# IQM3006

**LEVEL 3 · CONTROLLED STAFF DOCUMENT**

INTO QUALIFICATIONS

## Law and International Relations

# Assessment 1: Individual presentation

## STAFF ONLY · Staff rubric and indicative content

| | |
|---|---|
| **Assessment window**<br>Sample assessment | **Presentation date**<br>_____ |
| **Paper**<br>— | **Assessment set**<br>Sample 2026 · ID 2026-S |
| **Duration**<br>**15-minute presentation plus up to 5 minutes of unassessed questions (20 minutes maximum)** | **Total marks**<br>**100** |
| **Assessment window**<br>**Sample assessment** | **Assessment set**<br>**Set S of 2026** |
| **Audience**<br>**Staff only** | **Release timing**<br>**at coursework release** |
| **Presentation date**<br>_____ | **Assessment set ID**<br>2026-S |

**STAFF ONLY · Apply the three-criterion holistic rubric by best fit. Clarification questions are not assessed.**

## Holistic marking rubric

Read the three criterion descriptors together and award one holistic best-fit percentage. Do not total or average separate criterion marks. Clarification questions remain unassessed. Visual support is optional. Assess visual material only where used; do not penalise a presentation without visuals.

| Level | Mark range | **Content and task achievement**<br>**Holistic**<br>Addresses the question with a precise focus; demonstrates accurate, thorough knowledge; develops ideas with relevant evidence and evaluation. | **Organisation and design**<br>**Holistic**<br>Structures the presentation logically and coherently; uses accurate terminology, effective signposting and visuals, where used, that support the content; no visuals are required and their absence is not penalised. | **Presentation skills and pronunciation**<br>**Holistic**<br>Engages the audience with confident delivery; uses notes appropriately and speaks fluently with clear pronunciation, effective pace, volume and pausing. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A*** | **80–100** | • The question has been answered to an outstanding degree and has exceeded expectations in several places. An outstanding level of focus is evident throughout. Knowledge is consistently accurate & extremely thorough. All main ideas are developed and expanded upon. Accurate evidence is consistently provided to support ideas. Evaluation is extremely detailed & consistently in-depth. | • Structure is extremely logical throughout & all required parts are included. An extremely well-organised and coherent answer. Outstanding use of terminology throughout. Language is used precisely and appropriately throughout. Outstanding signposting. Where visuals are used, they enhance the presentation; their absence is not a weakness. There are no typos. | • Evidence of outstanding presentation skills with confident delivery throughout. Exceeds expectations in terms of audience interaction and engagement. Notes do not detract from presentation. Natural and confident fluency. Clear pronunciation of words & effective use of pausing, volume & pace. |
| **A** | **70–79** | • The question has been answered to an excellent degree and has exceeded expectations in 1-2 places. An excellent level of focus is evident in most places. Knowledge is very accurate & thorough in most places; there may be 1-2 omissions. Most main ideas are developed and expanded upon. Accurate & detailed evidence is provided in most places; there may be 1-2 slight inaccuracies/lack of focus. Evaluation is very detailed & in-depth in most places; there may be 1-2 omissions. | • Structure is logical in most places & all required parts are included. A well-organised and coherent answer. Excellent use of terminology in most places. The occasional, systematic error. Excellent signposting with 1-2 omissions/errors. Where visuals are used, they support the content; a presentation without visuals can still meet this band. There may be 1-2 typos. | • Evidence of excellent presentation skills with confident delivery in most places. Mostly excellent audience interaction and engagement. Use of notes/screen is occasionally distracting. Most speech is fluent; occasional hesitancy. Generally clear pronunciation of words with some effective use of pausing, volume & pace. |

| Level | Mark range | Content and task achievement<br>Holistic<br>Addresses the question with a precise focus; demonstrates accurate, thorough knowledge; develops ideas with relevant evidence and evaluation. | Organisation and design<br>Holistic<br>Structures the presentation logically and coherently; uses accurate terminology, effective signposting and visuals, where used, that support the content; no visuals are required and their absence is not penalised. | Presentation skills and pronunciation<br>Holistic<br>Engages the audience with confident delivery; uses notes appropriately and speaks fluently with clear pronunciation, effective pace, volume and pausing. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **B** | **60–69** | • The question has been answered to a good degree, although some required content is under-represented. The band reflects uneven coverage and development of approved course content; it does not require material beyond the course or cap strong work within the syllabus. A good-level of focus is evident in many places; there may be the odd irrelevance. Knowledge is accurate & thorough in many places. Many, but not all, main ideas are developed and expanded upon. Accurate evidence is provided in many places to a good degree, but more detail/precision required. Evaluation is fairly detailed & in-depth in many places, but more detail needed/some inaccuracy/vagueness. | • Structure is logical in many places & all required parts are included. A fairly well-organised and coherent answer with the occasional misplaced sentence/idea. Good use of terminology. Some errors which affect comprehension. Occasional inappropriate style e.g. informality. Good signposting in places but with some omissions/errors. Any visuals used are generally relevant and appropriate; no visuals are required or penalised. Some typos; inappropriate font size/style and/or too much text on slides. | • Evidence of good presentation skills with confident delivery in many places. Good audience interaction and engagement. Reading from notes/screen sometimes causes pauses. Speech is fluent in many places; may be some disfluency in others. Mispronunciation of some words; some attempt to use pausing, volume & pace but more expression required. |
| **C** | **50–59** | • The question has been answered to a satisfactory degree, but some key points may be missing/vague. A satisfactory-level of focus is evident in some places but there may be some irrelevance and/or ideas may be over-dependent on source material. Knowledge is satisfactory in most places. Some main ideas are developed and expanded upon. Satisfactory evidence is provided in some places but there may be inaccuracies and vagueness. Evaluation is given in some places and to a satisfactory degree but with some omissions/lack of detail/inaccuracy. | • Structure is logical in most places, but one required aspect may be missing/under-developed (i.e. introduction or conclusion). Satisfactorily organised and coherent answer with some misplaced sentences/ideas. Satisfactory use of terminology. Some dependence on script/slides. Some inappropriacy. Signposting may be under/overused. Some language errors which confuse/distract. Where visuals are used, text may be too dense or small; the absence of visuals is not penalised. | • Evidence of satisfactory presentation skills with satisfactory delivery in some places. Some evidence of fluent speech but also some frequent hesitation. Reading from notes/screen is sometimes distracting; may be facing the screen whilst speaking. Some fluency but also frequent hesitation. Mispronunciation affects understanding. Issues with pausing, volume & pacing. |

| Level | Mark range | **Content and task achievement**<br>**Holistic**<br>Addresses the question with a precise focus; demonstrates accurate, thorough knowledge; develops ideas with relevant evidence and evaluation. | **Organisation and design**<br>**Holistic**<br>Structures the presentation logically and coherently; uses accurate terminology, effective signposting and visuals, where used, that support the content; no visuals are required and their absence is not penalised. | **Presentation skills and pronunciation**<br>**Holistic**<br>Engages the audience with confident delivery; uses notes appropriately and speaks fluently with clear pronunciation, effective pace, volume and pausing. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **D** | **40–49** | • The question has been answered to a limited degree only with 3 or more key points missing/vague. There is a lack of focus in most places and/or ideas may be over-dependent on source material. Knowledge is limited and/or inaccurate in most places. Limited main ideas are developed and expanded upon. Limited evidence is provided. A lack of evaluation. | • Structure is illogical in most places and 1-2 required aspects may be missing/under-developed. A disorganised answer with misplaced sentences/ideas in most places. Limited and/or inaccurate use of terminology. Excessive reliance on a script; where visuals are used they may distract or fail to support content. | • Limited presentation skills with limited delivery in most places. Lacking in fluent speech and/or hesitancy in most places. The presentation is read entirely from notes/screen. A large proportion of the presentation is spent facing the screen. Speech is mostly disfluent. Difficulties with comprehension due to mispronunciation of words. |
| **E** | **30–39** | • Fails to answer the question. Misunderstanding of key concepts. Unable to expand upon main ideas and topics. No reference to the source material. | • No clear structure. Difficult to follow. Language and terminology used incorrectly or imprecisely throughout. Where visuals are used, they do not relate to the content or are unreadable because of too much or too little text. | • Delivery is hesitant or faltering. Presentation lacks fluency despite reading entirely from slides/notes. Poor pronunciation and fluency detract from comprehension. |
| **U** | **0–29** | • Performance does not meet the minimum requirements for the component. Evidence is absent, substantially incomplete or inaccurate, and delivery does not demonstrate the required knowledge, analysis or communication. | • Performance does not meet the minimum requirements for the component. Evidence is absent, substantially incomplete or inaccurate, and delivery does not demonstrate the required knowledge, analysis or communication. | • Performance does not meet the minimum requirements for the component. Evidence is absent, substantially incomplete or inaccurate, and delivery does not demonstrate the required knowledge, analysis or communication. |

