

Visual Impact & Organisation		Depth of analysis & future directions		Engagement (continued assessment from project leader)	
5	Very professional presentation of high quality, with clear and concise presentation of the project motivation, including putting the work into context.		5 Analysis beyond that outlined in the project description; clear extension to other application areas		5 Clear evidence of active involvement in the practical via good discussions within the group. Plentiful evidence of working well within the team. Clear leadership of the team and/or project direction.
4	Good use of slides, with a clear structure to the presentation. Visuals and graphics are well thought out.		4 Analysis is well-suited to the project and the conclusions are sound and supported; the future directions are limited		4 Good involvement in the project via participation in discussions within the group. Good evidence of working well within the team. Clear contributions to the project analysis.
3	Reasonable design and structure to the presentation.		3 Analysis is well-suited to the project, however, additional studies to support conclusions would benefit the project; limited future directions offered		3 Reasonable involvement in the project via participation in discussions within the group, and showed evidence of working well within the team.
2	Attended assessment but presentation isn't adequate and does not follow a sensible structure.		2 Limited analysis of the project outcomes and the conclusions are not supported; limited to no future directions are offered		2 Not engaged in the presentation seminar and little to no evidence of working well in the team.
1	Group assessment not attended or carried out.		1 No analysis is completed; no future directions are offered		1 Disruptive team work behaviour.
Verbal presentation & clarity		Scientific understanding		Quality of answers	
5	Very clear communication of the material, with an accessible presentation to the whole audience.		5 Clear grasp of the scientific material underlying the project; clear progression from the original project objectives		5 Excellent, coherent, and authoritative answer with no mistakes.
4	Good communication of the material, with coherent presentation		4 Clear grasp of the scientific material underlying the project; no clear progression from original project objectives		4 Good attempt at answering, with little mistakes. Answers are authoritative and well-structured.
3	Good communication of the material, however, slightly incoherent presentation		3 Partial grasp of scientific concepts, without deep understanding		3 Reasonable attempt at answering, with some mistakes. Lacking authority and coherence in answer.
2	Poor communication of the material.		2 Unclear on the underlying scientific concepts		2 Confused and disjointed answer.
1	Presentation seminar not attended.		1 No attempt made to understand scientific concepts		1 No questions answered