**SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**

**Student Assessment and Feedback Form**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Module Code:** ISYS10301 | | **Module Name:** Essential Skills | **Strand:** Professional Development | | **Module Leader:** Andrew Pierson | |
| **Student Name:** | Paul Oladapo | | **Student id:** | **N1041014** | **Overall grade:** | **21HIGH Presentation**  **1EXC CPD Plan** |
| **Assessor:** | Magdalena Williams | | **Submission date:** | **21.11.2022** | **Grade Date:** | **20/12/2022** |
| **CPD** | 50% Weighting | |
| **Presentation** | 50% Weighting | |
| **Overall Feedback Comments:**  (strengths and areas for improvement) | Detailed feedback on presentation and the CPD plan was provided to the student orally after the classroom delivery.  Main points for further development:  Keep your presentations informative with suitable research findings  Use effective signposting  Keep your presentation style formal with not too much text on the slides  Practise your Harvard Referencing Style  Practise your timing as the presentation was too short | | | | | |

**CPD Plan** (Social Engagement, Academic Engagement, Professional Development Engagement, Employment/Volunteering)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **1EXC** |  |  |  | **21HIGH** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **3LOW** |  |  |  | **ZERO** |
| **GPA** | **16** |  |  |  | **12** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **4** |  |  |  | **0** |
| 2.CPD Review  (50%) | Excellent engagement with several CPD activities. A full 30 hours of activity can be documented and evidenced via an accessible diary of events (ideally using your output from the WEB assignment) and associated reflection. Full engagement with all one-to-one tutorial sessions.  Excellent reflection provided. | | | | Very good engagement with several CPD activities. Minimum of 20 hours of activity demonstrated using an appropriate format (e.g. paper sheets). Good engagement with all one-to-one tutorial sessions.  Very good reflection provided. | | | No associated grading. | | | Some engagement with the suggested activities. Minimum (10 hours) of CPD activity can be discussed with a personal tutor as part of the final one-to-one tutorial session.  Limited reflection provided. | | | Poor/ little engagement with this process. No evidence of CPD engagement and/or student absent from one-to-one tutorial sessions.  No Reflection. | | | |

## Presentation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | First (Excellent) | Upper second (Very Good) | | | Lower Second (Good) | | | Third (Sufficient) | | | Fail (insufficient) | | | Zero |
| |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 1EXC | 1HIGH | 1MID | 1LOW | | 21HIGH | 21MID | 21LOW | 22HIGH | 22MID | 22LOW | 3HIGH | 3MID | 3LOW | FMARG | FMID | FLOW | zero |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presentation (Group)** | Well thought through, balanced discussion.  Evidence of extensive research based on high quality academic sources, including three or more research and professional journals  Sources appropriately referenced following the Harvard Referencing Style Conventions  Excellent understanding of the issues and the controversies involved, debated in a well-structured, innovative manner with some group-level view/personal insight  Cohesive, group level presentation maintaining audience interest and engagment.  Clear, confident presentation style which sounds natural (not scripted).  Practiced and polished, well-timed  Well-structured slides with good balance of text and images etc.  Multimedia used well to illustrate concepts and engage audience  No errors on slides | A good talk backed with detailed facts drawn from multiple sources, some of which include research or professional journals or academic books  Minor errors in referencing.  Clear comprehension of the issue has been demonstrated. The facts/issues are discussed, with some original thought shown  A good team effort, cohesive with meaningful attempts to engage the audience.  Good presentation style, but with some hesitant or scripted speech.  Appropriate length  Appropriate amount of material on slides  Well-structured slides with good balance of text and images etc, but with some areas needing improvement.  Some beneficial use of multimedia    Minor errors in spelling or grammar | Facts related to the subject matter are used to back up the point of view given.  Some detailed discussion of the issues is attempted,but lacks innovation or identification of overarching themes.  Several sources have been used but they tend to be not high quality academic sources  Major errors in referencing..  Some evidence of team effort and attempt to engage audience although the presentation predominantly comes across as series of individual mini-presentation  Significant reading directly from slides or obvious scripting  A bit short OR too long/rushing to finish on time  Good structure, but lacks key aspects such as overview and conclusions  Use of multimedia without a clear purpose, or over-used  Too much text on slides  Several errors on slides | A presentation giving related factual information with no clear analysis of the facts.  No high quality academic sources used.  No references used or references do not follow the Harvard Referencing Style conventions  The presentation does have some structure but points are rather vague and poorly discussed.  Lecture material or other key sources of information have been used.  Little evidence of team effort and presentation is a series of individual presentations.  Vague and waffly style.  Difficult to follow  Too short  Few, poorly-structured slides which detract from the presentation, but some areas of clarity  Multimedia detracts from the presentation somewhat | Information poorly connected to subject matter.  Unsubstantiated arguments.  No structure links in the talk.  Audience left doubting whether you understand the issues.  Depth of information very shallow and limited to buzz words and probably presented out of context  No information sources have been meaningfully used.  No referencing attempted.  Very little evidence of team effort or attempt to engage the audience  Poorly organised and delivered throughout  Seems unrehearsed  Numerous errors | No contribution to the presentation. No attendance at the presentation. |
| **Individual Contribution to Group** | Excellent contribution to the group, enabling the group to produce high quality work. Goes above and beyond the group expectation.. | Very good contribution to the group. Working at the level of the group expectation. | Good contribution to the group, slightly below the group expectation. | Little contribution to the group, significantly below the group expectation | Minimal/no contribution to the group. |