

London's  
International  
Drama School

**Rose  
Bruford  
College**

of Theatre  
& Performance

# Grading Descriptors

School of Performance

POLICIES and  
PROCEDURES

## Introduction

Assessment at Rose Bruford College is designed to enhance your learning experience and improve your performance. It allows both you and your tutors to evaluate your knowledge and understanding, your reflective and critical skills and your practical and transferable skills.

All your modules express these skills through the specific learning outcomes contained within individual module specifications. Assessment tasks are designed to allow you to demonstrate that you have met these learning outcomes. In other words, the intended learning outcomes are the assessment criteria. Obviously, these become more complex as you pass through each level of your studies.

When markers come to assess your work, effectively they have two questions to ask: Have you demonstrated that you have met all the learning outcomes that this assessment was meant to address? Remember to achieve a *pass mark*, you have to meet ALL the learning outcomes.

The second question is *how well* have you met those outcomes? Have you just done what is required to pass – in other words have you met the *threshold expectation*? Have you *exceeded* the expectation in some way? Indeed, have you *excelled*? Or have you flopped?

To assist with this decision the assessors use a set of *grading descriptors*. These outline what we would typically expect your work to demonstrate to achieve a particular classification banding (1<sup>st</sup>, 2.1 2.2 etc.) As far as possible, they help assessors to make objective judgements so that both you and they can be confident that everyone who gets a 2.1 for an assessment task has been graded fairly and equitably.

The detail within the band (i.e. the actual numerical percentage mark) relies to some extent on academic and professional experience and judgement. That is why at levels 5 and 6, much of your work will be independently marked by at least two people and (for performance or practical projects) a marking team. Everyone uses the same set of descriptors across each school.

Marking is a complex process and tutors at Rose Bruford College take a great deal of time and care to ensure that your work receives the grade it deserves and to ensure that you receive quality feedback that enhances your learning experience.

The following grading descriptors are those used in the School of Performance/on our PG Taught programmes. If you have any questions you should speak firstly to your tutor who should be able to help and advise you.

You can find out more in the College's **Assessment Policies and Procedures** available on DoRIS

## Written Work

Class	Mark	
First	90-100	As below but also demonstrating an imaginative application of research, argument and conclusions beyond the initial subject but with relevance to the field.
	80-89	As below but also demonstrating a consistent originality of thought and approach.
	70-79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Covers all aspects of the assignment briefing.</li> <li>ii. Guides the reader through well-reasoned and structured argument.</li> <li>iii. Demonstrates breadth of research and critical use of source material.</li> <li>iv. Demonstrates an appropriate style, use of language and syntax.</li> <li>v. Demonstrates a clear, secure grasp of the subject and context.</li> </ul>
2.1	60-69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Covers all aspects of the assignment briefing.</li> <li>ii. Has a clear structure and argument.</li> <li>iii. Demonstrates relevant and effective use of research.</li> <li>iv. Has rare lapses of style, language and syntax.</li> <li>v. Demonstrates a sense of the subject and its wider context.</li> </ul>
2.2	50-59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Addresses all of the assignment briefing, but in variable detail.</li> <li>ii. Shows evidence of a cohesive structure and relevant, if limited, argument.</li> <li>iii. Demonstrates an adequate use of research.</li> <li>iv. Has mainly a good use of style, language and syntax.</li> </ul>
Third	40-49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Addresses most aspects of the assignment briefing.</li> <li>ii. Has a sense of logical structure, with some argument.</li> <li>iii. Demonstrates some relevant research.</li> <li>iv. Uses sufficient style, language and syntax to be easily read.</li> </ul>
Condoned Fail*	35-39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Has a poor sense of the assignment briefing and its requirements.</li> <li>ii. Has a weak or incoherent structure.</li> <li>iii. Demonstrates little, or frequently irrelevant, research.</li> <li>iv. The use of style, language and syntax render the paper difficult to read.</li> </ul>
Outright Fail	0-34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Has no sense of addressing the assignment briefing or, at most, only sporadically.</li> <li>ii. Has an incoherent structure</li> <li>iii. Demonstrates no, or largely irrelevant, research.</li> <li>iv. Uses style, language and syntax consistently which is poor and faulted.</li> </ul>

\*only if a student fails to achieve the module pass mark at the second (retrieval) attempt. See RBC UG regulation 58.



