

MSc Award Regulations 2020/21
Grade Conversions for Joint Courses and Other Designations

MSc Award Regulations 2020/21

Grade Conversions for Joint Courses and Other Designations

As supporting rationale for the preceding conversions, the following table compares more detailed grade descriptors for RVC and LSHTM grades.

RVC Mark descriptor and mark	RVC criteria	RVC postgrad class	LSHTM descriptor and GP	LSHTM criteria	LSHTM postgrad class
No answer (0%)	<p>Selection and coverage of material: Nothing presented or completely incorrect information or containing nothing at all of relevance.</p> <p>Understanding: None evident. No evidence of wider reading of an appropriate nature.</p> <p>Structure, clarity and presentation: None or extremely poor.</p>				

MSc Award Regulations 2020/21
Grade Conversions for Joint Courses and Other Designations

RVC Mark descriptor and mark	RVC criteria	RVC postgrad class	LSHTM descriptor and GP	LSHTM criteria	LSHTM postgrad class
Clearly deficient answer (42%)	<i>As for 45 but with a greater number, and/or more significant, omissions/inaccuracies/errors, flaws in understanding, presentation and/or communication of information. There may be less evidence of wider reading of an appropriate nature.</i>	Fail	Unsatisfactory/ Poor (1)		

MSc Award Regulations 2020/21
Grade Conversions for Joint Courses and Other Designations

RVC Mark descriptor and mark	RVC criteria	RVC postgrad class	LSHTM descriptor and GP	LSHTM criteria	LSHTM postgrad class
Sound answer (55%)	<p>Selection and coverage of material: Basic coverage of main aspects of topic but with some significant omissions/inaccuracies/errors. For projects, systematic account of task with adequate record of aims and methods of practical work and no significant errors, omissions or inaccuracies; but appropriate speculation is unlikely or, if present, is likely to be unsubstantiated.</p> <p>Understanding: Statements supported by facts but limited evidence of critical ability or powers of argument. Evidence of sufficient wider reading of an appropriate nature. For projects, sufficient reference to published work from authoritative sources; data are largely accurate but there may be some unexplained observations or assertions; limited evidence of original/innovative thought.</p> <p>Structure, clarity and presentation: In general, (reasonably) organised and logical presentation with adequate clarity of expression.</p>	Pass	Satisfactory (2)	<p>Simple general criteria for qualitative work: Sufficient relevant information is included but not all major points are discussed, and there may be some errors of interpretation.</p> <p>Simple general criteria for quantitative work: Essential parts correct (to be defined), some incorrect.</p>	Pass
Very sound answer (58%)	<p><i>As for 55 but with fewer, and/or less significant omissions/inaccuracies/errors and more evidence of critical ability and/or powers of argument and clarity of expression. There may be more evidence of wider reading of an appropriate nature.</i></p>	Pass	Satisfactory (2)		Pass
Quite good answer (62%)	<p><i>As for 65 but with more, and/or more significant, omissions/inaccuracies/errors and less evidence of critical ability/judgement. There may be less evidence of wider reading of an appropriate nature.</i></p>	Pass	Good (3)		<p>Good (but not necessarily comprehensive) engagement with the topic, clear understanding & insight, reasonable argument & analysis, but may have some inaccuracies or omissions.</p>
Good answer (65%)	<p>Selection and coverage of material: Good coverage of relevant material and clear evidence of critical judgement in selection of information. Few or no significant omissions or errors. For projects, systematic and accurate account of task with full record of aims and methods of</p>				

MSc Award Regulations 2020/21
Grade Conversions for Joint Courses and Other Designations

RVC Mark descriptor and mark	RVC criteria	RVC postgrad class	
------------------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	--

