound flow between sections though transitions may be abrupt.
- Audience needs are considered, but clarity and tone are inconsistent.

3rd (40-49%) EMERGING

- Language is acceptable but lacks clarity in places.
- Writing often includes unnecessary words or repeats ideas, which affects clarity.
- Some but ineffective signposting.
- Some flow between sections although frequent disconnections.
- Audience awareness is weak, and writing may confuse or disengage the reader.

Marginal Fail (35-39%) LIMITED

- Language is largely unclear and can prevent understanding in places.
- Writing includes too much extra or unclear information, making it hard to follow.
- Inadequate/ ineffective signposting.
- Disjointed experience due to lack of integration.

- Writing is poorly suited to the audience, making comprehension difficult.

Fail (0-34%) INADEQUATE

- Unclear language throughout. Prevents understanding.
- Writing uses too many unnecessary or confusing words, making it hard to follow or understand.
- No signposting.
- No integration between sections.
- Writing is inaccessible to the intended audience and fails to communicate meaning.

Oral Presentation

The ability to deliver a spoken presentation effectively. This may include:

- Organisation and Structure: How well the presentation is organised and structured.
- Delivery: How clearly the presentation is spoken.
- Engagement: How well the audience's attention is captured and held.
- Use of visual aids (where appropriate): Enhancing understanding with tools like slides or charts.

First (85-100%) EXCEPTIONAL

- Structure is clear, purposeful, and flows seamlessly.
- Delivery is exceptionally clear and well-paced, with thoughtful emphasis.
- Presentation communicates ideas effectively and maintains strong engagement.
- Visual aids are integrated and enhance understanding.

First (70-84%) ADVANCED

- Structure is cohesive and supports a smooth flow of ideas.
- Delivery is clear and controlled, aiding comprehension.
- Presentation is engaging and well-matched to the audience.
- Visual aids reinforce key points.

2:1 (60-69%) PROFICIENT

- Structure is logical and supports the main points.
- Delivery is mostly clear, with consistent pace and tone.

- Presentation holds audience interest for most of the time.
- Visual aids support the message effectively.

2:2 (50-59%) DEVELOPING

- Structure is mostly clear, with some uneven transitions.
- Delivery varies in clarity or control.
- Presentation shows some engagement, though attention may fluctuate.
- Visual aids provide basic support.

3rd (40-49%) EMERGING

- Structure is basic and may disrupt flow.
- Delivery lacks consistency in clarity or pacing.
- Presentation struggles to maintain attention.
- Visual aids are minimal or unclear.

Marginal Fail (35-39%) LIMITED

- Structure is unclear or disjointed.
- Delivery is often unclear or distracting.
- Presentation does not sustain audience attention.
- Visual aids are poorly used or ineffective.

Fail (0-34%) INADEQUATE

- No clear structure is evident.
- Delivery prevents understanding.
- Presentation is disengaging and inaccessible.
- Visual aids are absent or unusable.

Response to Questioning

The ability to engage with questions in synchronous or asynchronous contexts in a manner that is clear, relevant, and informed. This includes:

- Clarity and subject understanding: Providing responses that are accurate, structured, and relevant, demonstrating understanding of the topic or issue.
- Engagement and adaptability: Interacting appropriately with the questioner, including responding to follow-up questions, considering alternative perspectives, and adapting responses to clarify or expand when needed.

First (85-100%) EXCEPTIONAL

- Responds to questions thoughtfully and with exceptional clarity, insight, and confidence, demonstrating a comprehensive understanding of the topic.
- Engages flexibly and perceptively, adapting responses to explore depth, clarify meaning, and consider alternative perspectives.

First (70-84%) ADVANCED

- Responds clearly and confidently, showing the ability to engage with different angles or follow-up points and demonstrating advanced understanding.
- Adapts responses effectively, offering clarification or elaboration when appropriate.

2:1 (60-69%) PROFICIENT

- Responds very well to most questions, with proficient understanding and generally clear communication.
- Shows some ability to reflect, clarify, or elaborate when prompted.

2:2 (50-59%) DEVELOPING

- Responds appropriately to most questions, with sound understanding.
- Shows some ability to clarify or expand when prompted, though responses may lack depth.

