

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 (30%)	A: Clear; engaging voice; eye contact B: Clear structure, easy to follow C: Well-paced; perfect time-keeping 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: Reference only to suggested reading O: Concepts regurgitated or misunderstood
Strength of argument (25%)	S: Compelling positive argument for each position T: Logic of all arguments explicitly supported by evidence U: Critical evaluation of arguments, with acknowledgement of limitations V: Evidence synthesized to communicate coherent narrative				S: Unclear why positions plausible T: “He said / she said” with no “Because” U: Data presented without appreciation of significance V: Facts presented without connection
Participation (5%)	Default: 5/5. If uneven contributions raised with teaching & learning team: awarded by peer evaluation				
Overall grade / 100					