# Topic-specific indicative content

## LIR-P-01 • Human-rights protection: principle and practice

To what extent do legal institutions provide effective protection for one human right? Choose a right and a named jurisdiction and examine one documented case or controversy. Apply the relevant domestic legal rule to the case and compare domestic protection with one relevant international human-rights instrument. Explain the difference between having a right in principle and obtaining an effective remedy in practice. Analyse how at least one relevant international institution, global political process or international-relations perspective shapes protection or response. Evaluate a strength and a limitation before reaching a supported judgement.

Define the selected right accurately and distinguish rights, liberties and the legal instruments relevant to the chosen jurisdiction. A declaration, treaty and domestic statute should not be treated as interchangeable.

Identify the responsible court or institution, the relevant rule and the issue raised by the selected case. Apply the rule to the facts instead of merely recounting events.

Analyse how at least one relevant international institution, global political process or international-relations perspective shapes protection or response. Explain one mechanism, such as access to a remedy, accountability or implementation. Credit any accurate, relevant institutional, process or theoretical analysis.

Analyse a relevant limitation such as cost, delay, enforcement, jurisdiction, a lawful limitation on a qualified right or a gap between formal protection and practice. Do not assume all rights permit the same limitations.

Compare domestic and international arrangements accurately. Where the Human Rights Act 1998 is relevant, distinguish domestic mechanisms from applications to the European Court of Human Rights and from European Union institutions.

Evaluate effectiveness against an explicit criterion, such as remedy, accessibility or implementation, and acknowledge what a single case can and cannot establish. Accept any supported conclusion.

Unassessed clarification: Which source establishes the rule or decision you relied on, and why did you regard it as authoritative?

Unassessed clarification: Which fact in your case most strongly limits your conclusion about effective protection?

## LIR-P-02 • Global governance and a shared challenge

To what extent has one international institution responded effectively to a defined conflict, poverty or inequality challenge? Choose one institution and one documented intervention or programme for which a relevant legal instrument, rule or obligation can be identified. Apply that instrument, rule or obligation to the institution’s mandate or response, explain its methods, use both realist and liberal perspectives to analyse the response, and evaluate achievements and limitations using evidence from a clearly stated period.

Define the institution, challenge, period and scope of the intervention. Identify and apply a relevant legal instrument, rule or obligation that establishes or constrains the institution’s mandate or response. Explain the mandate without assuming powers the institution does not possess; credit any accurate applicable instrument or rule.

Select evidence of actions and outcomes and distinguish an announced goal, an activity and an achieved outcome. Consider whether evidence comes from the institution itself or an independent assessment.

Apply realism to interests, power, sovereignty or limits on cooperation; apply liberalism to institutions, interdependence or collective action. Explain how each lens illuminates specific evidence.

