**Assessment overview**

* This is a **group assessment task worth 20% of your overall grade**.
* The due date for this assessment task is during **your designated Week 12 workshop**
* **All team members must be present, but not all have to speak/present.** **It is a requirement that** **any student who has not presented previously should present the final presentation**. A role will be used to mark attendance. If you do not attend, you will receive zero.

**Submission requirements:**

**Only one group member is required to submit the presentation on behalf of the group.**

One member of your group will need to upload an appropriately named (including Tutorial and Group number) presentation file to your group file location.

**Assessment task**

Your group is to make a presentation on your design area and your design solution. Formal presentation style should be used with presentation slides. You are required to address the marking rubric criteria.

A suggested structure for the presentation is:

- **Introduction**

**- Problem definition**

**- Summary of information**

**- Requirements**

**- Deliverables**

**- Design Solution**

In addition to these requirements, each group will be randomly asked by their tutor to provide comments and questions to one other group. These comments and questions should focus on the technical content of the other group’s presentation, rather than presentation structure and quality.

**Allocated time:**

**Presentation**: Strictly 10 minutes per group; your group will be given a time warning with two minutes to go, then one minute to go. Your team will be cut-off at 10 minutes.

Questions, comments and answers: Strictly 5 minutes per group.

**Marking rubric**

| **Category** | **Sub-category** | **Marks / Percent** | **Mark allocation** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **20%** | **40%** | **60%** | **80%** | **100%** |
| **Level 1** | **Level 2** | **Level 3** | **Level 4** | **Level 5** |
| **Presentation structure and quality** | **1 Clearly and logically communicated presentation structure** | **4 / 20%** | Poor presentation structure and no section transitions. Minimal clarity and preparation. Speech unclear or inaudible. | Reasonable presentation structure, but little / no section transitions. Limited in clarity and preparation. Speech often unclear or inaudible. | Logical presentation structure and average section transitions. Clear and soundly prepared. Speech is mostly clear and audible. | Logical presentation structure with attempted section transitions. Clear and well prepared. Speech is clear and audible throughout. | Logical and effective presentation structure and with good section transitions. Clear and thoroughly prepared. Speech is clear, audible and engaging |
| **Presentation content** | **2a Demonstration of technical understanding** | **5 / 20%** | Minimal technical understanding demonstrated and no solution plausible. | Limited technical understanding demonstrated is correct and few solutions plausible. | Technical understanding demonstrated and some solution plausible. | Good technical understanding demonstrated. Solution is plausible and appropriate to context with some consideration given to the local community. | High level of technical understanding demonstrated. Solution is plausible and highly appropriate to the context. High level of consideration of the local community. |
| **2b Demonstrated an integration of sustainable development into the design process** | **5 / 20%** | No consideration for the design’s sustainability. | Some reference to the design’s social, environmental or economic sustainability but little / no connection made to the project context. | Description of the design’s social, environmental and economic sustainability. Some connections made to the project context. | Good description of the design’s social, environmental and economic sustainability. Relevant connections made to the project context. | Detailed description of the design’s social environmental and economic sustainability. Outstanding and relevant connections made to the project context. |
| **Questions and answers** | **3a Ability to effectively answer questions** | **4 / 20%** | Very few questions answered, lacked depth. | Some questions answered but not in depth. | Most questions answered but not in depth. | Most questions answered thoroughly. | All questions answered thoroughly. |
| **3b Ability to provide peer-review questions and comments** | **2 / 20%** | Limited comments and questions, possibly to “yes/no” questions only. | Comments and questions are not well informed. Heavy reliance on own opinions | Comments and questions are sometimes constructive, with occasional signs of insight. Team does not use appropriate language. Comments not always relevant to the topic. | Comments and questions are mostly insightful and constructive; using appropriate language. Occasionally comments are too general or not relevant to the topic. | Comments and questions are insightful and constructive; uses appropriate language. Comments are balanced between general impressions, opinions and specific, thoughtful criticisms or contributions. |
| **Total** | | **20 / 100%** | | | | | |