

EMI Capstone Oral Examination

The following table gives a detailed view of how the Oral Examination will be assessed. The criteria briefly indicate what the assessors are looking for in the presentation, but the assessors will be taking a holistic view to grading each aspect and the descriptors should be taken as a guide rather than a definitive list of what is required for each category.

| Marking guide | N/A (0) | Very Poor (2.5) | Poor (4.5) | Pass (5.5) | Average (6.5) | Good (7.5) | Very good (8.5) | Excellent (10) |
|---|-----------------|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Quality of Media (Group Mark 20%) | No media | Unstructured and unclear. Virtually no preparation, difficult to view / read. Unbalanced, no consideration of length, errors | Somewhat unstructured, message requires clarification. Little preparation, lacks finish (e.g. not proof read), not well balanced. Length inappropriate, some errors. | Mostly structured, message some requires clarification. A little under prepared, not well balanced. Length inappropriate, occasional errors. | Structure and message ok. Prepared, but not well balanced. Appropriate length. Very few or no errors. | Good structure, well-directed, concise, clear message. Well prepared and well balanced (e.g. level of detail, treatment of topics, use of graphics, fonts, etc). | Very good structure, well directed, concise, clear message, and creative where appropriate. Polished appearance, logical order, a pleasure to view. | Meets professional or conference standards. |
| Quality of Oration (Individual Mark 20%) | No presentation | Oration often unclear. No interest in audience. Essentially reading from notes. | Oration sometimes unclear, confused or meandering. Little or no interaction with audience. Possibly rehearsed rather than understood. Inflexible, relies heavily on prepared material or others. | Oration ok, but can occasionally be unclear or confused. Sometimes off pace. Little audience feedback sought. Rather inflexible, relying a lot on notes. | Good oration. Expression sometimes requires clarification. Pace ok. Some audience feedback sought. Reasonably flexible. | Good oration. Good expression, clear. Pace ok. Audience feedback sought. Reasonably flexible. | Very good oration. Clear, precise, concise, and deliberate expression. Well-paced. Eye contact, seeks audience feedback, motivated, guides audience. Flexible (communicates with/without media), resourceful. A pleasure to watch and listen to. | Meets professional or conference standards. |

| Marking guide | N/A (0) | Very Poor (2.5) | Poor (4.5) | Pass (5.5) | Average (6.5) | Good (7.5) | Very good (8.5) | Excellent (10) |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| <p>Demonstrated Understanding of Overall project concepts</p> <p>(Individual Mark 20%)</p> | No understanding of the overall project concepts | Little understanding of the overall project concepts | Moderate understanding of some parts. | <p>Competent understanding of the parts the student has worked on.</p> <p>Only moderate understanding of the other parts and how they fit together.</p> | <p>Competent understanding of most parts of the projects.</p> <p>Maybe some gaps in how the parts fit together and how it compares to other work.</p> | <p>Solid understanding of all parts of the project, how the parts fit together, the practical and/or theoretical importance of the project and how it compares to related work.</p> | <p>Very good understanding of all parts of the project, how the parts fit together, the practical and/or theoretical importance of the project and how it compares to related work.</p> | Professional/PhD level understanding. |
| <p>Demonstrated Understanding of Theoretical and Fundamental Engineering Concepts</p> <p>(Individual Mark 20%)</p> | No understanding of the engineering concepts | Little understanding of the engineering concepts | <p>Moderate understanding of some concepts.</p> <p>Limited ability to apply these to new problems.</p> | <p>Moderate understanding of most concepts, some may be flawed.</p> <p>Some ability to apply these to new problems.</p> | <p>Competent understanding of underlying concepts.</p> <p>Some ability to apply these to new problems.</p> | <p>Solid understanding, clearly able to apply abstract concepts to new problems.</p> | <p>Very good understanding and depth of thought consistent with assimilation of concepts into knowledge base, easily and flexibly applied to new problems.</p> | Professional/PhD level understanding. |
| <p>Ability to Answer Questions</p> <p>(Individual Mark 20%)</p> | Unable to answer any questions | Limited credible answers. | Can credibly answer some questions in a particular area. | Can competently answer questions in a particular area, but not others. | <p>Can competently answer most questions, particularly those in a particular area.</p> <p>Able to say "I don't know" when appropriate.</p> | Can competently answer questions about all aspects of project and underlying concepts. | Intelligent, meaningful answers demonstrating depth of understanding. | Professional/PhD level answer. |