

# Student Group/Title: 9 Teleportalion

**Assessor:** 

ARH

1. Assess how well the speaker(s) *express* themselves

Very Poor	Poor	Deficient	Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Exce	ptional	Perfect
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	(	9	10

#### Feedback (circle as appropriate):

Voice is modulated poorly/adequately/excellently across the talk.

Language is loose/missing important details/flawed/precise/extremely clear.

The speakers ignore completely/ignore occasionally/engage occasionally with/engage enthusiastically with the audience.

## 2. Assess the *delivery* of the *oral presentation*:

Very	Poor	Deficient	Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Very	Excellent	Exceptional		Perfe	ect
Poor						Good					)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	(	9	(10	

# Feedback (circle as appropriate):

Pace is too slow/about right/too fast/perfect

The preparation is poor/haphazard/dependent on notes/standard/careful/flawlessly rehearsed

Oral delivery is unclear/hesitant/poorly planned/adequate/clear/engaging/pleasant/fluent/crystal clear

# 3. Assess the *standard* of the *presentation materials*:

Very	Poor	Deficient	Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Very	Excellent	Exceptional	Perfect
Poor			_	_		Good		_	
1	2	3	4	5	6	(7)	8	9	/(10

#### Feedback (circle as appropriate):

The content is too shallow/lacking profundity/standard/informative/highly meaningful

The slides are text-heavy/difficult to read/clear/visually appealing/excellent

The visual resources or props are not useful/lacking in meaning adequate/make an impact/inspiring to others

The presentation was on time / poorly timed (delayed by < 2 minutes) / lacking in time control (> 2 minutes late)

#### 4. Assess how evidence for the development of *expert knowledge* is presented:

Very	Poor	Deficient	Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Very	Excellent	Exceptional	Perfect
Poor			_			Good			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	(9)	(10)

#### Feedback (circle as appropriate):

Examples are missing superficial/standard/well-chosen/showing insight/profound

Explanation of figures is missing some important information/flawed/covers basics/has minor omissions/fully comprehensive Explanation of slide content is flawed/confused/confusing/generally clear/insightful/crystal clear

## 5. Assess the quality of the speaker(s) *responses to questions* and *feedback*:

Very Poor	Poor	Deficient	Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Exc	eptio	onal	Perfect
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		9		10

#### Feedback (circle as appropriate):

Answers to questions were off track/adequate/good/to the point /excellent.

Answers were too short/hesitant/off track/on point/too long.

45.5

Total Mark: /50

## Comments:

Group 9 discussed quantum teleportation in their presentation. This included a discussion of Zeilinger's original paper, as well as some illustrative ideas on how to encode teleportation on a quantum circuit. The talk was well delivered, but went slightly over time. The slides included useful illustrations throughout, but could have been more appealing.