

US

UNIVERSITY
OF SUSSEX

**History Department
Assessment Criteria - Group Presentations**

First (70 and above) <i>NB: the criteria in italics included in this category describe work that falls in the upper end of the first class band (80+)</i>	Upper Second (60-69)	Lower Second (50 - 59)	Third (40 - 49)	Fail (39 and below)
ARGUMENT and STRUCTURE				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation engages closely with task; shows sophisticated appreciation of its wider implications. <i>Presentation challenges or extends the terms of the task.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation displays understanding of task, shows appreciation of some of its wider implications, and makes serious attempt to engage with task. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation displays some understanding of task, but may lack sustained focus or may show only modest understanding of the task's wider implications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation displays little understanding of task, and tends to present material indiscriminately in relation to the task. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation fails to engage with task in any meaningful way.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Structure of presentation facilitates clear, coherent, compelling development of group's argument. Individual contributions effectively and seamlessly harmonised. <i>A sustained effort to develop an innovative presentation structure that supports the argument.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Structure of presentation facilitates clear development of group's argument. Individual contributions are effectively integrated. Towards lower end of mark band, analytical approach not sustained throughout. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Structure of presentation may be heavily influenced by material at group's disposal rather than requirements of task. Individual contributions may lack overall harmony. Ideas may be stated rather than developed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Structure of presentation underdeveloped; argument may be incomplete and unfold in haphazard or undisciplined manner. Little integration of individual contributions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Structure of presentation unclear or absent. No integration of individual contributions.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation moves move between generalization and detailed analysis; group able to synthesize as well as particularize. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation moves between generalization and detailed analysis, although may be a tendency towards either an over-generalized or an over-particularized response. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation prone to excessive narrative or mere description; may display knowledge without reference to the precise requirements of the question. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation prone to excessive narrative, and argument signposted by bald assertion rather than informed generalizations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation fails to present an argument.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation develops the group's own ideas and presents independent lines of thought. <i>Intellectual independence, grounded in a mature consideration of available evidence.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Group has not fully developed its own ideas, but presents ideas with a degree of intellectual independence. Demonstrates the ability to reflect on the past and its interpretation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation unlikely to show any originality in approach or argument, and may tend towards assertion of essentially derivative ideas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation shows no intentional originality of approach. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation shows no sign of originality of approach.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation goes well beyond paraphrasing of other historians' ideas. Demonstrates conceptual command of the historical/historiographical issues at stake. <i>Presentation presents the group's own historiographical interventions.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation deploys other historians' ideas and seeks to move beyond them. Presentation also shows appreciation of the extent to which historical explanations are contested. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation shows some understanding of historians' ideas, but may not reflect critically upon them. Problematic nature of historical explanations may be imperfectly understood. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation shows little appreciation of either historians' ideas or the problematic or contested nature of historical explanations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation shows no awareness of problematic or contested nature of historical explanations.
WRITING and STYLE				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation is audible, fluently delivered, engaging for the audience, and makes effective use of the time allotted. Strikes balance between spoken register and use of technical and advanced vocabulary appropriate to task. <i>An effective, presentation style that enhances the clarity and effectiveness of the argument.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation is audible, clear and to time. Will demonstrate appreciation of technical and advanced vocabulary used by historians. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation delivered so as to convey meaning clearly, but may lack fluency (e.g. reading from script), and may not be to time. May lack command of vocabulary/terminology used by historians. Clumsy expression in places. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation generally clear, but not to time. Lacks sophistication of vocabulary to sustain complex historical argument. In places may lack clarity/felicity of expression. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation unclear, and not to time. Incorrect use of register, and absence of appropriate vocabulary/terminology.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ If required, visual aids clear, relevant, used purposefully and supportively. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ If required, visual aids clear and used supportively. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ If required, visual aids clear, but may not fully support presentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ If required, visual aids lack clarity, relevance or purpose. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Even if required, absence of visual aids.

First (70 and above) NB: the criteria in italics included in this category describe work that falls in the upper end of the first class band (80+)	Upper Second (60-69)	Lower Second (50 - 59)	Third (40 - 49)	Fail (39 and below)
KNOWLEDGE and RESEARCH				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Knowledge relevant, both broad and deep, including knowledge of contemporary sources, historiography, secondary literature. Extensive range of research. <i>Innovative and autonomous research.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Knowledge extensive, but might be uneven. Demonstrated knowledge includes reference to relevant contemporary and historiographical sources. Considerable range of research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Knowledge significant, but may be limited and patchy. Some inaccuracy, but sound basic knowledge. Limited range of research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Knowledge sufficient to frame basic answer to question, but limited and patchy. Some inaccuracy. Slight if relevant research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Knowledge insufficient to frame answer to question. Slight or non-existent research.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation demonstrates clear sense of the nature and complexity of historical causality. <i>Group offers its own causal account of the question.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation demonstrates sense of the nature of historical causality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation shows some limited awareness of historical causality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation shows some understanding of historical causality but underdeveloped; ideas of historians and other students muddled or misrepresented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation shows no understanding of historical causality.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Group demonstrates ability to evaluate nature and status of information at its disposal. Where necessary, group identifies contradiction and attempts resolution. <i>Group successfully develops its own critical analysis of the information at its disposal.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Group reflects on nature and status of information at disposal, and seeks to use it critically. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Group uses information rather uncritically, without serious attempts to evaluate its status and significance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Group provides sufficient information to launch presentation, but not to sustain complete response. Information used uncritically as if self-explanatory. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Group provides insufficient information to launch presentation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation demonstrates informed and secure understanding of historical period(s) under discussion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation demonstrates secure understanding of the historical period(s) under discussion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation demonstrates some appreciation of historical period(s) under discussion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation demonstrates only rudimentary appreciation of historical period(s) under discussion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Presentation demonstrates no appreciation of historical period(s) under discussion.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Descriptive material and factual evidence deployed within presentation in order to support and develop argument; vigorous sense of relevance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Descriptive material and factual evidence deployed relevantly within presentation. Towards lower end of mark band, full implications of evidence not always brought out. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Descriptive material and factual evidence deployed within presentation, but not necessarily with critical reflections characteristic of answers in higher mark bands. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Some descriptive material and factual evidence deployed within presentation, but without critical reflection on its significance and relevance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Descriptive or factual material used within presentation is irrelevant, or deployed without critical reflection.