Analyse a mechanism connecting the intervention to an outcome and consider another plausible cause. Correlation alone does not establish institutional effectiveness.

Evaluate constraints such as consent, funding, unequal influence, coordination, enforcement or local implementation where relevant. Avoid requiring all constraints in every answer.

Reach a judgement using appropriate criteria, such as conflict reduction, access to services, distribution of benefits, durability or legitimacy. A mixed or conditional conclusion is acceptable.

Unassessed clarification: What evidence distinguishes the institution’s activities from their effects?

Unassessed clarification: How would the alternative IR theory challenge your explanation of one result?

## LIR-P-03 • Hard power, soft power and international influence

Is soft power more effective than hard power in advancing a country's international influence? Choose one country and a defined period. Compare one documented example of each form of power, explain the intended audience and objective, and apply at least one relevant international legal rule or obligation to one or both examples. Evaluate the evidence of influence against consistent criteria and relate your judgement to the country's position among great or emerging powers.

Define hard power through coercion or material inducement and soft power through attraction or persuasion; classify the selected mechanisms rather than relying on labels alone. Identify and apply at least one relevant international legal rule or obligation to one or both examples. Credit an accurate treaty, customary rule or other applicable obligation, with its scope explained; do not assume that every influence mechanism is legally governed.

Specify the intended target and objective of each example. Popularity, expenditure, military capability and achievement of a foreign-policy objective are different kinds of evidence.

Analyse how culture, diplomacy, education, institutions, economic resources or military capacity shape the selected relationship, using only those mechanisms relevant to the examples.

Consider interaction between forms of power, including whether coercion can undermine attraction or whether legitimacy can support cooperation.

Compare effectiveness against consistent criteria and recognise differences in objectives, audiences and time scales. Explain why the two examples may not support a universal ranking.

Relate the argument to great/emerging powers, hegemony or multipolarity. Support a conditional judgement; do not reward agreement with a preferred national or ideological position.

Unassessed clarification: What observable change would count as successful influence in your two examples?

Unassessed clarification: How does the country's wider position in the international system affect your comparison?

Indicative content supports consistent marking but is not exhaustive. Credit valid alternative examples and analytical routes that answer the approved topic.

## Applying the holistic rubric

Assess the presentation using the three criteria together and award one integer mark out of 100. Do not add or average separate criterion marks.

Locate the best-fit band using evidence across the complete presentation, then place the mark within that band according to how consistently and securely its descriptors are met. Record specific evidence and a rationale. A candidate is assessed against the approved course content; remaining within the syllabus is not a cap. Higher bands reward more accurate, detailed, applied, analytical and evaluative work within that content.

Clarification questions are unassessed. Use questions to clarify or authenticate evidence, not to award additional marks or create a second assessment.

Award zero where there is no relevant assessable evidence. An administrative non-submission or authenticity concern must follow the controlling procedure, not a fabricated academic judgement.

Credit valid alternatives and substantiated disagreement. Judge intelligibility and communication under the rubric, not imitation of a particular accent, political agreement or personal disclosure.

## Presentation administration

Before release, confirm approved topic set, source conditions, schedule, recording arrangements and access arrangements. Check that candidate and staff documents state 15 minutes plus up to 5 minutes, maximum 20 minutes.

Check that the selected focus fits one topic and is manageable in 15 minutes. A scope check must not supply the student’s argument, source selection or conclusion.

Record candidate identity, topic ID, presentation title, date, assessor, actual presentation/questioning times and recording reference on the marking record.

Ask the two topic prompts where useful within five minutes, adapting only to clarify the presentation without coaching. Record questions and any authenticity concern. Do not score the clarification separately.

Retain slides, references, cover sheet, recording and the completed marking record under the applicable centre process. Where slides are used, the centre checks by its communicated submission deadline that files open and comply with assessment conditions; this administrative check does not endorse academic content or predict a mark. Preserve original marker judgements and any moderation decisions without inventing approval.