Criterion 1: AO3 Speaking – Academic Presentation and Communication (60 points)

Mark **The UK percentage bands** **Points**	1st 100-70% 60-42	2:1 69-60% 41-36	2:2 59-50% 35-30	3rd 49-40% 29-24	Marginal Fail 39-30% 23-18	Clear Fail 29-0% 17-0
Descriptor short	Task Criteria fully addressed overall	Task Criteria very well addressed overall	Task Criteria generally addressed overall	Task Criteria addressed with underdeveloped points	Task Criteria partially addressed	Task Criteria not addressed overall
Descriptor long **Indicators of High Achievement (60–42 / 41–36)** The presentation explains the research question, thesis, and key arguments clearly and accurately. Ideas are well organised and logically developed, with effective signposting and time management. Academic sources are referred to appropriately and accurately in spoken form, demonstrating clear understanding of how evidence supports the argument. Academic register is appropriate and sustained throughout. Delivery supports communication through clear speech, appropriate pace, and professional use of notes. **Indicators of Middle Achievement (35–30 / 29–24)** The presentation communicates the main focus and arguments of the research, though clarity or organisation may be uneven. Some reference to academic sources is evident, but explanation of how sources support the argument may be limited or inconsistent. Academic register is generally appropriate, though precision or confidence may vary. Delivery supports communication overall, but reliance on notes or limited signposting may reduce effectiveness.						

Picture 1 ...

Indicators of Low Achievement (23–18 / 17–0) The presentation lacks clear explanation of the research question or thesis, or presents ideas in a disorganised or unclear way. Reference to academic sources is minimal, inaccurate, or absent. Academic register is inappropriate or inconsistent. Over-reliance on notes, reading from slides, or unclear delivery significantly limits communication of academic understanding.						

Criterion 2: AO1 Listening – Understanding and Responding in the Viva (40 points)

Mark **The UK percentage bands** **Points**	1st 100-70% 40–28	2:1 69-60% 27–24	2:2 59-50% 23–20	3rd 49-40% 19–16	Marginal Fail 39-30% 15–12	Clear Fail 29-0% 11–0
Descriptor short	Task Criteria fully addressed overall	Task Criteria very well addressed overall	Task Criteria generally addressed overall	Task Criteria addressed with underdeveloped points	Task Criteria partially addressed	Task Criteria not addressed overall
Descriptor long **Indicators of High Achievement (40–28 / 27–24)** The student consistently demonstrates clear understanding of academic questions during the viva. Responses address the questions directly and accurately, drawing confidently on the student's own research and reading. Answers are coherent, relevant, and reflective, with clear explanation of reasoning. The student engages in the academic discussion thoughtfully, responding appropriately to follow-up questions and demonstrating strong ownership of the research. **Indicators of Middle Achievement (23–20 / 19–16)** The student demonstrates general understanding of most questions, though interpretation may occasionally be partial or require clarification. Responses are relevant overall but may lack depth,						

Picture 1 ...

precision, or reflection. Answers draw on the student's research, but engagement with questions may be uneven. Some reliance on notes may be evident, though the student is able to respond independently at times. **Indicators of Low Achievement (15–12 / 11–0)** The student demonstrates limited or inaccurate understanding of questions, resulting in responses that are unclear, irrelevant, or overly rehearsed. Answers show little evidence of engagement with the research or reflection on the research process. Over-reliance on notes or prepared material prevents meaningful academic discussion.						

Notes for Markers (Rubric Use)

- AO3 is evidenced primarily through the **research presentation**, with supporting evidence from the viva.
- AO1 is evidenced primarily through the **viva**.
- Fluency alone should not be rewarded without evidence of academic understanding.
- Minor language errors should not be over-penalised where meaning and understanding are clear.
- When performance is borderline, **depth of understanding (AO3)** and **quality of engagement with questions (AO1)** should be the primary differentiators, in line with RPS project documentation.