

# SCALE FOR PROJECT FIRST-INTERNSHIP (/PROJECTS/WETHINKCODE\_-FIRST-INTERNSHIP) / PEER VIDEO (/PROJECTS/JOBURG-FIRST-INTERNSHIP- PEER-VIDEO)

## Guidelines

Note: Taking into account the subjective part of this evaluation, we decided to put a lot more peer-to-peer than usual.

## Preliminaries

### Submission

- As usual clone the git repository of the person you have to correct. It must contain a file which has the link to the video stored online.
- Exceptionally, this evaluation can be done without the person you have to grade. Be aware that is this goes out of control we'll put back the mandatory presence part.
- If there is no link, no video to watch, the correction stops here.
- Note that some videos are "censored" for confidentiality reasons. Not everything can be said during defense. Approach cleverly this scale in this case. Even if you're not explained everything, you must still be able to understand what's presented and the general logic.

✓ Yes

✗ No

# Submission's style

## Technical aspects

- The video lasts around 5 min (we will tolerate + or - 1 minute)
- The video contains a presentation using an appropriate software (powerpoint, prezi, keynote, magicpoint, etc...)
- The visual and sound quality of the video is acceptable, not too crappy, pixelized or inaudible

✓ Yes

✗ No

## The staging

- A thumbnail of the student is visible most of the time (It's possible to have an introduction/conclusion or chapters, for example, during which the student is in close-up shot instead of the presentation, or during which he isn't visible to display a title)
- The render is professional: presentation is pro, the attitude as well
  - > no funky fonts or flashy background burning the eyes
  - > no dirty shirt or sloppy style, a shirt or suit is better
  - > no rude language or attitude
- There is a little bit of roleplay: it's directed to the board, another company or someone that recently joined the company. récemment.

Rate it from 0 (failed) through 5 (excellent)



# The content

## Presentation and project's context

- You understood what the company does, in which context, on which market it evolves.
- You understood the intern's mission, and you know his task and attribution specifically when part of a group project.

- You understood the aim of the intern's mission(s) in the company's context.
- You got the result of this or these missions, what came of it, what worked and didnt, and if there is a continuation inside the company.



Rate it from 0 (failed) through 5 (excellent)

### Highlight of the qualities

- Without being a rug merchant, the intern highlighted himself to promote his technical or management qualities.
- The skills presented ("I'm able to do this or that", "I showed this or that skill", ... are supported ? Is there specific examples of what was done during the internship to support arguments? This second point should have a major part of your evaluation on this question.



Rate it from 0 (failed) through 5 (excellent)

## The communication

### Oral communication

- The voice is composed? Calm? (more points) Or is it stressed, faltering or even distraught? (less points)
- Are gestures sloppy or does it support the speech? Does the facial and body langage inspire confidence or is there nervous tics that raise a smile?



Rate it from 0 (failed) through 5 (excellent)

## Ratings

Don't forget to check the flag corresponding to the defense

 Forbidden function

## Conclusion

Leave a comment on this evaluation

Preview!!!

General term of use of the site  
(<https://signin.intra.42.fr/legal/terms/6>)

Privacy policy  
(<https://signin.intra.42.fr/legal/terms/5>)

Legal notices  
(<https://signin.intra.42.fr/legal/terms/3>)

Declaration on the use of cookies  
(<https://signin.intra.42.fr/legal/terms/2>)

Terms of use for video surveillance  
(<https://signin.intra.42.fr/legal/terms/1>)

Terms of use for the site  
(<https://signin.intra.42.fr/legal/terms/7>)