| Student name: | Talk short title: | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| This sheet is for marking the Week 8/9 assessment of MSc/MRes projects in Statistics/Data Analytics. Markers should provide so useful feedback and a short narrative to justify their overall marks below and give individual marks for sections on the following | | | | | | | | | |
| Marker's comments: | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

| Student name: | Talk short title: | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
|----------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Examiner's initials: | Mark assigned: | (to 2 decimal places) |

This is the form for marking the Week 8/9 assessment (talk + viva) of MSc/MRes projects. Each of the four sections ("Explanation of Background", "Talk Delivery", "Slides Quality", and "Statistical Approach") should be given an individual mark between 0 and 22 based on the headings (Poor, Weak etc..) and the heading descriptors. To help the marker decide on a mark for each section, some examples of characteristics to be assessed in that section are listed. The final mark for this component of assessment is the sum of the individual section marks multiplied by their associated weights. There are two examiners, who mark talks independently. Their marks are averaged. If there is a discrepancy of 3 marks or more, the two examiners will discuss and agree on a final mark.

| | Criterion | Poor (0-5) | Weak (6-8) | Acceptable (9-11) | Moderate (12-14) | Good (15-17) | Very Good (18-22) | Overall Section Mark |
|------------------|--|--|---|--|---|--|---|-------------------------|
| TALK AND VIVA | EXPLANATION OF BACKGROUND (weight = 20%) • Project background • Aims of the project • Data description | Unclear with errors. | Unclear. | Variable clarity. | Generally clear and sound. | High quality. | Generally excellent. | |
| TALK | SLIDES QUALITY (weight = 20%) Use of notation Quality of diagrams and tables Style and use of space | Unclear with errors. | Unclear. | Variable clarity. | Generally clear and sound. | High quality. | Generally excellent. | |
| TALK | TALK DELIVERY (weight = 20%) Talk structure Pace of delivery Clarity of style | Incoherent. | Poor exposition; substantial defects in mathematical arguments. | Coherent but sketchy exposition. | Fairly clear and coherent exposition. | Mostly clear exposition, with clear indications of thought. | Very clear, concise with indications of outstandingly good thought. | |
| TALK AND VIVA | Understanding of statistical issuesAppropriateness of choice of | No understanding apparent. Incorrect use of statistical techniques. | Little understanding apparent. Inappropriate use of statistical techniques. | Sensible but inadequate understanding. Not appropriate use of statistical methods. | Understanding of issues. Generally sound use of statistical techniques. | Good depth of understanding. Accurate and sound use of statistical techniques. | A very sound understanding of issues. Exceptionally assiduous, precise and concise. | |