

Sheet1

Structure and organisation

Poster was excellent in organisation, structuring of information and content (including clear and easy-to-read English).	90-100
Poster was very good but contained one or two minor problems in organisation, structuring of information, content and/or English language.	80-89
Poster was good but contained several minor problems in organisation, structuring of information, content and/or English language.	70-79
Poster was satisfactory but contained major problems in organisation, structuring of information, content and/or English language.	60-69
Poster was poor and contained several major problems in organisation, structuring of information, content and/or English language.	0-59

Problem

The problem was very well described and explained, including the biological importance and the coding challenge. There was an especially clear description of the "Additional Function" that the group decided to tackle.	90-100
The problem was clearly described and explained, except for one or two points that could have been made clearer. The "Additional Function" was clearly described.	80-89
The problem was mostly clearly described, but details or clarity were missing in a few places.	70-79
The description of the problem was satisfactory, but lacked detail or clarity in several places.	60-69
The description of the problem was confusing, incomplete, or missing entirely.	0-59

Approach

The approach taken was very well described at an appropriate level of detail. Diagrams, code snippets or other visual aids were used to clarify the approach.	90-100
The approach taken was well described and illustrated at an appropriate level of detail. Explanations could have been clearer or more succinct on one or two occasions	80-89
The approach taken was described and mostly clear. Explanations could have been clearer or more succinct on several occasions.	70-79
The approach taken was mentioned but not described in detail or the poster just showed a lot of code with little explanation.	60-69
The poster just showed the code for the project with no explanation; or there was no description of the approach taken at all.	0-59

Results

Results were complete and presented in an easy-to-understand form. Any figures were clearly labelled.	90-100
Results were complete and presented in an easy-to-understand form, with one or two minor shortcomings. Any figures were clearly labelled.	80-89

Sheet 1

Results were mostly complete and presented clearly, with several minor shortcomings. Figures were not always clearly labelled.	70-79
Results were presented, but with major shortcomings. Most figures were not clearly labelled.	60-69
Results were missing.	0-59

Visual presentation

The poster was neat in organisation and very nice to look at. Writing was large enough to read, resolution on images was satisfactory, and the chosen colour scheme was pleasant.	90-100
The poster was neat in organisation and nice to look at, with one or two minor shortcomings in visual design or readability.	80-89
The poster was readable (maybe with few minor shortcomings), but not visually appealing.	70-79
The poster was satisfactory, but had several smaller shortcomings in visual design and readability (e.g. too small fonts, too busy colour scheme)	60-69
The visual design was so bad that parts of the poster were impossible to read or understand (e.g. too small fonts, low-resolution figures, too little contrast)	0-59

Software demo / submitted code

The software demo/submitted code was very well prepared, including an example that could be run by a marker. It ran without a glitch and showed the expected results.	90-100
The software demo/submitted code was well prepared, including an example that could be run by a marker. There were one or two minor issues, but the run ended up showing the expected results.	80-89
The software demo/submitted code and example were there, but had several issues when run by a marker, which took significant time to fix before producing results.	70-79
The software demo/submitted code was incomplete or did not fully work.	60-69
No software demo/submitted code was submitted, or it did not work at the time of marking.	0-59

Oral presentation

The oral presentation was excellent, clearly structured, and contained a clear introduction, main part, and conclusion. It related to both the poster and the software demo, and was within the allocated time of 5-8 minutes.	90-100
The oral presentation was very good, clearly structured, with one or two minor shortcomings. It related to the poster and software demo and was within the allocated time of 5-8 minutes.	80-89
The oral presentation was good, mostly well structured, but there was room for improvement. Integration with the poster and software demo was not seamless. The presentation was slightly shorter or longer than the allocated time.	70-79
The oral presentation was satisfactory, with room for improvement in structure, presentation, and clarity. It did not relate well to either the poster or the software demo. Or it was far shorter or longer than the allocated time.	60-69
The oral presentation was of poor quality and not well prepared. It did not clearly relate to the poster and software demo.	0-59

Team work

Sheet1

There is clear evidence of teamwork in the preparation of the poster and the demo code. All team members presented in the oral presentation.	90-100
Very good evidence of teamwork in preparation of the poster and demo code. All team members presented in the oral presentation, with one or two instances where the work seemed unevenly distributed.	80-89
Good evidence of teamwork in preparation of the poster and demo code. All team members presented in the oral presentation. Evidence that some team processes could be running more smoothly.	70-79
Some evidence of teamwork in preparation of the poster and demo code. Most team members presented in the oral presentation. Several instances where team members did not optimally work together.	60-69
Poor or no evidence of teamwork in preparation and presentation. Visibly bad team atmosphere.	0-59

Average mark across eight categories