

[Welcome](#)[About MIG](#)[Introduction](#)[Unit Schedule](#)[Communications and FAQ](#)[Week 1](#)[Week 2](#)[Week 3](#)[Weeks 4 and 5](#)[Assessment](#)[Support Resources](#)[Assessment](#)[Approach to Assessment](#)[AT1](#)[AT2](#)[AT3](#)[AT4](#)[Challenge Preferencing](#)

## Assessment Task 2: Innovation Design Sprint Prototype Presentations (30% group)

### Assignment Aims for AT2

- To enable students to analyse an industry challenge with consideration of relevant stakeholders and systems
- To assist students in applying innovation sprint methods and mindsets to design a purpose-driven solution
- To provide an opportunity for students to collaborate to leverage interdisciplinary expertise
- To assist students in developing skills in effective and professional communication

### Learning Outcomes

After completing this assignment students should be able to:

- Analyse and map an industry problem, showing relevant stakeholders and systems
- Apply innovation methods and mindsets, including mapping, sketching, storyboarding, prototyping, testing and pitching
- Collaborate with an interdisciplinary team to understand a challenge and its solution in a multidimensional way
- Pitch and present effectively to a general, professional and interdisciplinary audience

This assessment task maps to the following unit learning outcomes:

Tasks	Unit learning outcomes demonstrated
AT2: Group presentations in Weeks 2 and 3)  Total: 30%	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Analyse an industry challenge, considering relevant stakeholders and systems</li> <li>2. Apply innovation methods and mindsets to design purpose-driven solutions</li> <li>3. Communicate effectively to industry partners from different sectors</li> <li>4. Collaborate to integrate and leverage interdisciplinary knowledge to approach real-world issues</li> </ol>

### Resources

Access the book 'Sprint: How to solve big problems and test new ideas in just five days' (Knapp, Zeratsy and Kowitz 2016)

***Each team will be provided with a hardcopy to use in the unit.***

The following chapters are useful for Week 2 and AT2a:

- Monday Sprint: Diagramming (pp. 53-83)
- Tuesday Sprint: Sketching (pp. 95-126)
- Wednesday Sprint: Storyboarding pages (pp.127-164)
- Thursday Sprint: Prototyping pages (pp. 165-194)
- Next Monday (Week 3): Insight and customer testing (pp. 195-225)

 Please click the section below to expand it and view the content.

 [Professional background](#)



Professionals need to apply innovation methods and mindsets in order to drive positive change and create impact within their organisation.

Copyright Monash University 2018. Copyright Warning You are logged in as Rui Qin (Log out)

We want to help you learn a proven methodology or process, which you can apply in the MIG or in any career you choose.

Sprint methods are used by the most successful organisations in the world, including [Google Ventures](#), and are now widely used across sectors. Why? The sprint process helps teams learn through doing and allows them to be uber productive in a short amount of time. Sprints have been shown to save unnecessary time, money and discussions and to boost creativity. We can all become distracted by competing demands and goals and it can be hard to focus as an individual, let alone a team.

### The sprint process helps you focus and boosts productivity in three key ways:

1. It allows you to leverage both individual and group contributions simultaneously, leading to interdisciplinary creativity and a more multidimensional view of the problem and its possible solutions
2. It allows you to put aside dedicated time to prototype without distraction
3. It provides short inescapable deadlines to keep you moving and stop you from getting "lost in the weeds"

A design sprint is a unique rapid 5-day process for answering questions and solving problems through prototyping and testing ideas with stakeholders, users and customers. It is applicable to any context and challenge. You'll develop and apply an innovation and entrepreneurial mindset.

The idea is to build and test a prototype in just a few days, rapidly progressing from analysing the problem to testing a solution using a proven step-by-step method. It allows you to fast-forward into the future a little, so you can start to see how customers/users react before you invest further time and expense to create a new product, service, marketing campaign, or idea.

You will use this innovation process to leverage the power of an interdisciplinary team to solve a complex challenge. This will enable you to generate potential solutions to create economic, social or environmental value for your industry partner and for society.

You will find that you can apply aspects of the sprint process and mindset in your studies and career.

Close

### ▲ [Template for AT2a and AT2b](#)

We've designed all our assessment tasks to be progressive and scaffolded.

Assessment Task 2 (AT2) will help you build your prototype.

AT2a is your first draft. AT2b is an iteration of AT2a with enhancements.

