|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Outstanding (70+)** | **Good (60~70)** | **Fair (40~50)** | **To be improved**  **(40-)** |
| Organisation | Presented information in logical, interesting sequence, which the audience followed and engaged into | Presented information in logical sequence, which the audience followed | Audience had at times difficulty in following the information because of interruptions to the logic flow | Sequence of information was hard to follow, could not be understood logically |
| Content | Showed full understanding of the product and used elaboration and backing research to promote its relevance | Showed adequate understanding of the product and provided good amount of details on its relevance | Showed basic understanding of the product, provided some information on its relevance or novelty | Showed only partial understanding of the product and its relevance |
| Presentation | Visuals effectively reinforced and gave more context to the presentation; slides were visually appealing | Use of visuals related to the presentation, clear and visually pleasant slides | Slides replicated the presentation, which was simply read aloud, could be more visually appealing | Slides were unrelated to the presentation and/or cluttered, spelling/grammar mistakes. |
| Engagement with audience | All speakers exhibited superior eye  contact during presentation and  rarely referred to a script | Most speakers exhibited good eye contact throughout the presentation, and occasionally referred to a script | Most speakers exhibited limited eye contact throughout the presentation, and often referred to a script | All speakers didn’t maintain eye contact with the audience and remained tied to a written script |
| Delivery (please be considerate of non-native speakers) | All speakers used a clear voice and effectively conveyed their ideas | Most speakers’ voices were clear, and clearly communicated ideas | Audience had difficulty understanding some speakers | Most speakers mumbled, and spoke too quietly for audience to hear |
| Pace | Time keeping was spot on with no prompting, without appearing rushed or stretched. Turn taking was seamless | Time keeping was good, with some reminders. Speakers took turns well | Speakers needed to skip parts to end on time, turn taking at times disorganised and time consuming | Presentation needed to be cut short/ended up too early. Speakers seemed unsure about their turn |
| Q&A | All questions were answered satisfactorily and competently | Most questions were addressed to a good extent. | Some questions were left partially unanswered. | Questions were not addressed; answers were too vague |
| Add any general feedback you want to send the group (this will be anonymized): | | | | |