Student name:_____ **Talk short title:** _____

This sheet is for marking oral presentations in Statistics. Markers should provide a short narrative to justify their overall marks and give individual marks for sections on the following page.

Marker's comments:

Student name:_____ **Talk short title:** _____

Examiner's initials: _____ **Mark assigned:** _____ (to 2 decimal places)

Each of the four sections ("Explanation of Background", "Talk Delivery", "Slides Quality", and "Statistical Approach") should be given an individual mark between 0 and 22 based on the headings (Poor, Weak etc..) and the heading descriptors. To help the marker decide on a mark for each section, some examples of characteristics to be assessed in that section are listed. The final report mark is the sum of the individual section marks multiplied by their associated weights.

Criterion	*Poor (0-5)*	*Weak (6-8)*	*Acceptable (9-11)*	*Moderate (12-14)*	*Good (15-17)*	*Very Good (18-22)*	**Overall Section Mark**
EXPLANATION OF BACKGROUND (weight = 25%) • Project background • Aims of the project • Data description	Unclear with errors.	Unclear.	Variable clarity.	Generally clear and sound.	High quality.	Generally excellent.	
SLIDES QUALITY (weight = 25%) • Use of notation • Quality of diagrams and tables • Style and use of space	Unclear with errors.	Unclear.	Variable clarity.	Generally clear and sound.	High quality.	Generally excellent.	
TALK DELIVERY (weight = 25%) • Talk structure • Pace of delivery • Clarity of style	Incoherent.	Poor exposition; substantial defects in mathematical arguments.	Coherent but sketchy exposition.	Fairly clear and coherent exposition.	Mostly clear exposition, with clear indications of thought.	Very clear, concise with indications of outstandingly good thought.	
STATISTICAL APPROACH (weight = 25%) • Understanding of statistical issues • Appropriateness of choice of statistical methods • Understanding of implications and limitations	No understanding apparent. Incorrect use of statistical techniques.	Little understanding apparent. Inappropriate use of statistical techniques.	Sensible but inadequate understanding. Not appropriate use of statistical methods.	Understanding of issues. Generally sound use of statistical techniques.	Good depth of understanding. Accurate and sound use of statistical techniques.	A very sound understanding of issues. Exceptionally assiduous, precise and concise.	