Assessment Part	Design Sprint Stage
AT2a (15%)	initial verbal presentation of your challenge analysis, sketch, storyboard and prototype
AT2b (15%)	verbal presentation of an iteration of the above, based upon feedback, plus some initial customer testing

AT2b will build on AT2a. The feedback from AT2a will help you with AT2b. **Handy Hint:** All of AT2 will help you write your final report (AT3), which is a written version of your AT2 Innovation Design Sprint Prototype Presentations. During Weeks 2 and 3, you will cumulatively build and iterate your sprint prototype. Along the way, you'll also build skills and confidence in applying innovation.

### Using the prototype template

[Our presentation template will help you complete AT2a and AT2b](#)

[Our presentation template will help you complete AT2a and AT2b.](#)

The workshops during Weeks 2 and 3 are designed to help you create slides in your [Innovation Design Sprint Presentation template](#). This template is your guide. Your coaches will help you work through this template during Weeks 2 and 3.

- The Week 2 slides focus upon AT2a. We will focus upon building these slides during the workshops throughout Week 2.
- The Week 3 slides show what you will add to AT2a to complete AT2b. In the workshops in Week 3, we will focus upon iterating your Week 2 talk. You will also add sections on customer testing and next steps.

Close

## Assessment Task 2A Overview

### PART 2a: Initial challenge analysis and prototype

**Value:** 15%

**Due:** Week 2 in class on Thursday Jan 19

**Format:** 6-minute Group Presentation

**Submission:** In person group presentation

**Marking:** See assessment guidelines and marking rubric

**Late Penalty:** 10% per day, or part thereof

**Feedback:** Written or audio feedback via Moodle

#### ▲ [Part 2a Guidelines: Initial challenge analysis and prototype \(15% group\)](#)

Each challenge team will create slides to present to the other challenge teams and coaches in the MIG for feedback.

The presentation is **6 minutes +/- 30 seconds**.

#### Each challenge team should include slides covering the topics below:

- The **challenge as envisioned by the team**, including the focus chosen for your sprint
- A **diagram/map** of the problem that considers the different stakeholders and systems related to the problem, with consideration of interdisciplinary perspectives, sustainability, empathy and human-centric design
- An **sketch** of three ideas considered by the challenge team, and why they have decided that a certain solution is the best one at this stage
- A **storyboard** that takes your winning sketch and extends it into a story from the customer/user perspective. The storyboard grid should include an opening scene that conveys how the customer/user first interacts with the challenge topic, and will roll out from there - showing how the customer/user moves through your proposed solution to a positive outcome (include just enough detail)
- A 'fake it' **prototype** or a facade of your solution including the proposed format for the prototype (e.g. physical, design map, infographic, report, recommendations, etc.), and the key tools you needed to build this (e.g. keynote, iPad, paper report, acting, survey, research method, etc.).

These topics will be covered in the workshops throughout Week 2 (you will receive training) and are explained in more depth in the Week 2 slides in our [Innovation Design Sprint Prototype Presentation template](#).

The template includes examples and formatting ideas (although you are welcome to use your own formatting).

New instructions will appear each day, for that day.

Clear and professional communication is a thread throughout this unit, as it allows you to influence and drive change. At least three individuals from the challenge team must present.

▲ Marking rubric: AT2a**MIG 2a Initial challenge analysis and prototype presentation (15%)**

This marking rubric supports the development of skills in challenge analysis, ideation, sketching, storyboarding and prototyping as well as effective communication to a general interdisciplinary audience. It challenges the student team to collaborate to apply design sprint tools and processes and synthesise the outcomes.

Criterion and Mark	Performance Description
Diagramming the problem (3 marks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Extended (HD):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Clear and astute team articulation of the problem from the perspective of the team, including insightful and considered articulation of the focus and target demographic for the sprint, with clear rationale</li> <li>◦ A sophisticated problem diagram/map is presented, which provides an insightful and comprehensive map of the various stakeholders and systems that need to be considered within the challenge, demonstrating consideration of interdisciplinary perspectives, sustainability, empathy and human-centric design</li> <li>◦ This section is supported by at least two relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Fundamental (C):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Sufficient team articulation of the problem and it's focus and target</li> <li>◦ Sufficient and clear problem diagram or map is presented that documents at least a few of the stakeholders and systems that need to be considered within the challenge, demonstrating consideration for one or more of the broader lenses, namely interdisciplinary perspectives, sustainability, empathy and human-centric design</li> <li>◦ This section is supported by one citation or less relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Unsatisfactory (NP):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Insufficient or unclear articulation of the problem and its focus and target</li> <li>◦ Insufficient or unclear diagram/map is presented with weak or no consideration of stakeholders, systems or broader lenses that need to be considered within the challenge</li> <li>◦ No relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Sketches (3 marks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Extended:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Three distinct ideas the group considered are presented with clarity, and with sophisticated yet brief rationales</li> <li>◦ Clear visual sketches are provided for each solution, with sophisticated and catchy titles and articulation</li> <li>◦ Clear rationale for the chosen solution, supported by at least two relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Fundamental:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ three ideas the group considered are somewhat clearly presented, with sufficient rationales</li> <li>◦ sufficient sketches are provided for each solution</li> <li>◦ sufficient and somewhat clear rationale for the chosen solution, supported by two relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Unsatisfactory:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Too few ideas are presented or the ideas do not have clear rationales</li> <li>◦ No visual sketches are provided for each solution</li> <li>◦ No rationale or relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Storyboard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Extended:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Sophisticated storyboard that extends the winning sketch into a comprehensive, insightful and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