## Practical and Performance Work

Class	Mark	
First	90-100	As below but also demonstrating an imaginative application of research, argument and conclusions beyond the initial subject but with relevance to the field.
	80-89	As below but also demonstrating a consistent originality of thought and approach.
	70-79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Achieves all of the designated outcomes of the assignment briefing with a coherent and confident grasp of all aspects of the work.</li> <li>ii. Is fully prepared and organised for all the potential outcomes of the brief.</li> <li>iii. Demonstrates an assured and fluent handling of knowledge and an understanding of the subject and its context.</li> <li>iv. Demonstrates an assured and confident formulation, expression and communication of ideas.</li> <li>v. Demonstrates a breadth and depth of research and effective judgement in its use.</li> <li>vi. Has a full imaginative engagement with all aspects of the work.</li> <li>vii. Has full personal commitment and self-discipline in the work.</li> <li>viii. Engages in the collaborative team process offering a fully realised personal contribution to the working group.</li> </ul>
2.1	60-69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Realises consistently all of the designated outcomes of the brief.</li> <li>ii. Is fully prepared and organised.</li> <li>iii. Demonstrates a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the subject and its context.</li> <li>iv. Ideas are well formulated, expressed and communicated.</li> <li>v. Demonstrates a relevant and effective use of research.</li> <li>vi. Has consistent imaginative engagement with the work.</li> <li>vii. Has consistent commitment and self-discipline in the work.</li> <li>viii. Successfully contributes to the work of the group and operates as a fully integrated team member.</li> </ul>
2.2	50-59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Realises all of the designated aspects of the brief, but unevenly.</li> <li>ii. Demonstrates competent preparation and organisation, but with some aspects unrealised.</li> <li>iii. Demonstrates a general but variable knowledge and understanding of the subject and its context.</li> <li>iv. Is generally able to formulate, express and communicate ideas.</li> <li>v. Demonstrates an adequate use of research.</li> <li>vi. Is generally, but erratically engaged at an imaginative level with the work</li> <li>vii. Shows commitment and self-discipline, but variably so.</li> <li>viii. Generally contributes to the work of the group</li> </ul>
Third	40-49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Addresses most but not all of the designated outcomes of the brief.</li> <li>ii. Demonstrates uneven preparation and organisation but sufficient to meet the demands of the brief.</li> <li>iii. Demonstrates an adequate but incomplete knowledge and understanding of the subject and its context.</li> <li>iv. Has partial success in formulating, expressing and communicating ideas.</li> <li>v. Demonstrates some relevant research and its application.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>vi. Demonstrates some imaginative engagement with the work.</li> <li>vii. Shows sufficient but erratic commitment and self-discipline.</li> <li>viii. Demonstrates some contribution to the working group and to collaborative team work.</li> </ul>
Condoned Fail*	35-39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Demonstrates an inadequate coverage of the range of designated outcomes of the brief.</li> <li>ii. Is poorly prepared and organised.</li> <li>iii. Demonstrates an insufficient grasp of the subject and its context.</li> <li>iv. Has ideas which are poorly formulated, expressed and communicated.</li> <li>v. Demonstrates an inadequate use of research.</li> <li>vi. Shows little imaginative engagement with the work.</li> <li>vii. Shows insufficient commitment and self-discipline.</li> <li>viii. Offers inadequate contributions to the work of the group and the building of a team.</li> </ul>
Outright Fail	0-34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Demonstrates a poor coverage of the range of designated outcomes of the brief.</li> <li>ii. Is unprepared and disorganised.</li> <li>iii. Shows little grasp of the subject and its context.</li> <li>iv. Has ideas which are unformulated, badly expressed and inadequately communicated.</li> <li>v. Demonstrates little or no research.</li> <li>vi. Shows no imaginative engagement with the work.</li> <li>vii. Is lacking in commitment and self-discipline.</li> <li>viii. Offers no contributions to the work of the group and the building of a team.</li> </ul>

