

| Evaluation area                        | Excellent (70–75)<br>Outstanding (76–85)<br>Exemplary (86–100)   | Good (60–64)<br>Very good (65–69) | Sound (50–59) | Acceptable (40–49) | Insufficient (30–39)<br>Unacceptable (<30)  |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------------------|---|
| Oral presentation (30%)                | A: Clear; engaging voice; eye contact<br>B: Clear structure, easy to follow<br>C: Well-paced; perfect time-keeping<br>D: Distinct and substantive contribution from each member of group   |                                   |               |                    | A: Difficult to hear; reading from notes / screen; audience disengaged<br>B: Elements disconnected; audience lost; emphasis absent/misplaced<br>D: Some members dominant/inactive                     |
| Clarity and presentation of site (20%) | E: Clear, simple, logical layout<br>F: Easy for non-specialist to read and follow<br>G: Headings and graphics provide clear structure<br>H: Images complement text and illustrate key concepts<br>I: Clear next steps for further reading                |                                   |               |                    | E: Information hidden behind clicks; or incoherent flow through page<br>F: Poor prose, misspellings<br>G: Cluttered; poor contrast; font face / size makes reading difficult; unbroken blocks of text |
| Depth of knowledge (25%)               | M: All major viewpoints discovered and recognized<br>N: Evidence drawn from wide literature base<br>O: Clear understanding and concise summaries of advanced concepts<br>P: Broader context and implications of topic articulated                        |                                   |               |                    | M: Prominent viewpoints omitted<br>N: Reference only to suggested reading<br>O: Concepts regurgitated or misunderstood  |
| Strength of argument (25%)             | S: Compelling positive argument for each position<br>T: Logic of all arguments explicitly supported by evidence<br>U: Critical evaluation of arguments, with acknowledgement of limitations<br>V: Evidence synthesized to communicate coherent narrative |                                   |               |                    | S: Unclear why positions plausible<br>T: “He said / she said” with no “Because”<br>U: Data presented without appreciation of significance<br>V: Facts presented without connection                    |
| Overall grade<br><br>/ 100             |  |                                   |               |                    |   |

#### Adjustments for non-participation:

If uneven contributions are raised with teaching & learning team, a maximum of five points may be deducted, as assigned by peer evaluation.

In the event of complete and documented lack of engagement; an overall grade of 0 will be recorded to that group member.