(3 marks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Sophisticated storyboard that extends the winning sketch into a comprehensive, insightful and cohesive story from the customer/user perspective, with consideration of human-centred design</li> <li>◦ Judicious use of detail - the storyboard is sophisticated yet only the right amount of detail is included</li> <li>◦ Compelling visuals and articulation of the story</li> <li>◦ This is supported by at least three relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul> <p>• <b>Fundamental:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Sufficient storyboard that extends the winning sketch into a story from the customer/user perspective with some insight and detail</li> <li>◦ Some form of visuals to support the story</li> <li>◦ This is supported by at least two relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul> <p>• <b>Unsatisfactory:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Insufficient or unclear storyboard is provided and/or no customer/user perspective is considered</li> <li>◦ Insufficient visuals to support the story</li> <li>◦ No relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul>
Prototype (3 marks)	<p>• <b>Extended:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Insightful and considered statement of the choice of format for the delivery of the solution, and identification of all the key tools you needed to design the solution</li> <li>◦ Compelling, clear and creative prototype of the solution in the chosen format</li> <li>◦ Demonstration of sophisticated thinking, planning and delivery by the team, with consideration of users from the challenge analysis</li> <li>◦ This is supported by at least three relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul> <p>• <b>Fundamental:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Sufficient statement of the choice of format for the delivery of the solution, and identification of some of the key tools you needed to design the solution</li> <li>◦ Somewhat clear and creative prototype of the solution in the chosen format</li> <li>◦ Demonstration of some consideration of users from the challenge analysis</li> <li>◦ This is supported by at least two relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul> <p>• <b>Unsatisfactory:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Insufficient or absent statement of the choice of format for the delivery of the solution, and/or no mention of key tools you needed to design the solution</li> <li>◦ Unclear or missing prototype of the solution</li> <li>◦ No consideration of users and the challenge analysis</li> <li>◦ No relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul>
Professional communication (3 marks)	<p>• <b>Extended:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ The talk is consistently polished, sophisticated and professional, and the speakers build excellent connection with the audience through the use of tone, pace, eye contact, movement, and storytelling</li> <li>◦ Highly compelling visuals in the form of slides and diagrams, as well as any other props as appropriate</li> <li>◦ The presentation is consistently appropriate for a general audience as disciplinary jargon is avoided or properly defined</li> <li>◦ The delivery is courteous, collegial and professional and thereby suitable for students, staff or the general public to view</li> <li>◦ Rehearsal and preparation is evident, as the speakers appear polished and confident and the presentation is well structured with a clear introduction, middle and end</li> <li>◦ Ten or more relevant and reputable journal articles, industry memos, technical reports, websites or books are cited in a consistent referencing style (these citations may be provided in particular sections of the presentation or at the end of the talk on a reference slide)</li> <li>◦ At least three team members present and all members are available for questions</li> <li>◦ 6 minutes +/- 30 seconds</li> </ul> <p>• <b>Fundamental:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ The talk is sufficiently professional and the speakers build some connection with the audience</li> </ul>

- The talk is sufficiently professional, and the speakers build some connection with the audience
- The visuals used are somewhat engaging and support the key messages
  - The presentation is somewhat clear and direct for a general audience and only has a little undefined disciplinary jargon
  - The delivery is somewhat courteous, collegial and professional and thereby suitable for students, staff or the general public to view
  - Some rehearsal/preparation is evident
  - Six relevant and reputable journal articles, industry memos, technical reports, websites or books are cited in a consistent referencing style. (these citations may be provided in particular sections of the presentation or at the end of the talk on a reference slide)
  - At least 2 team members present and all are available for questions (unless they have special consideration)
  - 6 minutes +/- 40 seconds
- **Unsatisfactory:**
- The talk is not professional, and/or the speakers build limited connection with the audience
  - Lack of visuals or the visuals used are not engaging and/or do not support the key messages
  - The presentation is not clear and direct for a general audience and full of disciplinary jargon
  - The delivery is not at all courteous, collegial and professional and thereby not suitable for students, staff or the general public to view
  - No rehearsal/preparation is evident
  - No relevant and reputable citations or inconsistent referencing style
  - Only 1 team member presents and not all are available for questions (without special consideration)
  - 6 minutes +/- 50 seconds

