Evaluation area	Excellent (70–75) Outstanding (76–85) Exemplary (86–100)	Good (60–64) Very good (65–69)	Sound (50–59)	Acceptable (40–49)	Insufficient (30–39) Unacceptable (<30)	
Oral presentation (25%)	A: Clear; engaging voice; eye contact B: Clear structure, easy to follow C: Well-paced; perfect timekeeping D: Distinct and substantive contribution from each member of group					A: Difficult to hear; reading from notes / screen; audience disengaged B: Elements disconnected; audience lost; emphasis absent/misplaced D: Some members dominant/inactive
Clarity and presentation of site (20%)	E: Clear, simple, logical layout F: Easy for non-specialist to read and follow G: Headings and graphics provide clear structure H: Images complement text and illustrate key concepts I: Clear next steps for further reading					E: Information hidden behind clicks; or incoherent flow through page F: Poor prose, misspellings G: Cluttered; poor contrast; font face / size makes reading difficult; unbroken blocks of text
Depth of knowledge (20%)	M: All major viewpoints discovered and recognized N: Evidence drawn from wide literature base O: Clear understanding and concise summaries of advanced concepts P: Broader context and implications of topic articulated					M: Prominent viewpoints omitted N: No reference even to suggested reading O: Concepts regurgitated or misunderstood
Strength of argument (35%)	S: Critical evaluation of arguments with discussion of limitations T: Logic of all arguments explicitly supported by evidence U: Evidence synthesized to communicate coherent narrative W: Convincing case for stated position					S: Data presented without appreciation of significance T: "He said / she said" with no "Because" U: Facts presented without connection W: Stated position doubtful
Overall grade / 100						*Annotation key:* Demonstrated Not met / no evidence