

# UG Marking Guidelines - Online Oral Presentations (Videos)

## Guidelines for marking online versions of Oral Presentations in the form of pre-recorded videos

<b>First</b>		<p>1) Excellent visual resources: informative, highly structured organization of presented materials,</p> <p>2) Excellent critical grasp of background materials with a well justified rationale and a clear explanation of hypotheses</p> <p>3) Excellent articulation of methods allowing full understanding of results, Results clearly articulated, with well explained graphics where appropriate</p> <p>4) Strong evidence of critical interpretation of findings with insightful understanding of how they relate to previous research and/or wider issues</p> <p>5) Highly engaging delivery: speaker maintained eye contact with audience via the camera, well paced and clear speech with little or no reliance on notes</p>
Excellent First	100	Presentation reaches an exceptional level of achievement that significantly exceeds the standards described by the statements above.
Good First	90	Presentation exceeds the standards described by the above statements.
Solid First	80	Presentation is well described by the above statements.
Low First	75	Presentation mostly meets the standards described by the above statements
<b>Upper Second</b>		<p>1) Good visual resources: informative, well organized materials, but with some minor issues (e.g. too much text on slides)</p> <p>2) Good critical grasp of background materials with a clear rationale and explanation of hypotheses, possibly with a few minor omissions</p> <p>3) Good articulation of methods, possibly with a few minor omissions or irrelevant details, Results clearly presented possibly with a few minor errors</p> <p>4) Some evidence of critical interpretation of findings with some understanding of how they relate to previous research and/or wider issues</p> <p>5) Engaging delivery: speaker maintained some eye contact with audience via the camera, relatively well paced and clear speech maybe with some reliance on notes</p>
Good 2.1	68	Presentation exceeds the standards described by the above statements, but does not meet standards for a first class mark.
Solid 2.1	65	Presentation is well described by the above statements.
Low 2.1	62	Presentation mostly meets the standards described by the above statements

<b>Lower Second</b>		<p>1) Recognizable structure in presented materials, coupled with some obvious shortcomings (e.g., very inappropriate length, unreadable visual resources, etc.)</p> <p>2) Some grasp of background materials, but maybe lacking a critical approach. Rationale and hypotheses are explained, with some shortcomings</p> <p>3) Parts of methods explained, possibly with a some omissions or irrelevant details, Some aspects of results presented clearly, but with some errors</p> <p>4) Little evidence of critical interpretation of findings and limited understanding of how they relate to previous research and/or wider issues</p> <p>5) Adequate delivery: speaker maintained little eye contact with audience via the camera, with relatively heavy reliance on notes, difficult to understand in places (too fast or quiet)</p>
Good 2.2	58	Presentation exceeds the standards described by the above statements, but does not meet standards for an upper second class mark.
Solid 2.2	55	Presentation is well described by the above statements.
Low 2.2	52	Presentation mostly meets the standards described by the above statements
<b>Third</b>		<p>1) Unclear, unstructured, messy materials.</p> <p>2) Sparse background information with little rationale for study and/or no clear research question. Deficient understanding of hypotheses</p> <p>3) Substantial errors or omissions in explanation of methods and results</p> <p>4) No evidence of critical interpretation of findings and very limited understanding of how they relate to previous research and/or wider issues</p> <p>5) Poor delivery: no eye contact with audience via camera, with heavy reliance on reading notes, difficult to understand (too fast or quiet)</p>
Good Third	48	Presentation exceeds the standards described by the above statements, but does not meet standards for a second class mark.
Solid Third	45	Presentation is well described by the above statements.
Low Third	42	Presentation falls below the standards described by the above statements

<b>Fail</b>		<p>1) Presentation is devoid of structure and does not make use of appropriate visual /auditory resources.</p> <p>2) No clear background information or rationale for study. Little or no understanding of hypotheses</p> <p>3) Substantial errors or omissions in explanation of methods and results</p> <p>4) No evidence of critical interpretation of findings and no understanding of how they relate to previous research and/or wider issues</p> <p>5) Very poor delivery: no eye contact with audience via camera, read notes or slides, incomprehensible.</p>
High Margin al Fail	38	Presentation exceeds the standards described by the above statements, but does not meet the standards for a pass mark.
Low Margin al Fail	32	Presentation is well described by the above statements.
Outright Fail	10	Presentation falls below the standards described by the above statements.
<b>Zero Marks</b>	0	No presentation given.