

MLiS Presentation

As part of the assessment for this module you will be expected to give a **group** presentation. This presentation will contribute **40%** towards your final mark. You will be assessed on both its content and its presentation according to the criteria described below. You will be expected to use overhead PowerPoint/Keynote (or, for LaTeX experts, Prosper) presentations, or some suitable alternative.

Each individual in the group will be expected to speak for approximately 10 minutes. There will be an additional 3 minutes per group member for questions. This means that

- Individuals will speak for a total of 10 minutes, plus 3 minutes for questions
- Pairs will speak for a total of 20 minutes, plus 6 minutes for questions
- Groups of 3 will speak for a total of 30 minutes, plus 9 minutes for questions

You will be penalized if you over-run significantly (i.e. more than a few minutes).

We don't enforce a particular format for the presentation. It should contain an introduction, methods, results, discussion/conclusion, and reference and discuss previous work. The marking criteria below gives more information. Since this is a group presentation, you should split things up appropriately and have good group coherence.

The level of the presentation should be at a level accessible by your peers.

Criteria for Assessment

Each presentation will be assessed for content and understanding and presentation according to the following marking standards.

Content and Understanding (60%)

A	The presentation material is of the correct level and coverage. The speaker speaks around the subject (more than is given on the overheads) and demonstrates that they understand the topic and how it relates to the module as a whole. The structure of the presentation has been considered well and does not slavishly follow the approach given in one of the references. The references and comments on the references show evidence of reading around the topic.
B	Generally as above, but with minor deficiencies in one or more areas or major deficiencies in one of them.
C	Major deficiencies in more than one area and/or several minor defects. Research has been carried out satisfactorily but with little initiative and comprehension shown.
D	Some evidence of preparation but major deficiencies, for example, in understanding and/or selection of material.
E	There is little evidence of preparation and research. Only the major source has been considered and little evidence of understanding demonstrated.

F	There is little evidence that much thought has been given to the subject; understanding is almost none existent. There may be serious reservations about the quantity of work.
---	--

Presentation (40%)

A	The presentation was well structured with an introduction and summary. The flow of the argument was logical and easy to follow. The overheads were of an excellent standard, being easy to read and relevant to the topic. The amount of information on the overheads was consistent with the content of the talk and the target audience. The speech of the presenter was clear and the voice modulation excellent. The interest of the audience was held throughout and the audience was able to obtain an excellent set of notes. The presenter kept to the allocated time.
B	Generally as above but with minor presentational defects.
C	Although the lecture was generally comprehensible, there are a few major defects; for example, overheads might be poorly prepared or the speaker mumbled at certain points.
D	The structure of the talk is poor and/or there are a sufficient number of presentational defects to make the topic hard to follow in places. Timekeeping may also be poor, with the talk being much too long or too short.
E	The talk was very badly structured and is mostly incomprehensible. The speech of the presenter may be very hard to hear and/or the overheads almost impossible to read.
F	The talk is so difficult to follow as to be useless; there are many serious defects in the presentation.