|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DETAILED MARKING RUBRIC – PART 1 - Project Demo (Quality of technical explanations) | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Group:** | **Description** | | | | | | | **Score**  **(0-5)** | **Score**  **\***  **Weight** | |
| **Quality of Features presented**  **(weight=2)** | Basic (1) | Average (2) | | Good (3) | Great (4) | | Excellent (5) |  |  | |
| **Comments:** | | | | | | |  |  | |
| **Justifications of the features (in terms of User Experience and Commercialisation potential) (weight=1)** | Basic (1) | Average (2) | | Good (3) | Great (4) | | Excellent (5) |  |  | |
| **Comments:** | | | | | | |  |  | |
| **Technical explanation of each feature**  **(weight=2)** | Basic (1) | Average (2) | | Good (3) | Great (4) | | Excellent (5) |  |  | |
| **Comments:** | | | | | | |  |  | |
| **Quality and apropriateness of answers to questions (weight=1)** | Basic (1) | Average (2) | | Good (3) | Great (4) | | Excellent (5) |  |  | |
| **Comments:** | | | | | | |  |  | |
| **Project Demo (Quality of technical explanations) TOTAL:** | | | | | | | | | **/ 30** | |
| **Project Demo (Quality of Presentation) TOTAL:** | | | | | | | | | **/ 20** | |
| **Project Demo TOTAL:** | | | | | | | | | **/ 50** | |
|  |  | | | |  | |  | | | |  |  |
| DETAILED MARKING RUBRIC – PART 1: Project Demo (Quality of Presentation) | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Group:** | **Description** | | | | | | | | | **Score** |
| Introduction to presentation | Missing (0) | | Average (1) | | | Good (2) | | | |  |
| Introduction is missing | | Basic introduction of the presentation | | | Good introduction to the presentation with structure highlighted | | | |
| Dressed professionally | Basic (0) | | Average (1) | | | Good (2) | | | |  |
| All but two dressed professionally | | All but one dressed professionally | | | All dressed professionally | | | |
| Speaking time | Basic (0) | | Average (1) | | | Good (2) | | | |  |
| One speaker takes over most of the presentation time | | Two members take over the presentation time | | | All members of the team have an equivalent speaking time | | | |
| Choice of presentation medium | Basic (0) | | Average (1) | | | Good (2) | | | |  |
| Choice of presentation medium is less than adequate | | Choice of presentation medium is adequate | | | Choice of presentation medium is adequate and showcases the features well | | | |
| Speech and Language | Missing or Basic (0) | | Average (1) | | | Good (2) | | | |  |
| Speech and Language used is unclear | | Speech and Language used is at times unclear | | | Speech and Language used is clear | | | |
| Body language | Basic (0) | | Average (1) | | | Good (2) | | | |  |
| Body language affect the clarity of the presentation | | Body language is appropriate | | | Body language helps the viewer’s understanding (pointing, showing, …) | | | |
| Technical vocabulary | Problematic (0) | | Average (1) | | | Good (2) | | | |  |
| No Technical vocabulary used | | Technical vocabulary used is at times not adequate or missing | | | Technical vocabulary used appropriately when needed | | | |
| Cohesion and flow | Basic (0) | | Average (1) | | | Good (2) | | | |  |
| Cohesion and/or Flow affects the clarity of the presentation | | There is average cohesion and flow in the way ideas are presented | | | There is good cohesion and flow in the way ideas are presented | | | |
| Pace and timing of presentation | Problematic (0) | | Average (1) | | | Good (2) | | | |  |
| Pace and timing of presentation creates issues with comprehension | | Pace and timing of presentation is either too slow/fast or inconsistent | | | Pace and timing of presentation is appropriate | | | |
| Answering questions | Missing or Basic (0) | | Average (1) | | | Good (2) | | | |  |
| Some group members have not answered any questions | | One group member takes over answering most questions | | | All group members are answering questions | | | |
| **TOTAL:** | | | | | | | | | | **/ 20** |