Close

## Assessment Task 2B Overview

### Part 2b: Pitch to test and validate

**Value:** 15%

**Due:** Week 3 during our Industry Pitch event on Wednesday Jan 25

**Format:** 6-minute Group Presentation

**Submission:** In person group presentation

**Marking:** See assessment guidelines and marking rubric

**Late Penalty:** 10% per day, or part thereof

**Feedback:** Written or audio feedback via Moodle

#### Part 2b Guidelines: Pitch to test and validate (15% Group)

Each challenge team will create slides to present to industry partners (and a handful of customers/users during testing) for feedback, ahead of the development of the final AT3 individual Industry Innovation Report (Week 4).

The presentation is **6 minutes +/- 30 seconds**.

### Each challenge team should include:

**Important:** You should hone many of the sections below based upon the feedback you received from other challenge teams and your markers during 2a.

- A challenge analysis **diagram/map**
- A **storyboard** that shows the customer/user experience
- A 'fake it' **prototype** or a facade of your solution in the chosen format, including a statement of the format for the prototype, and the key tools you needed to build this

- Some **insight draw** from initial testing with at least five users/customers and the industry partner as well as research from the literature (grey plus additional peer reviewed as desired)
- **Next steps** you will take to develop your prototype based upon testing

Feel free to hone and iterate the presentation based upon feedback on AT2a, and your work across Weeks 2 and 3.

AT2b includes extra sections on customer testing and insights.

Requirements are explained with examples in the [template here](#). See the Week 3 slides in the AT2 Prototype Presentation Template for the additional slides and examples on user/customer testing and next steps.

Clear and professional communication is a thread throughout this unit, as it allows you to influence and drive change. At least three individuals from the challenge team must present.

Close

▲ [Marking rubric: AT2b](#)

#### MIG 2b Pitch to test and validate (15%)

This marking rubric supports the development of skills in applying innovation sprint tools and processes, as well as effective communication to a general audience. It challenges the student team to collaborate to apply various design sprint tools and processes and synthesise the outcomes.

Criterion and Mark	Performance Description
Diagramming the problem (3 marks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Extended (HD):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Clear and astute team articulation of the problem from the perspective of the team, including insightful and considered articulation of the focus and target demographic for the sprint, with clear rationale</li> <li>◦ A sophisticated problem diagram/map is presented, which provides an insightful and comprehensive map of the various stakeholders and systems that need to be considered within the challenge, demonstrating consideration of interdisciplinary perspectives, sustainability, empathy and human-centric design</li> <li>◦ This section is supported by at least two relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Fundamental (C):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Sufficient team articulation of the problem and it's focus and target</li> <li>◦ Sufficient and clear problem diagram or map is presented that documents at least a few of the stakeholders and systems that need to be considered within the challenge, demonstrating consideration for one or more of the broader lenses, namely interdisciplinary perspectives, sustainability, empathy and human-centric design</li> <li>◦ This section is supported by one citation or less relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Unsatisfactory (NP):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Insufficient or unclear articulation of the problem and its focus and target</li> <li>◦ Insufficient or unclear diagram/map is presented with weak or no consideration of stakeholders, systems or broader lenses that need to be considered within the challenge</li> <li>◦ No relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Storyboard (2 marks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Extended:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Sophisticated storyboard that extends the winning sketch into a comprehensive, insightful and cohesive story from the customer/user perspective, with consideration of human-centred</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

