

Academic Skills

on the LEAPS Summer School

Team Project Presentation Assessment form

Team name: **EX.#1**

Mark out of 50 (subject to moderation):

34/50

Markers initials: **AS + JM**

Date: **12.6.18**

Comments

This was a good effort!

You clearly worked well as a team and spoke clearly and confidently.

What was good / strong :

- well researched
- good evidence (mostly)
- thoughtful ideas
- good visuals

For the future :

- think about structure - did the force against format work? eg. the Q. was 'discuss' not 'debate'.
- introduction should include 'signposts'
- don't include new ideas in conclusion
- avoid 'personal opinion' - use evidence!
- don't contradict earlier ideas / points

Note: the marks allocated represent the 'best fit' in the view of the marking team.

Where required, markers will provide additional comments.

Very positive overall - thank you! ¹

I. CRITICAL THINKING AND EVIDENCE

I.1 RELEVANCE

Has your team addressed the project brief? We are looking for content to be directly relevant to the task (within the short presentation time there is little room for wandering off topic). We are looking for regular and explicit connections to the project brief.

(5) The impression given is that the brief remained at the forefront of your minds throughout the project. The project brief is clearly addressed and content was relevant throughout.

(3) Although your presentation drifts off topic or lacks explicit connection to the question at times, the content is generally relevant.

(1) Large sections of your presentation drift away from the topic or fail to make explicit the relevance of what is being discussed. This might be due to misinterpretation of the project brief, or perhaps the impression given is that your team lost sight of the project brief.

(0) Your team have not attempted to address the project brief (or have attempted to address an alternative one). What has been offered bears little or no relevance to the project brief.

I.2 CRITICAL REFLECTION

We want to see that your team has attempted to critically reflect on the project brief. We should get the impression that you spent time giving careful thought to the subject.

(5) There is clear evidence that your team has attempted to critically consider the project brief. Your team has clearly made an effort to get to grips with the topic and have achieved depth in the response. This is convincing and impressive work.

(3) The impression given is that your team has spent some time reflecting on the subject although could have gone into more depth. Perhaps there was a tendency towards description rather than analysis. More analysis or interpretation would have provided a more convincing presentation.

(1) It is unclear whether your team spent very much time reflecting on the brief. The response lacks depth and analysis (it skims the surface). There might be some description, however the response lacks interpretation and thought.

(0) There is no evidence that your team has attempted to critically reflect on the topic.

I.3 UNDERSTANDING AND INTERPRETATION

We want to see that your team has grasped the key themes from the literature and the topic.

(5) It is clear that your team has read widely which has contributed to an impressive understanding of the topic.

(3) Your team has demonstrated an understanding of some themes. Perhaps there was some misinterpretation or an overly narrow focus.

(1) It is not clear that your team has grasped the main themes of the topic or read sufficiently widely and critically.

(0) Your team appears to have little or no understanding of the topic.

I.4 SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

We want to see that you used appropriate evidence effectively, orally and visually, which made for a convincing discussion of the topic.

(5) Content was supported by evidence wherever appropriate and regular reference to the literature was made; your team has clearly grasped how to draw on evidence to support ideas. This is impressive work.

(3) There was regular use of supporting evidence, however it was lacking on a number of occasions where it could have been used to support an argument. Nevertheless, this was a decent first effort.

(1) Your presentation included some limited supporting evidence although it was generally lacking. It felt like a token effort.

(0) Your presentation included no evidence of appropriate quality or relevance to the topic.

1.5 QUALITY OF SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

Your team used evidence that was relevant and appropriate for academic study.

(5) Your team demonstrated a broad range of evidence that was consistently relevant and of sufficient quality for academic work.

(3) The range of evidence in your presentation was mostly relevant and of sufficient academic quality.

(1) With a few exceptions, your presentation lacked reference to appropriate supporting evidence.

(0) Your presentation included no evidence of appropriate quality or relevance to the topic.

2. STRUCTURE AND COMMUNICATION

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Your presentation included a clear introduction that set the scene and demonstrated the team's interpretation of the brief by providing: an introduction to all of your team members; key background information and discussion of terms where appropriate; a clear demonstration of intent for the presentation; an overall upbeat beginning.

