

Marking Criteria for Public-Facing Projects

(E.G. Blog, Podcast, Vlog, Theatre Programme, Magazine, Exhibition Guide)

These are general principles for assessing projects which communicates academic knowledge to a non-specialist audience. Arrangements for individual modules may differ according to subject specificity and/or intended learning outcomes. For example, use of the School's marking criteria on exhibitions, performances, short films, and presentations might be appropriate to use in conjunction with this more general mark scheme. If the project is accompanied by a separate rationale or critical essay, those are to be marked according to the School's general criteria of assessment.

Outstanding First (80-100). An exemplary project, which is both ambitious and successfully executed, negotiating module themes with imagination and integrity. Content is engaging and persuasive, and the student has succeeded in synthesising and conveying complex, nuanced ideas in an accessible manner. Excellent deployment of the chosen format to create a highly polished, visually or aurally appealing project.

- A highly sophisticated incorporation of primary sources within the limits of the chosen format, and evidence of significant amounts of independent research.
- Compelling and innovative content, handled with maturity. The aims of the project are highly relevant to the module content and are clearly explained in either an accompanying rationale, or within the project itself.
- Very well-presented, using a lucid and clear communication style with a suitable register for a public audience. Evidence of attention to their chosen format, e.g. by replicating a 'real world' format such as a magazine lay-out, or by using captioned multi-media sources and hyperlinks on digital projects. If a time-limited project, then the recording will fit into the time allowed, and is not hurried or drawn out.

First (70-79) An informative, ambitious, and persuasive project, which negotiates module themes with imagination and integrity. The project mainly succeeds in synthesising and conveying complex, nuanced ideas in an accessible manner. Consistently good deployment of the chosen format to create a polished, visually or aurally appealing project.

- A sophisticated incorporation of primary sources within the limits of the chosen format, and evidence of thorough independent research.
- Compelling and innovative content. The aims of the project are highly relevant to the module content and are well explained in either an accompanying rationale, or within the project itself.
- Well-presented, using a clear communication style with a suitable register for a public audience. Evidence of attention to their chosen format, e.g. by replicating a 'real world' format such as a magazine lay-out, or by using captioned multi-media sources and hyperlinks on digital projects. If a time-limited project, then the recording will fit into the time allowed, and is not hurried or drawn out.

Upper second (60-69) An informative and generally persuasive project, which negotiates module themes consistently well, but which might lack the flair of a first class project. At the higher end of the classification, while the project might not be as skilful in communicating nuance or complexity in an accessible manner, the ambition to do so is evident. At the lower end of this classification, the work draws on a more routine set of ideas or themes from the module. Good use is made of the chosen format, to create a visually or aurally appealing project.

- Good incorporation of primary sources within the limits of the chosen format, and evidence of independent research.
 - The content is accurate and well analysed. At the lower end there may be some inaccuracies, but these are infrequent enough and easily corrected. The aims of the project are relevant to the module content, and generally explained in either an accompanying rationale, or within the project itself.
 - Well-presented, with a clear communication style, though there might be some variance in quality across the project. A suitable register for a public audience is used, and there is some evidence of attention to their chosen format, though this might not be consistently executed (e.g. by replicating a 'real world' format such as a magazine lay-out, or by using captioned multi-media sources and hyperlinks on digital projects). If a time-limited project, then the recording will generally fit into the time allowed, though some aspects might be hurried or impeded.
-

Lower second (50-59) An adequate project, which, while it broadly responds to module themes, may lack in ambition both in content, and in the use of the chosen format. The project might be unevenly developed, mainly drawing on a more routine set of ideas or themes from the module. While an effort has been made to use the chosen format to be visually or aurally appealing, some elements (e.g. captioning, hyperlinks, use of multi-media) might be missing.

- Evidence of adequate understanding of primary sources, which might not be fully integrated into the chosen format. Evidence of a small amount of independent research, which at the lower end of the classification might be irrelevant, or not well utilised.
- The content is mainly accurate, but the analysis of primary or secondary sources demonstrates some misunderstanding or evidence gaps in logic or reasoning. The aims of the project are stated or implied, but might not be convincingly executed, and at the lower end might not be relevant to the module content.
- Uneven presentation, which at times is hard to follow or might at times be unsuitable for a public audience. Minimal use of the chosen format might demonstrate a lack of ambition or originality (e.g. if the project is effectively an essay, shoehorned into a different format; if images or multimedia are decorative rather than informative). Alternatively, there might more attention to style over content. If a time-limited project, then the recording might not fit the time allowed, perhaps due to an inappropriate planning. Delivery might be rushed, and gaps in logic or content might appear.

Third (40-49) A basic project which partially responds to module themes but might demonstrate significant gaps in content or knowledge. Minimal use is made of the chosen format, or its organisation and style is inconsistent and difficult to follow.

- Partial understanding of primary sources, which might not be clearly integrated into the chosen format. Limited and irrelevant independent research.
- Unconvincing or incoherent content, with numerous inaccuracies and gaps of logic demonstrating a misunderstanding of the brief and module content. Aims of the project are poorly expressed, and at the lower end are irrelevant to the module themes.
- Poor and confusing presentation, with an inconsistent style which is hard to follow, or is unsuitable for a public audience. Minimal or no effort is made to use the chosen format, which might demonstrate a lack of attention to the brief, or a disinterest in using available and appropriate multimedia. If a time-limited project, then a lack of planning might be evident if the recording is too long or is rushed and therefore misses out content, or if is too short due to a lack of content.

Marginal Fail (35-39) A limited or largely inaccurate project, with tangential connections to the module themes, and insufficient use of the chosen format. Large gaps in internal logic, organisation, and content are confusing, and demonstrate little thought about the accessibility of their project.

- Insufficient or flawed understanding of primary sources or module content. No evidence of independent research.
- There is minimal evidence that an effort has been made to meet the requirements of the brief. Content might therefore rely on opinion or unsupported assertion, and aims very poorly expressed, and irrelevant to the module themes.
- Presentation is very poor and confusing in many respects. No effort has been made to use a chosen format, which might demonstrate a lack of attention to the brief, or a disinterest in using available and appropriate multimedia. If a time-limited project, then a lack of planning will mean that timing is poor (either unreasonably long or short).

Fail (0-34) A highly limited, incomplete, or inaccurate project, with no connection to the module themes, and no use is made of the chosen format. Largely incoherent, and demonstrates no thought about the accessibility of their project.

- A lack of understanding of primary sources or module content. No evidence of independent research.
 - There is no evidence that an effort has been made to meet the requirements of the brief. Content might therefore rely on opinion or unsupported assertion, and aims are not expressed at all.
 - Presentation is very poor and confusing in all respects. No effort has been made to use a chosen format, which might demonstrate a lack of attention to the brief, or a disinterest in using available and appropriate multimedia. If a time-limited project, then a lack of planning will mean that timing is very poor (either unreasonably long or short).
-