Presentation Marking

# **Final Presentation Marking Scheme**

|  |
| --- |
| **The Setting & The Characters** |
| · 1 - 2: Unclear project vision. No sense of users, product etc.  · 2 - 4: Decent definition of project vision. Clear ideas reasonably well expressed. Some background on other similar offerings.  · 4 - 5: Very clear definition of project vision. Clear sense of users at the centre of the product. Clear understanding of fulfilled need. |
| **Demo** |
| · 1 - 2: Poorly delivered demo (maybe some technical problems).  · 2 - 4: Decent demo, with perhaps some aspects poorly articulated.  · 4 - 5: Very well presented demo with clear story to support the user experience. |
| **The System** |
| · 1 - 2: No clear understanding on what it means to define a technology stack (e.g. we're using Python). No detailed descriptions of key technology pieces.  · 2 - 4: Good clear definition of key technologies being used. No big gaps.  · 4 - 5: Great description of all pieces in the technology stack and how they connect together. |
| **The Design** |
| · 1 - 2: No clear idea of a consistent design or ability to reflect on design decisions.  · 2 - 4: Some gaps in connecting the design to the user experience.  · 4 - 5: Clear description of a design vision tied to a planned user experience. |
| **The Business** |
| · 1 - 2: Poor description of business model with gaps in critical aspects.  · 2 - 4: Some gaps in the business model or poorly supported assumptions.  · 4 - 5: Clear definitions of value proposition, profit model, critical processes and resources; evidence to backup this model choice. |
| **The Reviews** |
| · 1 - 2: Little or no evaluation.  · 2 - 4: Gaps in evaluation or no connection between idea for future development and evaluation results.  · 4 - 5: Well designed evaluation with clear idea of how to address the findings of the evaluation to improve the offering. |
| **Reflections** |
| · 1 - 2: Little or no evidence of critical reflections on the project.  · 2 - 4: Ok reflections, but somewhat patchy/superficial.  · 4 - 5: Strong, honest critical reflection on the successes and failures of the project, with evidence of learning. |
| **Presentation** |
| · 1 - 2: Badly prepared presentation and inability to answer questions.  · 2 - 4: OK presentation, but some issues not clear.  · 4 - 5: Very good presentation, clearly delivered, good ability to answer questions. |