(3) Your introduction provided all of the stipulated characteristics and 'set the scene' effectively.

(2) Your introduction matched most, but not all of the stipulated characteristics.

(1) An introduction was offered but lacked many of the stipulated characteristics.

(0) No introduction has been offered – your team simply 'launched into' discussion without appropriately setting the scene.

2.2 MAIN BODY

Your presentation included a clear main body that included: the key ideas your team has chosen to explore; consistency with what is outlined in the introduction; logical progression of content including thoughtfully considered handovers that guide the audience through the presentation.

(3) The main body matched all of the expected characteristics.

(2) The main body included most, but not all of the characteristics above.

(1) There was little cohesion or structure, making the presentation difficult to follow.

(0) A series of individual presentations was offered.

2.3 CONCLUSION

Your presentation included a clearly identified conclusion that: was short and punchy; summarised the key arguments covered within the presentation; did not introduce new material; made a concluding statement that linked back to the original question; was consistent with the introduction and drew the presentation to a natural close.

(3) Your conclusion fulfilled all the criteria listed above.

(2) Your conclusion included most, but not all of the characteristics above.

(1) A conclusion was offered but lacked many of the characteristics stipulated above.

(0) No conclusion was offered, or it was difficult to determine when the main body ended and the conclusion began.

2.4 ORAL COMMUNICATION

We are looking for the presenters to be clearly audible; to speak at a well-paced rate; and to speak with enthusiasm.

- (3) There was effective oral communication across your team and throughout the presentation.
- (2) Overall, a good effort if a little inconsistent.
- (1) The quality varied, perhaps due to lack of preparation or rehearsal.
- (0) Your team ignored the criteria.

2.5 NON-VERBAL COMMUNICATION

We are looking for your team to: speak directly to the audience; use positive body language; be attentive and supportive of other members.

- (3) There was effective non-verbal communication across your team and throughout the presentation.
- (2) Overall, a good effort if a little inconsistent.
- (1) The quality varied, perhaps due to lack of preparation or rehearsal.
- (0) The team ignored the criteria.

2.6 SUPPORTING VISUAL MATERIALS

We are looking for appropriate visual materials that match the following criteria: consistent with what is being presented; integrated within the presentation; clear and consistent throughout (e.g. colour, font type and size); finished to a high standard (including proofing):

- (3) High quality and relevant visual materials were provided by your team and contributed to the audience's understanding of the presented information.
- (2) Your team made a good effort overall, however the quality of supporting visual materials varied across the presentation.
- (1) The visual materials added little to the audience's understanding: perhaps they were unclear or failed to support the content that was being delivered.
- (0) No visual materials were used.

2.7 DISCUSSION

We are looking for responses that were: considered (i.e. not a 'snap response'); relevant; concise; demonstrated an understanding across the team. We want to see that the team reflected and acted upon feedback from the Mid-Project Review (MPR).

- (3) Your team responded impressively to questions, giving the impression that they understood the topic. It was clear that your team had used the feedback provided at the MPR.
- (2) There was generally a willingness to respond to questions, even if the quality of responses varied. There was some evidence that your team had engaged with the feedback from the MPR.
- (1) Where responses were offered, perhaps they were vague, unconvincing or long-winded. This gave the impression of a lack of understanding across your team. It was not clear where you used the feedback from the MPR.
- (0) No responses were offered. Feedback from the MPR was ignored.

2.8 LANGUAGE

The language used in your presentation was neutral, non-emotive, passive and contributed to a positive 'audience experience'.

- (3) Your presentation matched all of the criteria.
- (2) Although not consistently the case, your presentation generally matched the criteria.

(1) Your presentation was let down by regular examples of language that did not meet the above criteria and as such was not in an academic style.

(0) Your team ignored the guidance offered.

2.9 BIBLIOGRAPHY/SLIDES

The bibliography and slides were handed in by the deadline and matched the stipulated requirements.

The slides (including bibliography) **were** provided in advance of the presentation.

The slides and/or bibliography **were not** provided in advance of the presentation.

