

Presentation Marking Guide

Introduction

The presentation is worth 20% of the semester marks for each student. The marking guide assigns a mark out of 45, which can be modified to a mark up to 55 (although this would be exceedingly rare). The final mark is multiplied by 0.4 to obtain the semester mark (which means it is possible to score more than 20). A score cannot be negative.

Marking Category Explanations

Introduction

The introduction should clearly lay out the basis of that team member's part of the project. Each team member needs to be properly and clearly introduced, both verbally and by displaying their names visually at some point. The project name and client needs to be clearly presented, as well as the major goals of the project.

Organisation of Material

[5] Outstanding and indistinguishable from the best professional presentations. Worthy of presentation at an international conference or professional gathering.

[4] Very well organised. Well thought out structure to the presentation. Clear table of contents explained slowly and clearly at the beginning of the presentation. Sections of equal size. Clear mapping between the items in the table of contents and the titles of the slides. Every slide has a clear title. Each slide is well organised.

[3] Well organised. Fairly good structure to the presentation. Table of contents explained reasonably well. Sections of approximately equal size. Fairly clear mapping between the table of contents and the titles of the slides. Most slides have a clear title. Most slides are well organised.

[2] Poor organisation. No table of contents slide. No clear organisation to the presentation. The individual slides are not well organised.

[1] An attempt has been made to present the project, but it is of very poor quality. Typically no table of contents, no real introduction, and no obvious structure.

Clarity

[5] Outstanding and indistinguishable from the best professional presentations. Worthy of presentation at an international conference or professional gathering. Exceptionally clear. At all times one has complete understanding of the presentation. Excellent combination of the speaking and visual channels. Complete engagement of the audience, and very clear exposition. Speaking at a very clear speed. No ambiguity or confusion.

[4] Very clear. Nearly all parts of the presentation are clear to the audience. Very good combination of the speaking and visual channels. Good engagement of the audience and clear exposition. Speaking at a clear speed. Very little ambiguity or confusion.

[3] Clear. Most parts of the presentation are clear to the audience. Good combination of the speaking and visual channels mostly. Fairly clear exposition. Little ambiguity or confusion.

[2] Poor clarity. Much of the presentation is not clear, and the clarity could be greatly improved. Poor combination of the speaking and visual channels. Too few slides. Far too much material being presented just in the verbal channel making it difficult to follow. Exposition unclear. In several places there is ambiguity or confusion.

[1] An attempt has been made to present the project, but it is of very poor quality. Typically attempting to speak without slides and a resulting loss of clarity.

Speaking Coherence/Quality

[5] Outstanding and indistinguishable from the best professional presentations. Worthy of presentation at an international conference or professional gathering.

[4] Very good speaker. Good engagement of the audience. Good eye contact with the audience. Little woodenness in speaking. Very good delivery speed. Very good use of timing, especially at the beginning of sections. Very good use of stress in varying the speech.

[3] Good speaker. Fairly good engagement of the audience. Fairly good eye contact with the audience. Very little woodenness in speaking. Good delivery speed. Good use of timing. Good use of stress in varying the speech.

[2] Fair speaker. Some engagement with the audience. Some eye contact with the audience. Some woodenness in speaking, for example some reading directly from notes. Fair delivery speed, but too fast in some places. Some variation in the stress contour of the speech pattern.

[1] Poor speaker. Little engagement of the audience. Little eye contact with the audience. Speech is wooden in style, typically by reading directly from notes. Speaking too fast. Speaking in a monotone with very little variation in speed or stress.

Quality of Visual Aids

[5] Outstanding and indistinguishable from the best professional presentations. Worthy of presentation at an international conference or professional gathering.

[4] Very high quality slides. Very clear titles that stand out. All the text can be very clearly read. The right amount of material on each slide. Clear indication by pointing of what is being talked about. Possibly a good use of colour and/or diagrams.

[3] Good quality slides. Good clear titles. All the text can be clearly read. In nearly all cases the right amount of material on each slide. Usually always aware of what is being talked about.

[2] Poor quality slides. Many slides with titles that do not stand out, or no titles at all. Several slides have text that is too small. Possibly some slides with a paragraph of text rather than summaries (but in some circumstances this is defensible, e.g. a quotation if relevant), resulting in far too much text on the slide. Alternatively far too little text on the slide causing overload in the visual channel. Similarly if there are too few slides. In most cases four slides will be too few especially if the first is the title and the second the table of contents. No clear relation between the speech channel and the slide.

[1] An attempt has been made to present the project, but it is of very poor quality. Typically there is only one slide or only a pro-forma attempt at use of visual aids.

Timing

[5] Finishes around the correct time.

[3] Finishes within a minute before or after the correct time. Does not skip over significant parts of the presentation.

[1] Finishes more than a minute before or after the correct time. May skip significant parts of the presentation in order to better meet deadlines.

Interest and Enthusiasm

[5] Outstanding and indistinguishable from the best professional presentations. Worthy of presentation at an international conference or professional gathering. Exceptionally interesting and very enthusiastic speaker. The speaker has the attention of the audience at all times.

[4] Very interesting and enthusiastic speaker. The speaker has the attention of the audience nearly all the time.

[3] Fairly interesting with some enthusiasm. Attention of the audience is waning at times. Some evidence of being boring, typically in the speaking style.

[2] Boring with no real engagement of the audience. Little interest and no enthusiasm. The speaker does not command the attention of the audience. Typically speaking is done in a monotone.

[1] An attempt has been made to present the project, but it is of very poor quality. Typically there is no serious attempt to speak with any interest or enthusiasm.

Teamwork

Note that this value is generally the same for all members of the team.

[5] Excellent teamwork. The team assist and enhance each other's presentation in a truly professional manner. Each team member has a clear role and area of responsibility, and the way that changes between team members are used greatly enhances the presentation.

[3] Good teamwork. The team assist each other when needed. Each team member has a role which relates to their tasks and these roles are generally clear in both the presentation and the answering of questions. The change-over between team members during the presentation does not detract from the presentation as a whole.

[1] No obvious team work. Team members present more or less independently. Generally this appears as multiple different presentations.

Modifier

When some aspect of the presentation is particularly good or bad and not covered by the rest of the marking scheme, a mark of +/-3 may be awarded as a modifier. The reason must be stated, and the modifiers cannot total more than +/-10 per student.

For example, a presenter who uses a particularly fitting example that enhances their presentation may get a bonus for this, while a student who answers a question particularly badly may get a penalty.

Marking Sheet

Group:

Speakers:

1 _____

2 _____

3 _____

4 _____

[illegible]