|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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: Reference only 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* |  | | | | | | |