3rd (40-49%) EMERGING

- Responds to questions with basic understanding and limited clarity.
- May need prompting to clarify or expand, and responses may lack depth, precision, or adaptability.

Marginal Fail (35-39%) LIMITED

- Responds with limited clarity or relevance, showing some understanding but struggling to elaborate or directly address the question.
- Rarely adapts responses, even with prompting.

Fail (0-34%) INADEQUATE

- Unable to respond meaningfully to questions, showing no clear understanding of the topic.
- Does not engage or adapt responses, even with support.

Presentation of Data

The ability to present and assimilate data in ways that align with academic and disciplinary expectations. This may include:

- Selecting appropriate methods of data presentation, such as tables, graphs, charts, or other visual formats suited to the subject field and type of data.
- Applying formatting and labelling conventions, including titles, axis labels, units, legends, and consistent styling, in accordance with disciplinary norms.
- Integrating data into the wider work, ensuring it is clearly referenced, placed appropriately, and contributes to the communication of ideas or findings.
- Aligning with disciplinary expectations, demonstrating awareness of how data is typically presented and interpreted within the subject area.

First (85-100%) EXCEPTIONAL

- Data presentation methods are not only consistently appropriate and well-judged but also show originality or creativity in how they are selected or adapted to enhance communication and insight within the disciplinary context.
- Formatting is precise and consistent; all labels, titles, and legends are complete and follow disciplinary conventions.
- Data is seamlessly integrated into the work, clearly referenced, and enhances communication.
- Presentation of data fully aligns with disciplinary expectations, demonstrating clear awareness of subject-specific norms.

First (70-84%) ADVANCED

- Data presentation methods are consistently appropriate and effectively used. There may be some thoughtful choices or adaptations, though not necessarily original. Selection supports clear and purposeful communication.
- Formatting and labelling are mostly accurate, with very few minor errors or omissions.
- Data is well-integrated and referenced, with clear relevance to the surrounding content.
- Presentation of data aligns well with disciplinary expectations.

2:1 (60-69%) PROFICIENT

- Data presentation methods are generally appropriate and competently applied. Some choices may be conventional or lack precision, but they are mostly suitable for the data and context.
- Formatting and labelling are mostly correct, with occasional inconsistencies or missing elements.
- Data is integrated and referenced, though some connections may be less clear or underdeveloped.
- Presentation of data shows general awareness of disciplinary expectations.

2:2 (50-59%) DEVELOPING

- Some data presentation methods are appropriate, but others may be poorly chosen, overly simplistic, or inconsistently applied. Selection may limit the clarity or effectiveness of communication.
- Formatting and labelling show noticeable issues or omissions.
- Data is inconsistently integrated or referenced, which may affect clarity.
- Presentation of data partially aligns with disciplinary expectations.

3rd (40-49%) EMERGING

- Data presentation methods are basic or occasionally inappropriate. There may be limited variety or understanding of how to match method to data type or context.
- Formatting and labelling are frequently unclear or incomplete.
- Data is included but weakly integrated or referenced.
- Some but limited evidence that the presentation of data aligns with disciplinary expectations.

Marginal Fail (35-39%) LIMITED

- Few appropriate data presentation methods are used. Choices may be unclear, irrelevant, or show limited understanding of how to present data effectively.
- Formatting and labelling are often incorrect or missing.
- Data is poorly integrated or not clearly referenced.
- Minimal evidence that the presentation of data aligns with disciplinary expectations.

Fail (0-34%) INADEQUATE

- No clear attempt to use appropriate data presentation methods. Methods used are unsuitable or absent, with no evidence of understanding how to present data.
- Formatting and labelling are absent or completely incorrect.
- Data is not integrated or referenced in the work.
- No evidence that the presentation of data aligns with disciplinary expectations.

Formatting of Citations

- The ability to apply the required referencing style when citing sources accurately and consistently in the main body of the work (e.g. Harvard Bath, APA, etc.).

First (85-100%) EXCEPTIONAL

- The required referencing style is followed perfectly throughout, with no errors.

First (70-84%) ADVANCED

- The required referencing style is followed closely and consistently, with only occasional minor errors.

2:1 (60-69%) PROFICIENT

- Most aspects of the required referencing style are applied correctly, with a few minor formatting errors.

2:2 (50-59%) DEVELOPING

- There are noticeable errors in formatting or application of the referencing style.

3rd (40-49%) EMERGING

- Frequent formatting issues or deviations from the required referencing style are present.

Marginal Fail (35-39%) LIMITED

- The referencing style is applied inconsistently or incorrectly in most cases.

Fail (0-34%) INADEQUATE

- The required referencing style is not used or is entirely misapplied.

Formatting of Reference List/Bibliography

- The ability to accurately present the full list of sources at the end of the work. A good reference list includes all the sources that were cited directly in the text, written in the correct format and alphabetical order (or as required by the referencing style. They should be complete, consistent, and follow the rules of the required referencing style. A bibliography includes all sources consulted, whether they were cited directly or not.

First (85-100%) EXCEPTIONAL

- The reference list/bibliography is complete, perfectly formatted, and follows the required style exactly. All sources cited in the text are included.

First (70-84%) ADVANCED

- The reference list/bibliography is mostly complete and accurate, with only minor formatting errors. All key sources are included.

2:1 (60-69%) PROFICIENT

- The reference list/bibliography is mostly correct but may contain some formatting issues or small omissions. Most sources are included.

2:2 (50-59%) DEVELOPING

- The reference list/bibliography is inconsistent, with several formatting errors or missing details. Some sources may be missing.

3rd (40-49%) EMERGING

- The reference list/bibliography is incomplete or poorly formatted. Several sources cited in the text may be missing or incorrect.

Marginal Fail (35-39%) LIMITED

- The reference list/bibliography is mostly missing or incorrect, with major formatting issues and many missing sources.

Fail (0-34%) INADEQUATE

- No reference list/bibliography provided, or the list is completely incorrect and does not reflect the sources used.

Practical Competence

The ability to apply relevant skills, techniques, and knowledge in real or simulated contexts. This may include:

- Skill performance: Executing tasks with appropriate levels of accuracy, efficiency, and confidence.
- Knowledge application: Drawing on theoretical understanding to inform and enhance practical work.
- Autonomy: Taking initiative and responsibility in conducting tasks.
- Responsiveness: Adapting to challenges, solving problems, and making informed decisions.
- Innovation: Exploring and applying creative or original approaches where appropriate.
- Assessment may take written, oral, or practical forms and may be aligned with external or professional standards where relevant.

First (85-100%) EXCEPTIONAL

- Skills are comprehensive and consistently demonstrated with precision, efficiency, and confidence.
- Theory is used in sophisticated and insightful ways to inform and enhance practice.
- Works completely independently and takes initiative.
- Responds to challenges with confidence and adaptability.
- Demonstrates creative and original approaches, often trying new methods.

First (70-84%) ADVANCED

- Skills are advanced, with work that is mostly precise, efficient, and confident.
- Theory is applied clearly and effectively to support practical work.

- Works independently, requiring little support.
- Adapts well to challenges and demonstrates problem-solving ability.
- Shows thoughtful and sometimes original approaches.

2:1 (60-69%) PROFICIENT

- Skills are proficient, with work that is generally accurate and confident, despite minor errors.
- Theory is applied in a clear and sensible way to guide practice.
- Can work independently in familiar situations.
- Demonstrates some responsiveness and flexibility in approach.
- Uses standard methods but can adapt when needed.

2:2 (50-59%) DEVELOPING

- Skills are developing but usable, with work that is sometimes accurate, though not always confident.
- Theory is applied in a simple but workable way.
- Uses standard methods with limited independence.
- Shows independence but needs support in more complex situations.
- Shows some ability to respond to guidance and adapt.

3rd (40-49%) EMERGING

- Skills are emerging but meet the minimum level, with inconsistent and hesitant performance.
- Theory is only partly used or not well understood.
- Shows some independence but needs regular support.
- Struggles to adapt or problem-solve independently.
- Approaches are basic and reactive, lacking depth.

Marginal Fail (35-39%) LIMITED

- Skills are limited, with frequent mistakes and lack of control.
- Theory is poorly used or misunderstood.
- Requires significant help to complete tasks.
- Shows little ability to respond to challenges or adapt.
- Approaches are often inappropriate or ineffective.

