GEP. Self-evaluation
Deliverable 6: Oral presentation and final document

		Excellent (4)	Expected level (3)	Poor (2)	Unacceptable (1)
Project Scope	Formulation of the problem	The objectives of the project are clear and well-specified. The proposed project is significant enough to be considered a TFG.	The objectives of the project are clear and adequately specified. The proposed project is significant enough to beconsidered a TFG.	The objectives of the project are specified (but not clearly enough). The significance of the proposed project is questionable.	The objectives of the project are not specified, and/or the proposed project is not significant enough to be considered a TFG.
	Scope	The scope of the project is well-defined. Possible obstacles that may hinder the execution of the project are clearly stated.	The scope of the project is defined. Possible obstacles that may hinder the execution of the project are briefly stated.	There are some problems in the definition of the scope of the project and/or potential obstacles that may hinder the execution of the problem. Some relevant information is missing.	The scope of the project and potential obstacles are extremely incomplete or not defined.
	Methodology and rigor	The document perfectly describes the methodology that will be followed. Tools to monitor the evolution of the project are clearly stated.	The document describes the methodology that will be followed. Information on tools to monitor the evolution of the project is incomplete.	The document roughly describes the methodology that will be followed. Information on tools to monitor the evolution of the project is missing.	There is no information on the methodology that will be followed, or on tools to monitor the evolution of the project.

		Excellent (4)	Expected level (3)	Poor (2)	Unacceptable (1)
Context, state-of-the-art and references	Context	There is an excellent introduction (context) that defines the terms and concepts of the subject under study. Stakeholders (target audience, users and beneficiaries) are fully specified.	There is a brief introduction to the problem under study, in whichterms and concepts are defined. Stakeholders (target audience, users and beneficiaries) are specified.	The introduction that defines the terms and concepts of the subject under study is totally inadequate, and should be extended and improved. Stakeholders (target audience, users and beneficiaries) are specified (but not clearly enough or in enough detail).	There is no appropriate introduction (context) that defines the terms and concepts of the subject under study. Stakeholders (target audience, users and beneficiaries) are not specified.
	State-of-the-art	There is an excellent literature review onthe subject under study: previous studies are cited, summarised and discussed. It is possible to identify the gap in the literature that this project addresses. Thus, this project is fully supported by the literature.	There is an appropriate literature review onthe subject under study: previous studies are cited and summarised. It is possible to figure out the gap in the literature that this project addresses. Thus, this project is somewhat supported by the literature.	Theliterature review onthe subject under study is limited: few previous studies are cited and not all of them are adequately summarised. It is difficult to figure out the gap in the literature that this project addresses.	The literature review is incomplete: very few previous studies are cited and most of them are not summarised. It is difficult to figure out the gap in the literature that this project addresses.
	Quality of information sources	Information is abundant and complete. The information sources that are used are accurate, verified and of good quality.	Information is abundant. Not all of the information sources that are used are accurate, verified and of good quality.	Few sources of information have been used. The relevance of some of these sources is questionable.	There are no references to previous studies or research works. Hence, both the quantity and the quality of the information sources are insufficient.
	Format of references	Citations of references appear in the correct place in the text, and support the content. The citation style is uniform. All references are listed at the end of the text using the same style.	Citations of references appear in the correct place in the text, and support the content. However, the citation style varies. Almost all references are listed at the end of the text using the same style.	There are few citations of references in the text. The citation style varies. A list of references is included at the end of the text.However, it is incomplete and the style that is used varies.	There are no citations of references in the text. A full list of information sources is provided at the end of the document. The citation style that is used varies.

		Excellent (4)	Expected level (3)	Poor (2)	Unacceptable (1)
Planning	Task description	Tasks are perfectly described in terms of what has to be done in each activity, the length, and the resources (both material and human) needed to complete them. Tasks follow a logical sequence and the order of precedence is clear.	Tasks are correctly described in terms of what has to be done in each activity, the length, and the resources needed to complete them. The planning makes sense. Tasks follow a logical sequence, but the order of precedence between tasks is not as clear as expected.	Activities are scheduled and information on the resources and duration is given, but with few details. The sequence between activities is not clear. The planning is rather unrealistic.	The planning is not credible at all. Activities are very poorly described, and important information (resources and duration) is lacking. There is no logical sequence of activities, and the order of precedence between tasks is not presented.
	Alternatives and action plan	Alternative solutions to potential deviations are coherent and exhaustively detailed. Information on how the total duration of the project will be modified is also included, as well as implications in terms of resource consumption. The plan ensures that the project will be finished within the given time.	Alternative solutions to potential deviations are coherent and briefly detailed. Although some difficulties may arise because of unexpected events, it is possible to guarantee that the project will be completed within the given time.	Alternative solutions to potential deviations are poorly described. There are many constraints and unexpected events that could lengthen the project duration. The plan does not ensure that the project will be finished within the given time.	There are no alternative solutions to potential deviations, or the proposed alternatives are inconsistent. The plan does not ensure that the project will be finished within the given time.

