

School of Biomedical Science – BBiomed Sc & BSc Honours Program
Research Proposal Seminar Feedback

Examiners (and candidates) should familiarize themselves with the criteria sheet. There are five rows, the first three relate to *content*, the fourth to *presentation* and the fifth to *questions*. Each row is worth 20%. Examiners are to circle the relevant achievement level of the candidate in each row (guide marks are provided for ease of calculation). Please ensure that your marks for each component **add up to the final score out of 100**. Specific comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's presentation are to be made on the reverse side of the sheet.

Candidate's name:

Examiner's name:

I give permission for the course coordinators to provide my name to the candidate:

Examiner's signature (not required if replying by email):

Date :

Score out of 100:

Yes/No

- | | |
|-------------------------|--|
| >80 (Hons 1) | Work of superior quality in all aspects of the seminar, containing clear examples of excellent critical skills and personal insights into research area. |
| 70-79 (Hons IIa) | Work of very good quality in all aspects of the seminar, but showing lesser critical skills and personal insights into research area. |
| 60-69 (Hons IIb) | Good quality in all aspects of the seminar, but with inadequacies in understanding, critical skills, organisation and presentation |
| 50-59 (Hons III) | Adequate quality work, but with significant deficiencies in understanding, critical skills, organisation and presentation. |
| <50 (Fail) | No understanding of area or incomprehensible. |

Hons Research Proposal - Seminar - Criteria Sheet

Candidate's name:

	Attribute	High Honours I (100-85%)	Med-Low Hons I (80-84%)	Hons IIA (70-79%)	Honours IIB (60-69%)	Honours III (50-59%)	Fail (<50%)
CONTENT	Concepts and terminology	All concepts and terminology described <i>exceptionally clearly</i> .	All concepts and terminology described <i>clearly</i> .	<i>Most</i> concepts and terminology described.	Some concepts and terminology described <i>with minor omissions</i> .	Some concepts and terminology described with <i>significant omissions</i> .	<i>No attempt</i> to describe concepts and terminology.
	SCORE (20% of total):	20 – 17	16.9 – 16	15.9 – 14	13.9 – 12	11.9 – 10	<10
	Experimental strategy, expected outcomes align with aims/hypothesis (NB. The supervisor typically conceives the experimental design)	Outlined <i>exceptionally clearly</i> , and <i>consistent</i> with aims / hypotheses.	Experimental strategy and expected outcomes outlined <i>clearly</i> . <i>Fully consistent</i> with aims / hypotheses.	Experimental strategy mostly but <i>not fully clear</i> . <i>Some inconsistencies</i> with aims / hypotheses.	Experimental strategy <i>not clear</i> . <i>Many inconsistencies</i> with aims / hypotheses	<i>Little evidence</i> of experimental strategy. <i>No links</i> to aims / hypotheses apparent.	<i>No experimental strategy</i> apparent. Strategy and outcomes missing.
	SCORE (20% of total):	20 – 17	16.9 – 16	15.9 – 14	13.9 – 12	11.9 – 10	<10
	Communication of content (to non-expert audience) and structure.	All content communicated <i>clearly</i> , with <i>logical</i> structure throughout.	<i>Nearly all</i> content communicated <i>clearly</i> / <i>Logical</i> structure throughout.	<i>Some</i> sections unclear / <i>Mostly logical</i> structure.	<i>Majority</i> of content unclear / <i>Major errors</i> in structure.	<i>Very little attempt</i> to communicate to non-experts./ <i>Little structure</i> .	<i>No attempt</i> to communicate to non-experts / <i>No structure</i>
	SCORE (20% of total):	20 – 17	16.9 – 16	15.9 – 14	13.9 – 12	11.9 – 10	<10
PRESENTATION	- Spelling/labelling..... - Use of figures..... - Delivery..... - Stance.....	<i>No errors</i> ; <i>Excellent</i> ; Well-paced, articulate; <i>Exceptionally confident</i> .	<i>Very few errors</i> ; <i>Very good</i> ; Well-paced, articulate; <i>Highly confident</i> .	<i>Some errors</i> ; <i>Minor mistakes</i> ; Mostly clear and <i>well-paced</i> ; <i>Mostly confident</i> .	<i>Many errors</i> ; <i>Major mistakes</i> ; Mostly clear; <i>Some major lapses</i> in body language.	<i>Poor</i> ; <i>Largely ineffective</i> ; Unclear / inaudible; <i>Major lapses</i> in body language.	<i>Very poor</i> ; <i>Not useful at all</i> ; Unclear / inaudible; <i>Poor</i> body language.
	SCORE (20% of total):	20 – 17	16.9 – 16	15.9 – 14	13.9 – 12	11.9 – 10	<10
QUESTIONS	Comprehension of contextual and technical issues; and ability to answer questions drawing on literature.	<i>All responses</i> demonstrated clear understanding; <i>Exceptionally well</i> argued and <i>accurate</i> answers.	<i>Most responses</i> demonstrated clear understanding; <i>Well argued</i> and <i>accurate</i> answers.	Mostly demonstrated <i>some understanding</i> of technical and contextual issues. <i>Mostly accurate</i> answers to questions.	Demonstrated some understanding of technical or contextual issues <i>but not both</i> . <i>A number of errors</i> made in answers.	Demonstrated <i>little understanding</i> of technical and contextual issues. <i>A number of major errors</i> made in answers.	Responses did <i>not</i> demonstrate <i>any understanding</i> of the project. <i>Significant errors</i> made in answers.
	SCORE (20% of total):	20 – 17	16.9 – 16	15.9 – 14	13.9 – 12	11.9 – 10	<10

Hons Research Proposal - Seminar - Criteria Sheet

Candidate's name:

Specific comments (strengths / weaknesses / suggestions):