Silwood Masters Oral Presentations: criteria for assessment

Class	%	Criteria
Distinction (A)	100 95 90	Presentation does an excellent job of communicating a very substantial body of scientific information. The presenter **held the audience's attention**, showed **command of the relevant concepts and facts**, **spoke authoritatively and without obvious notes**, showed **evidence of substantial background reading** (where appropriate), provided a **consistently analytical*, critical* and/or synthetic* treatment** of the information (where relevant), gave **excellent answers to questions**, and showed **fluency in the use of any teaching aids** (PowerPoint, demonstrations, handouts, PRS clickers, *etc*). Any **visual aids were conference-level**.
	85 80	Presentation does an excellent job of communicating a very substantial body of scientific information. It meets all of the criteria for a mark of 68, as well as meeting **most but not all of the criteria for a mark of 90+**.
	76 72	Presentation does an excellent job of communicating a very substantial body of scientific information. It meets all the criteria for a mark of 68 as well as meeting **one or a few of the qualities of a 90+ presentation**.
Merit (B)	68 65 62	Presentation very effectively communicates a significant body of scientific information, being a **logically-structured exposition** enabling the audience to appreciate the significance of the material presented. Presentations in this range would generally be expected to show the following characteristics: **appropriate background reading**, **good critical, analytical or synthetic treatment of the information**, **no evidence of significant errors of understanding** during the talk or in answers to questions, **used resources well**, **spoke without detailed notes**, **little or no hesitation**, and **kept more or less to time.**
Pass (C)	58 55 52	Presentation successfully communicates a significant body of scientific information. It is a **mostly accurate account of most of the expected relevant material**, showing evidence of **some background reading** and **adequate preparation**, but is marred by confused sections, poor use of resources, over-run, omissions, errors, hesitation, irrelevance (*e.g.* slides that do not add value), over-reliance on non-primary sources, or by reading from notes.
Fail (D)	48 45 42	Presentation achieves only limited communication of scientific information, containing major errors or omissions. Presenter delivers a **mainly accurate account of at least a third of the expected relevant material**, showing a generally weak understanding and evidence of little background reading or preparation.
Bad fail (E)	38 35 30	Presentation fails to communicate any significant scientific information. Presenter demonstrates **understanding of less than a third of the expected relevant material** (either through errors, through lack of preparation, or by omission).
	25 20	Presentation fails to communicate scientific information and is on balance misleading. It shows **understanding of less than a quarter of the expected relevant material**, but is so inaccurate and/or irrelevant that it succeeds only in misinforming and confusing the audience.
	15 10 5	Presentation includes **very little that is correct and relevant.**
	0	Presentation not given.

Footnotes: **Analytical** = breaking a concept down into its parts and examining their inter-relationships, *e.g.* comparing and contrasting two models. **Critical** = judging a hypothesis or conclusion by examining the validity of the evidence presented for it, *e.g.* evaluating two competing models. **Synthetic** = integrating concepts from several sources. *e.g*. discussing relevant background reading, or combining material into a coherent or original whole.