|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **%** | **0-40** | **40-50** | **50-60** | **60-70** | **70-100** |
| **Content**  (Knowledge, application, analysis, evaluation, structure, persuasiveness) | 40 | 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. |
| **Delivery**  (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. |
| **Visual aids**  (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. |
| **Creativity**  (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. |
| **Code**  (Difficulty of coding involved, clarity, efficiency) |  | 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. | Code is clearly written with a high level of difficulty. | Code is of extremely high quality with various novel aspects included. |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presentation**  (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. |
| **Analysis & Evaluation**  (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 jevaluate 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. |