\*only if a student fails to achieve the module pass mark at the second (retrieval) attempt. See RBC UG regulation 58

## Portfolio, Reflective Journals and Seminar Presentations

Class	Mark	
I	90-100	As below but also demonstrating an imaginative application of research, argument and conclusions beyond the initial subject but with relevance to the field.
	80-89	As below but also demonstrating a consistent originality of thought and approach.
	70-79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Covers all aspects of the assignment briefing with evidence of perceptive insight and originality.</li> <li>ii. Uses a variety of appropriate and effective research methodologies in completion of assignment.</li> <li>iii. Demonstrates clear analysis and understanding of the material combined with effective and innovative presentation.</li> <li>iv. Shows clear evidence of developed reflection upon, and understanding of, the processes involved in practice.</li> </ul>
II i	60-69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Covers all aspects of the assignment briefing.</li> <li>ii. Uses a variety of appropriate research methodologies in completion of assignment.</li> <li>iii. Demonstrates a clear analysis and understanding of the material combined with effective presentation.</li> <li>iv. Demonstrates clear evidence of developed reflection upon the processes involved in practice.</li> </ul>
II ii	50-59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Addresses all aspects of the assignment briefing but unevenly.</li> <li>ii. Uses appropriate research methodologies.</li> <li>iii. Demonstrates an analysis of the material combined with some understanding of effective presentation.</li> <li>iv. Demonstrates evidence of reflection upon the processes involved in practice.</li> </ul>
III	40-49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Addresses most aspects of the assignment briefing.</li> <li>ii. Has some understanding of different modes of research.</li> <li>iii. Demonstrates some analysis of the material within adequate presentation.</li> <li>iv. Demonstrates evidence of uneven reflection upon the processes involved in practice.</li> </ul>
Condoned Fail*	35-39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Demonstrates a poor sense of the assignment briefing and its requirements.</li> <li>ii. Shows no understanding of the variety of research appropriate for the assignment.</li> <li>iii. Offers poor written analysis of the material with poor presentation.</li> <li>iv. Shows inadequate evidence of reflection upon practice.</li> </ul>
Outright Fail	0-34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Demonstrates no sense of the assignment briefing.</li> <li>ii. Shows a distinctive lack of research.</li> <li>iii. Offers no written analysis.</li> <li>iv. Offers no evidence of an ability to reflect upon practice.</li> </ul>

\*only if a student fails to achieve the module pass mark at the second (retrieval) attempt.  
See RBC UG regulation 58



DOCUMENT CONTROL BOX		Version 2.1
<b>Policy / Procedure title:</b>	Grading Descriptors School of Performance level 4 and 5 2018-10	
<b>Policy owner:</b>	Head of School of Performance	
<b>Lead contact:</b>	Head of School of Performance	
<b>Audience:</b>	Students and Staff	
<b>Equality Impact Screening date Referred to Equality Impact Assessment Group? Yes/No</b>	Yes (via revision to Assessment Policy)	
<b>Approving body:</b>	LQSC (Reformatting)	
<b>Date approved:</b>	14 September 2017	
<b>Implementation date:</b>	1 September 2018	
<b>Previous revision dates:</b>		
<b>Supersedes:</b>	See further notes below	
<b>Next review date:</b>	July 2019	
<b>Related Statutes, Ordinances, General Regulations</b>	Academic Regulations	
<b>Related Policies, Procedures and Guidance:</b>	Assessment Policy and Procedures	
<b>Further information:</b>	<p>Following revision to the Assessment Policy and Procedures on 10 July 2015, the grading descriptors appended to that documents have been extracted since the Schools of Performance and DMTA are now operating different grading descriptors.</p> <p>These grading descriptors have been reviewed following the award of TDAP in January 2017 for students studying on RBC awards at level four. They were further reviewed in August 2018 to cover students studying on RBC awards at level four and five.</p> <p>For 2019-20 applies to all levels.</p>	