## MSc Award Regulations 2021/22
## Grade Conversions for Joint Courses and Other Designations

**MSc/PGDip/PGCert Veterinary Epidemiology/One Health: scheme for converting LSHTM grades to RVC grades**

The following table indicates how grades (marks) awarded under the LSHTM grading system (whereby individual component grades are marked on a six-point integer grading scale, which may be combined into more fine-grained gradepoint averages) should be mapped to the RVC Common Grading Scheme (whereby grades are given against a seventeen-point grading scale, with associated percentages).

| LSHTM Integer Grade Point | LSHTM descriptor | Commonly associated GPA range (may vary for individual assessments) | Related points on RVC Common Grading Scheme | LSHTM-to-RVC conversion | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | For GPAs | For Integer GPs |
| 0 | Not submitted (null) | N/A | • No answer (0%) | 0 ⇨ 0% | 0 ⇨ 0% |
| 0 | Very poor (fail) | 0.00 – 0.99 | • Extremely poor answer (15%)<br>• Very poor answer (27%)<br>• Poor answer (35%) | 0.01 to 0.33 ⇨ 15%<br>0.34 to 0.66 ⇨ 27%<br>0.67 to 0.99 ⇨ 35% | 0 ⇨ 27% |
| 1 | Unsatisfactory / poor (fail) | 1.00 – 1.99 | • Clearly deficient answer (42%)<br>• Deficient answer (45%)<br>• Marginally deficient answer (48%) | 1.00 to 1.33 ⇨ 42%<br>1.34 to 1.66 ⇨ 45%<br>1.67 to 1.99 ⇨ 48% | 1 ⇨ 45% |
| 2 | Satisfactory | 2.00 – 2.64 | • Adequate answer (52%)<br>• Sound answer (55%)<br>• Very sound answer (58%) | 2.00 to 2.21 ⇨ 52%<br>2.22 to 2.44 ⇨ 55%<br>2.45 to 2.64 ⇨ 58% | 2 ⇨ 55% |
| 3 | Good | 2.65 – 3.59 | • Quite good answer (62%)<br>• Good answer (65%) | 2.65 to 3.14 ⇨ 62%<br>3.15 to 3.59 ⇨ 65% | 3 ⇨ 62% |
| 4 | Very good | 3.60 – 4.49 | • Very good answer (68%) | 3.60 to 4.49 ⇨ 68% | 4 ⇨ 68% |
| 5 | Excellent | 4.50 – 5.00 | • Extremely good answer (75%)<br>• Excellent answer (82%)<br>• Outstanding answer (90%)<br>• Exceptional answer (100%) | 4.50 to 4.64 ⇨ 75%<br>4.65 to 4.79 ⇨ 82%<br>4.80 to 4.94 ⇨ 90%<br>4.95 to 5.00 ⇨ 100% | 5 ⇨ 90% |

## MSc Award Regulations 2021/22
## 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%) | **Selection and coverage of material:** Nothing presented or completely incorrect information or containing nothing at all of relevance.<br>**Understanding:** None evident. No evidence of wider reading of an appropriate nature.<br>**Structure, clarity and presentation:** None or extremely poor. | Fail | Not submitted (0) | Null mark may be given where work has not been submitted or attempted, or is in serious breach of assessment criteria/regulations. | Fail |
| Extremely poor answer (15%) | **Selection and coverage of material:** Hardly any information or information that is almost entirely incorrect or irrelevant.<br>**Understanding:** No or almost no understanding evident. No, or almost no, evidence of wider reading of an appropriate nature.<br>**Structure, clarity and presentation:** None or very poor. | Fail | Very poor (0) | Poor engagement with the topic, limited understanding, very poor argument & analysis.<br><br>***Simple general criteria for qualitative work:*** None of the major points present; many irrelevant points included and a serious lack of understanding.<br>***Simple general criteria for quantitative work:*** Some correct, essential part incorrect. | Fail |
| Very poor answer (27%) | **Selection and coverage of material:** Very limited amount of information that is correct and relevant.<br>**Understanding:** If any, extremely limited evidence of understanding. No, or almost no, evidence of wider reading of an appropriate nature.<br>**Structure, clarity and presentation:** Very poor. | Fail | Very poor (0) | | Fail |
| Poor answer (35%) | **Selection and coverage of material:** Little information that is correct and relevant. For projects, incomplete or inaccurate account of task with inadequate description of aims and methods of practical work and containing significant, and/or a large number of, errors.<br>**Understanding:** If any, very limited evidence of understanding. There may be evidence of very limited wider reading of an appropriate nature. For projects, many unexplained observations or assertions likely; little or no evidence of original/innovative thinking; very limited reference to published work from authoritative sources.<br>**Structure, clarity and presentation:** Poor. | Fail | Very poor (0) | | Fail |

