

Category	Excellent (8)	Good (7-6)	Adequate (5-4)	Inadequate (3-1)	Pts	wght	Sub-totals
<b>Introduction &amp; Conclusion;</b> <b>Organization:</b> context and implications.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The opening was innovative, immediately gained the group's attention and directed the group to the central foci of the presentation.</li> <li>Background information is presented, explains significance &amp; relevance of topic.</li> <li>Conclusion neatly ties up and convincingly summarizes the argument.</li> <li>Organization and information flow is immediately obvious. Structure of the presentation was communicated up front; the presentation was logical and orderly; each idea flowed naturally onto the next</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Background information is presented, explains significance &amp; relevance of topic.</li> <li>Conclusion summarises main ideas and clearly restates the argument.</li> <li>Points and evidence arranged effectively.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significance or relevance is poorly discussed.</li> <li>Conclusion summarizes the main ideas but does not use results to support the objectives.</li> <li>The material was structured and the audience was able to follow the material; at times the overall focus of the presentation was clouded by the detail.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No discussion of scientific context.</li> <li>Conclusion is missing or does not explain the objectives.</li> <li>Little thought was given to the overall structure of the presentation; the information did not flow well at times losing the audience. Main points are not clear.</li> </ul>		<b>X 1</b>	
<b>Scholarship &amp; Analysis:</b> evidence of well researched work and critical thinking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The subject has evidently been researched exhaustively, using a wide range of sources and appropriate citations given.</li> <li>Critical thinking was demonstrated. Scientific context, &amp; implications or possibilities, considered. Unique insights (original interpretations) and implications to practice were expressed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many relevant references were consulted and citations are present.</li> <li>Thorough analysis and evaluation of current work, data, current designs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Few relevant resources have been consulted or some that are inappropriate (marginal websites, etc). Some citations missing.</li> <li>Some analysis was evident; little integration of ideas was expressed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only a single source, or sources that are inappropriate.</li> <li>Ideas are introduced but are not followed up on. Listed ideas, paraphrases data.</li> </ul>		<b>X 2</b>	
<b>Visual aids:</b> legible and logical, used effectively.	High quality, clearly understandable and creative. Logic of information flow is immediately clear. Excellent use of found or original figures and <u>appropriate references given</u> .	Images & text do support ideas. May have some extra or missing info. Some images may be hard to see. Flow of information may be slightly confusing.	Too few images, or extraneous ones. Too much or too little detail. Perhaps tough to see the structure of the presentation.	Text and images are not easily usable, unrelated, or ill prepared. Far too much or too little text.		<b>X 1</b>	
<b>Delivery:</b> pace, volume & enunciation.	Evidence of rehearsal, audible, confident, good English. Delivery is enthusiastic and engaging for the viewers. Seamless flow from introduction through to conclusion. At target time limit.	Perhaps some visible nervousness or uncertainty, but generally well presented. At target time limit.	Some hesitancy or lack of enthusiasm. Slightly long or short. Not rehearsed, read the slides.	Appears to have not practiced, or otherwise ill-prepared. Too long, rushed, or too short. Read the slides.		<b>X 1</b>	
<b>Questions:</b> Knowledgeably handled	Thoughtful response to questions, using sound logic and/or reference to precedent & research not necessarily mentioned in actual presentation. Using the opportunity to express further insights on the topic. Further depth of knowledge clearly demonstrated rather than just the information in the presentation.	Questions handled knowledgeably and with confidence. Thoughtful response to questions, using sound logic and/or reference to precedent & research not necessarily mentioned in actual presentation.	Strong effort made to answer questions, but lacked depth of knowledge beyond what was already presented. Simple content related questions were handled well however application/ analytical questions were not.	Answers to obvious questions lacking. Unable to answer some content related questions		<b>X 2</b>	

Maximum Total Marks Awarded to Presenters:  $8*(1+2+1+1+2) = 56$

TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_