SCHOOL OF COMPUTING
ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR CSC3094 PROJECT PRESENTATION

Examiners are expected to use the whole of the marking scale and to interpret these criteria in the context of the specific project undertaken. It is important to ensure that feedback justifies the final mark awarded based on these descriptors. Clear explanations should be given for any deviations.

The presentation should not exceed 10 minutes duration. There is no upper limit on the number of slides used. The presentation should include:

- What is the project about?
- What are the project's aims (or hypothesis) and objectives?
- How do you propose to tackle it?
- What is your progress so far and how have you addressed any ethical considerations?
- What are your plans for the rest of the project?

The audience is assumed to be competent graduate computer scientists, but not necessarily with expertise specific to the topic. Marks are given for Presentation and Technical Content, with equal weighting. Each of these categories is marked out of 5 to give a total out of 10.

	0: No submission	1: Failing	2: Pass	3: Good	4: Excellent	5: Outstanding
Presentation	No submission	Presentation lacks structure or has significant elements that are illegible or not comprehensible.	Presentation has a logical structure covering the aim, objectives and plan. Slides are individually legible with few spelling or grammar defects.	Logically structured, comprehensive presentation covering introduction, aim, objectives, method and plan, with very few language defects. Appropriate use of graphics and/or animation to clarify or illustrate content. Clear commentary.	Logically structured, comprehensive presentation, including overview of contents and/or key points. An engaging presentation using images, graphics or animation to good effect to illustrate and reinforce content. No language defects, good choice of type style and size (clear, consistent). Clear commentary using the available time well.	Professional quality. Clear, logical structure, including overview of key points. An engaging presentation that uses appropriate textual and non-textual forms to explain content. Very well-chosen Images, graphics or animation illustrate and reinforce content. No spelling or grammar defects. Readable and consistent type style and size. Appropriate language and length of text. Clear and concise commentary that use the available time, and divides time appropriately.

	0: No submission	1: Failing	2: Pass	3: Good	4: Excellent	5: Outstanding
Technical Content	No technical content	Most discussion of the technical content of the project lacks validity.	Most of the technical content is valid, with feasible aim and objectives. There is some discussion of the methods/technology to be applied and of progress to date. A structured plan is included.	The technical content is entirely valid, with introduction including motivation, and feasible aim and objectives outlined. Discussion of methods/technology to be applied is sound and demonstrates engagement with the literature or knowledge base. There is clear evidence of progress to date and awareness of ethical considerations. The future plan is clear and viable.	Technical content is entirely valid, with clear, sound motivation. Feasible aim and objectives outlined. There is evidence of engagement with the knowledge base, including listing good quality, relevant sources. Discussion of methods/technology to be applied is sound and demonstrates an understanding of the effort and risk associated with them. Discussion of progress to date is evidenced by good outputs and demonstrates attention to ethical considerations. The future plan is clear and viable and demonstrates understanding of possible risks.	Technically sound and ambitious. Clear introduction including motivation and examples as appropriate. Clear aim and objectives, including explanation of how objectives enable achievement of the aim. Evidence of strong engagement with the knowledge base, including reference to good quality, relevant sources. Summary of relevant technologies including pros and cons. Progress to date is discussed in a balanced way with evidence from outputs developed so far and demonstrates maintaining ethical standards. The future plan is clear and viable with evidence of good plans for managing risk. Valid discussion of how the project will be managed.