Marking Scheme for Research and Library Project Oral Presentations

Name:	**Course/Year:**
Title of Talk:	**Date of Presentation:**

		Extremely Poor	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
PRESENTATION							
1	**(i) Content; depth of coverage**	Entirely inappropriate; far too superficial	Generally superficial	Adequate throughout or some topics/ sections covered well & others less so	Appropriate depth of coverage of all topics/sections	Appropriate depth that is greater than expected in parts	Greater than expected depth throughout
2	**(ii) Evidence of understanding of study, including strengths/ limitations & implications**	Extremely limited	Little or none; likely to be superficial with gaps in knowledge	Adequate although may be variable	Good or generally good with strengths / limitations or implications dealt with less well	Very good across all aspects of the study with some evidence of critical analysis	Deep across all aspects of the study with critical analysis clearly evident
HANDLING QUESTIONS							
3	**Appropriateness / relevance/correctness *{recognising some questions may require speculation}***	Unable to answer questions appropriately &/or correctly	Most answers inappropriate &/or irrelevant &/or incorrect	Answers generally appropriate, relevant, correct or with minor errors {but may lack detail}	Answers appropriate, relevant & correct {but may contain minor errors}	Answers appropriate, relevant, detailed & correct	Extremely comprehensive appropriate, relevant & correct answers
QUALITY of DELIVERY							
4	**Appropriate - audibility; pace; fluency; reference to notes; balance between different sections; use of time**	Very poor timekeeping & may be lacking in balance; very hard to follow	Too short/long &/or inappropriate balance; generally hard to follow; may be overreliance on reading from detailed notes	Time keeping & balance satisfactory; generally clear & easy to follow although may be variable with reading from detailed notes	Good timekeeping & balance; clear & easy to follow; may make occasional reference to detailed notes	Good timekeeping & balance; fluent delivery with good clarity of expression and no reference to detailed notes	Good timekeeping & balance; fluent, faultless, delivery with no reference to detailed notes
***QUALITY OF SLIDES**							
5	**Legibility; quality of figures &/or images; visual impact; *use of animations/videos appropriate/competent***	Most/all difficult to read/follow; figures/images poor quality &/or irrelevant; overall, visual impact extremely poor. *Use of animations/videos unlikely*	Generally too much/ little information & figures/images of poor quality (some may be irrelevant); overall, visual impact poor. *Use of animations/videos unlikely*	Generally easy to read/follow; figures/images relevant/acceptable quality; overall visual impact satisfactory; *Use of animations/videos unlikely*	Easy to read/follow; good quality {relevant} figures/images; overall visual impact good; *appropriate & competent use of animations/videos*	Very easy to read/follow; good quality {relevant} figures/images; overall visual impact very good; *appropriate & competent use of animations/videos*	Lay out, images/figures and overall visual impact all excellent; *imaginative & competent use of animations/videos*

Instructions for use of this marking scheme: circle the appropriate descriptors for each of the five categories and award marks out of ten overall, according to the scheme overleaf. *Where the instructions given do not specify use of PowerPoint, and no visual aids have been used, choose a descriptor that indicates the impact, if any, of this on the quality of delivery. Select extremely poor or poor where it is thought to be detrimental. Otherwise select satisfactory, unless using no visual aids is regarded as having been advantageous.

Marking Scheme for Research and Library Project Oral Presentations

Name:	**Course/Year:**
Title of Talk:	**Date of Presentation:**

Marks	Criteria	Marks	Criteria
10	Excellent in all 5 categories	**4**	Satisfactory in 3 categories; poor or extremely poor in the others
9	Excellent in 4 categories; 1 no less than good	**3**	Poor in 3 or 4 categories; the others extremely poor
8	Good in a minimum of 3 categories; very good or excellent in the others	**2**	Extremely poor in 3 or 4 categories; the others poor
7	Good in a minimum of 3 categories; at least satisfactory in the others	**1**	Extremely poor in all 5 categories
6	Satisfactory in 4 categories; the other no less than good	**0**	No presentation given without good reason
5	Satisfactory in 4 or 5 categories with 1 no worse than poor		

	Content and Handling Questions:	**Presentation (Slides and Delivery):**
To improve your mark you should:		

Presentation Mark (out of 10)**:**

Examiner 1 - Signature & Name:

Examiner 2 - Signature & Name: