

# UG Marking Guidelines - Oral Presentation for Mini Projects Transform Challenge

The overall mark will reflect your group's performance in all four sections and will therefore be a mean of your grades in the four sections.

## Slides

1 st	Excellent visual resources: informative, highly structured organization of presented materials
2 : 1	Good visual resources: informative, well organized materials, but with some minor issues (e.g. too much text on slides)
2 : 2	Recognizable structure in presented materials, coupled with some obvious shortcomings (e.g., very inappropriate length, unreadable visual resources, etc.)
3 rd	Unclear, unstructured, messy materials
F a il	Presentation is devoid of structure and does not make use of appropriate visual/auditory resources.

## Group verbal presentation

1 st	Clear, articulate, well organised explanation of the slides that enhanced and extended the audience's understanding of the material presented. Questions answered thoughtfully and clearly. <b>All group members contributed</b> and the presentation was appropriate in length.
2 : 1	Clear and quite well organised explanation of the slides that helped the audience to understand it. Questions answered thoughtfully and clearly. <b>All group members contributed</b> . The presentation may have been slightly too long or short.
2 : 2	Explanation of the slides lacked clarity and organisation in parts. The audience's understanding may have been helped by the explanations in parts, but the explanations may also have created confusion. Questions may not have been properly understood or answered appropriately. All group members may not have contributed. Length of the presentation may have been inappropriate.
3 rd	Limited, disorganised explanation of the slides that mainly lead to confusion in the audience. All group members may not have contributed and length of presentation may have been inappropriate. Questions answered poorly or not attempted.
F a il	No comprehensible explanation of the slides offered and no questions answered.

**Quality of proposed intervention**

1 st	The intervention was designed thoughtfully with systematic use of evidence to support the design. A very high level of creativity. The intervention clearly addresses all the problems outlined, is highly feasible, and the proposed measure of effectiveness is excellent.
2 : 1	A well-designed intervention with good use of evidence to support the design, and a good level of creativity. The intervention addresses most of the problems outlined, is feasible for the most part, and the proposed measure of effectiveness is good.
2 : 2	The intervention design may have some problems and shows some level of creativity. There is some evidence to support the design. The intervention may only address some of the problems outlined, may only be partly feasible, and the proposed measure of effectiveness may be problematic.
3 rd	The intervention design has clear flaws and is based on minimal to no evidence. Creativity is lacking. The intervention addresses very few of the problems outlined, is not really feasible, and the proposed measure of effectiveness is poor.
F a il	The proposed intervention has not been designed effectively and is not based on evidence. No creativity evident. It does not address any of the issues outlined, is not feasible, and the proposed measure of effectiveness is exceptionally poor or non-existent.

**Understanding of project (from slides, verbal explanations and answers to questions)**

1 st	Excellent understanding of the project. Shows exceptional understanding and knowledge of the links between the evidence, highlighted issues, the proposed intervention and its impact
2 : 1	Solid understanding of the project. Shows good understanding and knowledge of the links between the evidence, highlighted issues, the proposed intervention and its impact though there may be slight misunderstandings in some areas.
2 : 2	Fair understanding of some aspects of the project. Shows satisfactory understanding and knowledge of the links between the evidence, highlighted issues, the proposed intervention and its impact though there may be several weaknesses or gaps in this understanding and knowledge.
3 rd	Poor understanding of the project. Very little understanding and knowledge of the links between the evidence, highlighted issues, the proposed intervention and its impact
F a il	No evidence of understanding the project as a whole nor the links between the evidence, highlighted issues, the proposed intervention and its impact.