

UNDERGRADUATE CRITERIA OF ASSESSMENT FOR PRESENTATIONS

What are represented here are general principles for assessing presentations. Arrangements for individual modules may differ according to subject specificity and/or intended learning outcomes.

Presentations will be marked with reference to structure, clarity, relevance of content, use of aids (visual, audio, etc.), timekeeping and, if questions are asked, understanding displayed in responses to these questions. Content is therefore only marked insofar as it bears on each of these criteria.

In the case of group presentations, the marker will allocate a provisional mark to all students in the group according to the quality of the presentation as a whole, but may then modify this mark for each student according to the quality of the work that is clearly each student's own.

Students absent without a valid reason will receive a mark of 0 (zero).

First Class (1st) (70-100)

- A very high standard is demonstrated in all aspects of the presentation. The student delivers a seamless or almost seamless performance. At the higher end of this mark range, the student demonstrates the skills of a public speaker.
- Highly appropriate aims are stated clearly, the content is highly relevant, and explanations are clear.
- Structure is clear and sophisticated.
- Delivery is confident and articulate, voice level is good, listening is made easy by changes in tone and the presenter frequently looks up.
- Aids, if used, are appropriate, highly relevant and astutely selected and are 'readable' by all in the room.
- The presentation fits into the time allowed, and is not hurried or drawn out.
- If questions are asked, the presenter demonstrates sophisticated understanding and provides clear, concise and appropriate responses.

Upper Second (2:1) (60-69)

- A good performance (at the upper end of this marking range a student's performance will be very good) in most or all aspects of the presentation.
- Aims are stated clearly, the content is relevant and explanations are mostly clear.
- Structured is clear and appropriate.
- Delivery is generally good, although there may be some variation in the quality of the delivery.
- Aids, if used, are relevant and mostly 'readable' by all in the room.
- Timekeeping is generally good or very good, although some aspects of the presentation may be slightly hurried or impeded.
- If questions are asked, the presenter demonstrates adequate understanding and provides appropriate responses.

Lower Second (2:2) (50-59)

- An adequate performance which demonstrates an average standard in most or all aspects of the presentation.

- Aims are stated or implied, the content is largely relevant and attempts are made to explain material.
- The presentation has evidence of structure but this may be unwieldy or inappropriate to the aims and content.
- Delivery is generally adequate, although some aspects may be poor.
- Aids, if used, may be variable in quality and relevance. If visual aids are not used this may impede comprehension.
- The presentation may not fit into the time allowed, perhaps due to inappropriate structure, inadequate rehearsal or lack of confidence.
- If questions are asked, the presenter demonstrates basic understanding and makes an attempt to provide an appropriate response.

Third (3rd) (40-49)

- There are flaws in most aspects of the presentation. However, it is clear that an effort has been made to meet the requirements of the assignment.
- Aims are poorly expressed, a large proportion of the content is lacking in relevance or is at an inappropriate level. There is a marked lack of explanation of material.
- There is some evidence of structure, but this is less than adequate.
- Delivery is hesitant or is difficult to hear, voice is monotone or too loud or too quiet and there is a failure to maintain interest. The presentation is given as though there has been little rehearsal.
- Aids, if used, are poorly constructed, not always relevant, and are difficult to 'read' for some or all the audience, or are not used when they would be important for the effectiveness of the presentation.
- The presentation exceeds the time requirements, either because there is too little or too much content.
- If questions are asked, the presenter demonstrates some understanding and may not provide an appropriate response.

Fail (0-39)

- There is little to no evidence that an effort has been made to meet requirements of the assignment, and evidence of preparation is scant.
- Aims are either very poorly expressed or not expressed at all, content is mostly or all lacking in relevance or is at a very poor level. Material is very poorly explained.
- There is little to no evidence of structure.
- Delivery is very poor in most or all respects.
- Aids are either entirely lacking where they would be beneficial or, if used, are very poorly constructed and/or employed.
- Timing is poor
- If questions are asked, the presenter demonstrates little to no understanding and does not provide an appropriate response.