**MSc Award Regulations 2021/22**
**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%) | *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.* | Fail | Unsatisfactory/ Poor (1) | Inadequate engagement with the topic, gaps in understanding, poor argument & analysis.<br>***Simple general criteria for qualitative work:*** A few points are included, but lack of understanding is shown together with use of irrelevant points.<br>***Simple general criteria for quantitative work:*** Many correct but essential part (to be defined) incorrect or unknown. | Fail |
| Deficient answer (45%) | **Selection and coverage of material:** Superficial coverage of topic that is descriptive and flawed by many important omissions and/or significant errors. For projects, also incomplete record of aims and methods of practical work, little comment on most observations.<br>**Understanding:** Some evidence of understanding but not of original thought or critical analysis. Evidence of limited wider reading of an appropriate nature. For projects, likely to be inaccuracies in data analysis and/or interpretation and unexplained observations or assertions; little or no evidence of original/innovative thought; very limited reference to published work from authoritative sources.<br>**Structure, clarity and presentation:** Some disorganisation in structure, lack of organisation, and deficiencies in clarity of expression. For projects, adequate although may not be entirely systematic. | Fail | Unsatisfactory/ Poor (1) | | Fail |
| Marginally deficient answer (48%) | *As for 45 but with fewer, and/or less significant, omissions/inaccuracies/errors, flaws in understanding, presentation and/or communication of information. There may be more evidence of wider reading of an appropriate nature.* | Fail | Unsatisfactory/ Poor (1) | | Fail |
| Adequate answer (52%) | *As for 55 but with more numerous, 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.* | Pass | Satisfactory (2) | Adequate evidence of engagement with the topic but some gaps in understanding or insight, routine argument & analysis, and may have some inaccuracies or omissions. | Pass |

**MSc Award Regulations 2021/22**
**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%) | **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. **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. **Structure, clarity and presentation:** In general, (reasonably) organised and logical presentation with adequate clarity of expression. | Pass | Satisfactory (2) | ***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. ***Simple general criteria for quantitative work:*** Essential parts correct (to be defined), some incorrect. | Pass |
| Very sound answer (58%) | *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.* | Pass | Satisfactory (2) | | Pass |
| Quite good answer (62%) | *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.* | Pass | Good (3) | Good (but not necessarily comprehensive) engagement with the topic, clear understanding & insight, reasonable argument & analysis, but may have some inaccuracies or omissions. | Pass |
| Good answer (65%) | **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 practical work and no significant errors or omissions; some speculation, where appropriate, but may not be fully supported. | Merit | Good (3) | | Pass (there is no merit option) |

**MSc Award Regulations 2021/22**
**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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Understanding:** Thorough grasp of concepts and evidence of synthesis of information and critical ability. Evidence of sufficient, or some more extensive, wider reading of an appropriate nature. For projects, reasonable comment on all observations with few unexplained findings or assertion; some evidence of original/innovative thinking; appropriate reference to published work from authoritative sources; data manipulated and analysed correctly. **Structure, clarity and presentation:** Logical and organised structure with clarity of expression. | | | ***Simple general criteria for qualitative work:*** The major points are discussed, but relevant, though less important considerations, are omitted. ***Simple general criteria for quantitative work:*** Most correct, a few incorrect allowed. | |
| Very good answer (68%) | *As for 65 but with fewer, and/or less significant, omissions/inaccuracies/errors. More evidence of critical judgement likely. There may be more evidence of wider reading of an appropriate nature.* | Merit | Very good (4) | Very good engagement with the topic, very good depth of understanding & insight, very good argument & analysis. This work may be 'borderline distinction standard'.<br>• Note that very good work may have some inaccuracies or omissions but not enough to question the understanding of the subject matter.<br>***Simple general criteria for qualitative work:*** A full discussion of the topic that includes all relevant information and critical evaluation. ***Simple general criteria for quantitative work:*** Almost all correct, none incorrect. | Pass (there is no merit option) |
| Extremely good answer (75%) | **Selection and coverage of material:** Question answered fully and accurately. Few errors and/or omissions and none of significance. For projects, full and accurate account of task, aims and methods of practical work with few errors and/or omissions and none of significance; where appropriate, sensible speculation, supported by evidence. **Understanding:** Thorough grasp of concepts with evidence of powers of critical analysis, argument and original thinking . Evidence of extensive wider reading of | Distinction | Excellent (5) | Excellent engagement with the topic, excellent depth of understanding & insight, excellent argument & analysis. Generally, this work will be 'distinction standard'.<br>• NB that excellent work does not have to be 'outstanding' or exceptional by comparison with other students; these grades should not be capped to a | Distinction |

**MSc Award Regulations 2021/22**
**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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | an appropriate nature. For projects, also some critical and/or comparative comment on all observations; clear evidence of original/innovative thinking; published work from authoritative sources used extensively and appropriately; data manipulated and analysed correctly. **Structure, clarity and presentation:** Logical and organised structure with clarity of expression. For projects, very well organised. | | | limited number of students per class. Nor should such work be expected to be 100% perfect – some minor inaccuracies or omissions may be permissible. | |
| Excellent answer (82%) | *As for 75 but demonstrating an authoritative grasp of concepts with sustained powers of argument, and frequent insights (and for projects, much evidence of original/innovative thinking). Virtually no errors or omissions and none of significance.* | Distinction | Excellent (5) | ***Simple general criteria for qualitative work:*** A comprehensive discussion of the topic giving all relevant information, showing in-depth critical understanding of the topic, going beyond conventional answers, and bringing in additional relevant ideas or material. ***Simple general criteria for quantitative work:*** All correct. | Distinction |
| Outstanding answer (90%) | *As for 85 but with strong evidence of independent thinking throughout and no omissions or factual errors. For projects, also original/innovative thinking, and would be of publishable standard with only minor modifications to content.* | Distinction | Excellent (5) | | Distinction |
| Exceptional answer (100%) | **Selection and coverage of material:** Exceptional depth of coverage with no identifiable errors or omissions. **Understanding:** Exceptional powers of analysis, argument, synthesis and insight. Considerable evidence of extensive wider reading of an appropriate nature. **Structure, clarity and presentation:** Flawless. For projects, of publishable standard with only amendments in style/formatting required. | Distinction | Excellent (5) | | Distinction |