

**MA1003 Computing for mathematics – Presentation task marking criteria (25% of total available module marks)**

Criteria	%	0-40	40-50	50-60	60-70	70-100
<b>Content</b> (Knowledge, application, analysis, evaluation, structure, persuasiveness)	20	Goals not addressed. Content of little strategic value. Structure not apparent or confusing. Unconvincing or unappealing case made.	Goals addressed insufficiently. Descriptive and untargeted content. Needlessly overt and/or confusing structure. Unpersuasive case.	Goals achieved. Reasonable content evidencing some awareness of strategic value. Clear and coherent structure. Case held some sway.	Goals achieved. Critically targeted content demonstrating strategic awareness. Discrete, logical and structure. Persuasive and credible case made.	Goals surpassed. Perceptive, critical and strategically valuable content. Innate, cogent structure. Persuasive, influential and convincing case made.
<b>Code</b> (Difficulty of coding involved, clarity, efficiency)	20	Code not functioning correctly.	Very basic unclear code without any difficulty.	Code is clearly written with a low level of difficulty but is not efficient and no comments.	Code is clearly written with a high level of difficulty including some comments.	Code is of extremely high quality with various novel aspects included and excellent level of documentation.
<b>Delivery</b> (Spoken delivery, audience rapport, time management)	20	Poor delivery style. Did not build relationship or rapport with audience.	Awkward or uncomfortable delivery style. Little relationship or rapport building. Inadequate time management impacting on other criteria.	Acceptable and practical delivery style. Satisfactory level of relationship building, lacking overall audience rapport. Adequate time management.	Articulate and expressive delivery style. Established relationship and rapport. Efficient time management.	Appealing, eloquent and enjoyable delivery style. Excellent relationship and rapport building. Perfect time management.
<b>Visual aids</b> (Co-ordination with content and delivery, PowerPoint, Beamer or similar, graphic design, images, graphs, handouts etc.)	20	Not co-ordinated. Impractical. Inappropriate use of technology and new medias.	Not adequately co-ordinated. Overcrowded, complex or confusing design. Visually unattractive and/or impractical. Poor use of technology and new medias.	Generally well co-ordinated. Adequate design standard with minor faults. Suitable use of technology and new medias.	Co-ordinated and functional. Good, communicative design standard. Beneficial use of technology and new medias.	Subtle, purposeful, & complementary. Professionally designed & visually appealing. Creative use of technology and new medias.
<b>Creativity</b> (Innovative approach to meeting the above criteria)	20	Lacked creativity. Mundane and uninteresting approach taken.	Minimal evidence of original thought. Routine or standard approach taken.	Demonstrates some original and creative thought. Encouraging approach taken.	Novel, inventive, enthusiastic and thoughtful approach taken.	Innovative, original, imaginative and inspiring approach taken.

In addition to their specific criteria, the above components will be assessed according to their presentation and critical approach using the following criteria:

<b>Presentation</b> (Spelling, grammar, punctuation, references)	Poor standard of spelling, grammar, and/or punctuation. Inappropriate and confusing structure, incorrect referencing.	Confusing written/spoken style. Many mistakes in grammar, spelling and/or punctuation. Poorly researched, evidenced & presented.	Acceptable written/spoken style. Mistakes in grammar, spelling and/or punctuation. Acceptably researched, evidenced & presented.	Clear written/spoken style. Generally correct grammar, spelling and/or punctuation. Researched, evidenced & presented to good standard.	Articulate written/spoken style. Grammar and spelling wholly accurate. Researched & evidenced to high standard. Professionally presented.
---	---	--	--	---	---

**MA1003 Computing for mathematics – Presentation task marking criteria (25% of total available module marks)**

<b>Analysis &amp; Evaluation</b> (Commercial awareness, enterprise competency, critical approach employed)		Does not provide adequate description. Demonstrates little awareness of the commercial process. Fails to analyse or evaluate.	Conveys superficial descriptive information only. Demonstrates limited commercial awareness. Little or no attempt made to contextualise, analyse or evaluate points made.	Description is satisfactorily contextualised, analysed and evaluated. Demonstrates adequate standard of commercial awareness. Some consideration of real world issues.	Description is competently contextualised, analysed and evaluated. Good standard of commercial awareness and/or enterprise skills. Perceptive consideration of real world issues.	Conveys very good to professional standard of commercial awareness combined with strong knowledge of relevant industry.
---	--	---	---	--	---	---