		Excellent (4)	Expected level (3)	Poor (2)	Unacceptable (1)
Budget and Sustainability	Identification of costs	The budget includes, and appropriately describes, all the elements that should be considered: direct and indirect costs, depreciation, unforeseen contingencies, etc. Cost estimation is linked to task description (according to a Gantt chart), so that a link can be established between the various activities and the cost of each one.	The budget includes, but barely describes, almost all of the elements that should be considered: direct and indirect costs, depreciation, unforeseen contingencies, etc. Cost estimation is not linked to task description (according to a Gantt chart), so a link cannot be established between the various activities and the cost of each one.	The budget barely includes some of the costs that should be considered. Some relevant costs are not considered. Cost estimation is not linked to task description (according to a Gantt chart), so a link cannot be established between the various activities and the cost of each one.	The budget omits relevant costs. Cost estimation is not linked to task description (according to a Gantt chart), so a link cannot be established between the various activities and the cost of each one.
	Estimation of costs	Costs are consistent and clearly justified.	Costs are consistent, but only briefly justified.	Some of the costs are under/over-estimated, or their justification is missing.	Cost estimation is completely unrealistic. Costs are not justified.
	Control management	Variouscontrol mechanisms are suggested to prevent deviations. Indicators are established.	Some control mechanisms are suggested to prevent deviations. Indicators are barely established.	Few control mechanisms are suggested to prevent deviations. Indicators to ensure control are not established.	No control mechanisms are suggested to prevent deviations. Indicators to ensure control are not established.
	Sustainability* - Economic - Social - Environmental	All the items that are described above and apply to the project are considered adequately. Ratings are given according to the guidelines (*) and seem to be appropriate.	Most of the items that are described above and apply to the project are considered. Ratings are given according to the guidelines (*).However, it is not clear how they have been assigned.	There are many items described above that apply to the project but are not considered. Ratings are given according to the guidelines (*).However, there are major concerns about how they have been assigned.	Many items from those described above are not discussed, despite applying to the project. Ratings (*) are not given.

		Excellent (4)	Expected level (3)	Poor (2)	Unacceptable (1)
Structure and style	Organisation	The document is logically structured. The different sections are well-connected, which makes it easy to read.	The document is fairly well-structured. Sections are differentiated, however some are disconnected.	The document is fairly well-organised. However, some important aspects need to be improved (badly-connected sections, missing headings, headings in different styles, overlong paragraphs and/or sentences, etc.).	The document does not follow a logical structure. There is no rigor in presenting the different sections and arguments. Many aspects need to be improved (badly connected sections, missing headings,headings in different styles, overlong paragraphs and/or sentences, etc.).
	Clarity	The content is very clear and ideas flow logically. There is no need to read a paragraph twice because the writing style is very precise.	The content is clear and ideas flow logically. Despite minor problems, the document is readable.	Ideas do not flow logically. It is difficult to figure out what the text is saying. Some paragraphs need to be read twice to understand their meaning.	It is very difficult to understand the content. Ideas do not flow logically. Most of the paragraphs need to be read twice to figure out what they mean.
	Writing	The document is free of grammar and spelling mistakes.	Few grammar and spelling mistakes.	Some grammar and spelling mistakes.	The document is full of grammar and spelling mistakes.

Oral presentation

		Excellent (4)	Expected level (3)	Poor (2)	Unacceptable (1)
Non-verbal skills	Body language	Movements seem fluid and help the audience to assimilate the message.	Movements or gestures enhance articulation.	Very little movement or descriptive gestures.	No movement or descriptive gestures.
	Posture	Stands up straight, looks relaxed and confident.	Displays little or no tension. Makes minor mistakes, but quickly recovers from them.	Displays mild tension. Has trouble recovering from mistakes.	Tension and nervousness is obvious. Has trouble recovering from mistakes.
	Elocution	Student speaks clearly with correct, precise pronunciation, so that all audience members can hear the presentation.	Student's voice is clear. Most audience members can hear the presentation.	Student's voice is low. Audience members have difficulty hearing the presentation.	Student mumbles, and speaks too quietly.
Verbal skills	Synthesis	The student is able to summarise the most important topics discussed in the report. Ideas are logically introduced. Both the start and the end of the presentation are clear.	The student is able to summarise almost all the topics discussed in the report. Ideas are introducedlogically. The start and end of the presentation are not clearly indicated.	The student has problems when summarising the project (either too many details or too few are given). Ideas are not introducedlogically. The start and end of the presentation are not clearly indicated.	The student is unable to summarise the project (either too many details or too few are given). Ideas are not introducedlogically. The start and end of the presentation are not clearly indicated.
	Pronunciation	Pronunciation and enunciation are very clear. The speaker exhibits very few disfluencies, such as "ahhs", "umms" or "you knows".	The pronunciation and enunciation are clear. The speaker exhibits few disfluencies, such as "ahhs", "umms" or "you knows".	The pronunciation and enunciation are unclear. The speaker exhibits many disfluencies, such as "ahhs", "umms" or "you knows".	The pronunciation and enunciation are very unclear.
	Length of the presentation	Within +1 minute of the allotted time.	The presentation is too long (+2 minutes) or too short (-1 minute).	Within +3 minutes of the allotted time.	Within +4 minutes of the allotted time.
Structure	Organisation	The student presents information in a logical, interesting sequence that the audience can follow.	The student presents information in a logical sequence that the audience can follow.	The audience has difficulty following the presentation, because the student jumps around.	The audience cannot understand the presentation, because there is no sequence of information.
	Content	The presentation contains all the required sections: purpose, scope, timeframe and budget estimate.	The presentation contains almost all the required sections.	The presentation lackssome of the required sections.	The presentation lacks important sections that are required.