(3 marks)	<p>design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Judicious use of detail - the storyboard is sophisticated yet only the right amount of detail is included.</li> <li>◦ Compelling visuals and articulation of the story</li> <li>◦ This is supported by at least three relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Fundamental:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Sufficient storyboard that extends the winning sketch into a story from the customer/user perspective with some insight and detail</li> <li>◦ Some form of visuals to support the story</li> <li>◦ This is supported by at least two relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Unsatisfactory:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Insufficient or unclear storyboard is provided and/or no customer/user perspective is considered</li> <li>◦ Insufficient visuals to support the story</li> <li>◦ No relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>Prototype</p> <p>(3 marks)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Extended:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Insightful and considered statement of the choice of format for the delivery of the solution, and identification of all the key tools you needed to design the solution</li> <li>◦ Compelling, clear and creative prototype of the solution in the chosen format</li> <li>◦ Demonstration of sophisticated thinking, planning and delivery by the team, with consideration of users from the challenge analysis</li> <li>◦ This is supported by at least three relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Fundamental:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Sufficient statement of the choice of format for the delivery of the solution, and identification of some of the key tools you needed to design the solution</li> <li>◦ Somewhat clear and creative prototype of the solution in the chosen format</li> <li>◦ Demonstration of some consideration of users from the challenge analysis</li> <li>◦ This is supported by at least two relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Unsatisfactory:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Insufficient or absent statement of the choice of format for the delivery of the solution, and/or no mention of key tools you needed to design the solution</li> <li>◦ Unclear or missing prototype of the solution</li> <li>◦ No consideration of users and the challenge analysis</li> <li>◦ No relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>Insight and testing and next steps</p> <p>(3 marks)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Extended:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Sophisticated synthesis of insight from at least two pieces of relevant and reputable grey literature</li> <li>◦ Sophisticated synthesis of feedback from at least five customers/users and the industry partner gained via zoom</li> <li>◦ Sophisticated and clear articulation of how insight from customers/users, the partner and the grey literature has shaped the iteration of the prototype and the next steps that will be taken to develop it</li> <li>◦ This is supported by at least two relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Fundamental:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Sufficient insight from at least two pieces of relevant and reputable grey literature</li> <li>◦ Sufficient synthesis of feedback from at least 5 customers/users and the industry partner via zoom</li> <li>◦ Somewhat concise and clear articulation of how insight from customers/ users, the partner and the grey literature has shaped the iteration of the prototype and the next steps that will be taken to develop it</li> <li>◦ This is supported by at least one relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Unsatisfactory:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Insufficient or lack of insight from reputable grey literature</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Insufficient or lack of insight from reputable grey literature</li> <li>◦ Insufficient or lack of synthesis of feedback from 5 or less customers/users and the industry partner via zoom</li> <li>◦ Insufficient or lack of articulation of how insight from customers/users, the partner and the grey literature has shaped the iteration of the prototype and/or unclear or lack of the next steps that will be taken to develop it</li> <li>◦ No relevant and reputable citations</li> </ul>
Professional communication (3 marks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Extended:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ The talk is consistently polished, sophisticated and professional, and the speakers build excellent connection with the audience through the use of tone, pace, eye contact, movement, and storytelling</li> <li>◦ Highly compelling visuals in the form of slides and diagrams, as well as any other props as appropriate</li> <li>◦ The presentation is consistently appropriate for a general audience as disciplinary jargon is avoided or properly defined</li> <li>◦ The delivery is courteous, collegial and professional and thereby suitable for students, staff or the general public to view</li> <li>◦ Rehearsal and preparation is evident, as the speakers appear polished and confident and the presentation is well structured with a clear introduction, middle and end</li> <li>◦ Ten or more relevant and reputable journal articles, industry memos, technical reports, websites or books are cited in a consistent referencing style (these citations may be provided in particular sections of the presentation or at the end of the talk on a reference slide)</li> <li>◦ At least three team members present and all members are available for questions</li> <li>◦ 6 minutes +/- 30 seconds</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Fundamental:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ The talk is sufficiently professional, and the speakers build some connection with the audience</li> <li>◦ The visuals used are somewhat engaging and support the key messages</li> <li>◦ The presentation is somewhat clear and direct for a general audience and only has a little undefined disciplinary jargon</li> <li>◦ The delivery is somewhat courteous, collegial and professional and thereby suitable for students, staff or the general public to view</li> <li>◦ Some rehearsal/preparation is evident</li> <li>◦ Six relevant and reputable journal articles, industry memos, technical reports, websites or books are cited in a consistent referencing style. (these citations may be provided in particular sections of the presentation or at the end of the talk on a reference slide)</li> <li>◦ At least 2 team members present and all are available for questions (unless they have special consideration)</li> <li>◦ 6 minutes +/- 40 seconds</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Unsatisfactory:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ The talk is not at all professional, and/or the speakers build no connection with the audience</li> <li>◦ Lack of visuals or the visuals used are not engaging and/or do not support the key messages</li> <li>◦ The presentation is not clear and direct for a general audience and full of disciplinary jargon</li> <li>◦ The delivery is not courteous, collegial and professional and thereby not suitable for students, staff or the general public to view.</li> <li>◦ No rehearsal/preparation is evident</li> <li>◦ No relevant and reputable citations or inconsistent referencing style</li> <li>◦ Only 1 team member presents and not all are available for questions (without special consideration)</li> <li>◦ 6 minutes +/- 50 seconds</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Close