Fail (0-34%) INADEQUATE

- Skills are inadequate; they are missing or not demonstrated.
- Work is mostly incorrect or incomplete.
- No clear use of theory is evident.
- Cannot work without full support.
- No useful approach to tasks is shown.

Use of Target Language (Written Work)

The ability to use the target language in terms of correctness, fluidity, word choice, influence from other languages, and appropriateness for the given context. This includes:

- Accuracy: How correctly the language is used, including grammar and syntax.
- Fluency: The smoothness and flow of the language.
- Vocabulary: The range and appropriateness of words and expressions used.
- Interference: The extent to which the target language is influenced by another language, such as English.
- Register: The suitability of the language for the context, whether formal, informal, technical, etc.

First (85-100%) EXCEPTIONAL

- Highly natural use of linguistic structures with virtually no errors.
- Fluent and smooth expression throughout.
- Varied and precise vocabulary used effectively.
- Very little to no interference from English.
- Consistently appropriate and well-judged register.

First (70-84%) ADVANCED

- Mostly natural use of linguistic structures with few minor errors.
- Generally fluent and well-paced expression.
- Broad and appropriate vocabulary.
- Little interference from English.
- Generally appropriate and consistent register.

2:1 (60-69%) PROFICIENT

- Appropriate use of linguistic structures with some errors.
- Mostly natural expression with occasional awkwardness.
- Adequate range of vocabulary with some repetition.

- Some interference from English.
- Mostly appropriate register with minor inconsistencies.

2:2 (50-59%) DEVELOPING

- Basic use of linguistic structures with frequent errors.
- Comprehensible but uneven expression.
- Limited vocabulary with noticeable repetition.
- Frequent interference from English.
- Uneven or inconsistently applied register.

3rd (40-49%) EMERGING

- Very basic use of linguistic structures with frequent errors.
- Hesitant or disjointed expression.
- Confusing or inappropriate vocabulary.
- Strong interference from English.
- No clear awareness of register.

Marginal Fail (35-39%) LIMITED

- Little awareness of linguistic structures; very frequent errors.
- Mostly confusing and sometimes incomprehensible expression.
- Very limited vocabulary.
- Strong interference from English.
- Register is inappropriate or absent.

Fail (0-34%) INADEQUATE

- No awareness of linguistic structures; language is largely inaccurate.
- Expression is confusing and incomprehensible.
- Vocabulary is extremely limited or misused.
- Overwhelming interference from English.
- No evidence of appropriate register.

Use of the Target Language (Oral Work)

The ability to orally communicate in the target language in terms of pronunciation, fluency, influence from other languages, and overall understandability. This includes:
Pronunciation and Intonation:

- The accuracy and natural flow of speech sounds.
- Fluency: The smoothness and ease of speaking.
- Interference: The minimal influence of another language, such as English.
- Comprehensibility: How easy it is to understand the spoken language.

First (85-100%) EXCEPTIONAL

- Pronunciation and intonation are highly accurate and natural.
- Speech is very fluent and smooth.
- Very little interference from English.
- Extremely easy to understand.

First (70-84%) ADVANCED

- Pronunciation and intonation are accurate and well-controlled.
- Speech is fluent and well-paced.
- Very little interference from English.
- Very easy to understand.

2:1 (60-69%) PROFICIENT

- Pronunciation and intonation are mostly accurate.
- Speech is mostly fluent with minor hesitations.
- Some interference from English.
- Easy to understand.

2:2 (50-59%) DEVELOPING

- Pronunciation and intonation are occasionally accurate but inconsistent.
- Speech lacks fluency and may be hesitant.
- Quite a lot of interference from English.
- Generally understandable despite lapses.

3rd (40-49%) EMERGING

- Pronunciation and intonation are rarely accurate.
- General lack of fluency.
- A lot of interference from English.
- Hard to understand.

Marginal Fail (35-39%) LIMITED

- Pronunciation and intonation are inaccurate.
- Little to no fluency.
- Strong interference from English.
- Not generally understandable.

Fail (0-34%) INADEQUATE

- Pronunciation and intonation are very inaccurate.
- No fluency.
- Strong interference from English.
- Not understandable.