

MRes in Environmental Geosciences: assessment criteria & grade descriptors.

	Empirical project	Oral/Group Presentations
80%+ Distinction	Extremely high level of technical competence and accuracy. Fluent explanation of key concepts and use of a wide range of appropriate details to illustrate the argument. Evidence of independent and original thought. Synthesis and analysis of ideas and results.	Ambitious and innovative presentation. An engaging presentation which is authoritative and includes original ideas.
70-79% Distinction	Very high level of technical competence and strong understanding of key concepts. Appropriate application and use of salient detail. Displays evidence of independent thought and strong critical evaluation. Well-organised, well-structured and properly cited.	Excellent preparation. Broad and occasionally insightful presentation. A presentation which is convincing and engaging.
60-69% Merit	Very good understanding of technical concepts and key ideas. Well organised, detailed and well-structured. Thorough understanding of material as taught, with evidence of additional study. Demonstrates overall competence and may show excellence in some areas. Engages with the question and cites accurately.	Very well-prepared. Very good selection of relevant material. Very good understanding and clearly expressed. Able to deliver a well-paced, quite engaging presentation.
50-59% Pass	Satisfactory understanding of relevant concepts and techniques. Some errors in understanding and/or application. Tendency to be descriptive and lack of critical insight. Adequate citations.	Good evidence of having prepared some relevant material. Good time management and use of an appropriate structure. Some understanding and linkage of concepts. Good engagement with audience.
40-49% Fail	Poor understanding of relevant concepts. Limited use of appropriate techniques. Significant errors in understanding and/or application. Raises doubts about the candidate's grasp of the subject basics. Limited attempt to cite sources.	Evidence of preparation and basic competence in structure and delivery. Remains largely descriptive with very little argument or critical comment. Limited ability to engage audience.
0-39% Fail	Very basic evidence of completing technical components. May have multiple errors and/or gaps in understanding. Poor organisation and structure, poor use of English, substantial omissions and irrelevances. No attempt to cite sources.	May show evidence of preparation, but very limited understanding. Very limited use of evidence. Poor ability to engage the audience. Lacks a clear structure. Substantial irrelevances. Lacks relevance to required outcomes. Very limited engagement with audience.