

UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM  
Department of Mathematical Sciences  
**Mathematics Teaching III**  
Assessment criteria

***Element 1 of coursework component: Essay — 35% of module mark***

***Section A***

**(21% = 14 marks)**

**1. Appropriateness of theme, originality** (2 marks)

- The choice of theme was entirely the work of the student with only limited direction from the tutor 2/2
- The choice of theme was mainly the work of the student but with support from the tutor 1/2

**2. Advanced standpoint element** (4 marks)

- The advanced standpoint element was clearly evident, being fully developed and showing considerable insight 4/4
- The advanced standpoint element was substantially evident 3/4
- The advanced standpoint element was present but somewhat limited 2/4
- There was an attempt to present an advanced standpoint element 1/4

**3. Links between school and university work** (4 marks)

- The link between school and university work was clearly evident and contained student reflection which was perceptive and incisive 4/4
- The link between school and university work was substantially evident and there was some evidence of student reflection 3/4
- The link between school and university work was limited 2/4
- There was an attempt to show the link between school and university work 1/4

**4. Mathematical content and accuracy** (4 marks)

- The content was substantial, advanced and fully developed. There were no errors 4/4
- The content was substantial and any errors were minor 3/4
- The content was limited and any errors were minor 2/4
- The content was superficial or the mathematical content was limited and contained significant errors 1/4

*See overleaf*

## ***Section B***

**(9% = 6 marks)**

### **1. Logical structure and clarity of expression**

**(4 marks)**

- The assignment was concisely written in an appropriate mathematical style, logically developed and with excellent clarity of expression 4/4
- The logical structure and clarity of expression were substantially evident 3/4
- The logical structure and clarity of expression were limited 2/4
- The assignment lacked logical structure and was written in a style that was inappropriate to a mathematical report 1/4

### **2. References/Appendices**

**(2 marks)**

- Good use of references and appendices 2/2
- Only limited references and appendices 1/2

## ***Presentation***

**(5% = 25 marks)**

### **7 marks Structure**

- 2 Context and aims clearly explained at the outset
- 3 Focused discussion with logical progression
- 1 Aims achieved
- 1 Clear summary with fitting conclusions

### **7 marks Delivery (speech and body language)**

- 1 At ease, fluent
- 2 Seeks eye contact and engages the audience
- 1 Minimal use of notes
- 3 Audible and comprehensible

### **5 marks Coverage**

- 2 Interesting ideas
- 2 Fresh material researched and developed
- 1 Level appropriate for the audience

### **4 marks Mastery**

- 2 no evident errors in concept logic or calculation
- 1 slips of the tongue/pen corrected at once
- 1 clear and concise response to questions

### **2 marks Time management**

- 1 Keeps to time overall
- 1 Balance between and within sections

UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM  
Department of Mathematical Sciences  
**Mathematics Teaching III**  
Assessment criteria

*Element 2 of coursework component: School file — 15% of module mark*

**Section A** **(6% = 10 marks)**

1. **Setting the scene** (2 marks)
  - Clear description of contexts of lessons 2/2
  - Some significant omissions 1/2
2. **Knowledge, skills and understanding** (4 marks)
  - Excellent identification with good explanation 4/4
  - Good identification with some explanation 3/4
  - Some identification with limited explanation 2/4
  - Limited identification, no attempt to explain 1/4
3. **Pupils' confidence and attitudes** (2 marks)
  - Significant comments on both aspects 2/2
  - Limited comments 1/2
4. **References to individual pupils** (2 marks)
  - Good reporting with student comment 2/2
  - Limited reporting 1/2

**Section B** **(9% = 15 marks)**

1. **Overview and conclusions** (11 marks)
  - Comprehensive coverage, incisive analysis 11/11
  - Comprehensive coverage with perceptive comments 9/11
  - Reasonable coverage with competent commentary 7/11
  - Coverage and commentary somewhat limited 5/11
  - Limited description with little or no analysis 3/11
2. **Coherence and style** (4 marks)
  - Clearly-expressed and well-organised file 4/4
  - Satisfactory with some shortcomings 2/4