



Appendix 2. Detailed Guidelines for Assessment of Thesis

This appendix provides specific guidelines for the different sub-criteria assessment levels, for the use of supervisors and evaluators. Students wishing to have a more precise idea of marking criteria may also find this appendix useful.

There are eight criteria for content and five for presentation. Content criteria are further subdivided into four to six sub-criteria. Content criteria have equal weight and content sub-criteria are also meant to have equal weight within each of the criteria.

To simplify the presentation of sub-criteria assessment levels the following letter-based scale will be used:

Thesis Achievement Level	MSM Grading Scales (Cum Laude addition)	
A	90-100	Distinction Cum Laude
B	80-89	Distinction
C	70-79	Credit
D	60-69	Pass
E	50-59	Marginal Failure
F	40-49	Redeemable Failure
G	<40	Irredeemable Failure

Assessment criteria for content (70%).

The eight assessment criteria for content include: formulation of research question, extent of literature review, relevance of approach, scope of analysis, strength of conclusions and recommendations, managerial implications of recommendations and holistic. Each criterion has the same weight (1/8 of the content aspect) and within them each sub-criterion has equal weight.

Formulation of research question

Problem statement

The extent to which a valid research problem has been identified and its essential aspects isolated.

Achievement level.

- A. The problem has been clearly identified and most essential aspects unmistakably isolated.
- B. The problem has been clearly identified and some of its essential aspects isolated.
- C. The problem has been clearly identified but only few of its essential aspects isolated
- D. The problem has been clearly identified but none of its essential aspects isolated
- E. The problem and its essential aspects have only been vaguely identified
- F. The problem is only vaguely stated and there is no mention of its essential aspects
- G. The problem has not been identified

Research question

The extent to which the focus of the research is expressed and specified in relation to the problem statement. This need not be in the form of a question but could also be stated through alternative formulations such as hypothesis.

Achievement level.

- A. The research question is clearly and precisely stated and is sharply focused on an essential aspect of the problem statement.
- B. The research question is clearly stated and addresses the essential aspect of problem statement.
- C. The research question is clearly stated but only partially addresses the essential aspect of the problem statement
- D. The research question is clearly stated but has very little relationship with the problem statement
- E. The research question is imprecisely stated and has very little relationship with the problem statement
- F. The research question is imprecisely stated and has no relationship with the problem statement.
- G. The research question is not stated



Difficulty

The extent of the challenge posed to the student by the complexity of the research problem or question.

Achievement Level

- A. The research problem/question is highly complex and requires a highly structured solution/answer
- B. The research problem/question is reasonably complex and requires an elaborate solution/answer
- C. The research problem/question is somewhat complex and requires some elaboration in its solution/answer
- D. The research problem/question is simple and requires a straightforward solution/answer
- E. The research problem/question and solution/answer is too easy
- F. The research problem is simplistic
- G. The research problem/question poses no challenge at all

Scope and feasibility of research project

The extent to which the borders of the research project are delimited and can be treated within the time and word limit constraints.

Achievement level

- A. The research project is specifically delimited and is totally implemented within the given constraints
- B. The research project is specifically delimited and is substantially implemented within the given constraints
- C. The research project is specifically delimited and is moderately implemented within the given constraints
- D. The research project is specifically delimited but is not sufficiently implemented within the given constraints
- E. The research project is broad in scope and not sufficiently implemented within the given constraints
- F. The research project is very broad in scope and is hardly implemented within the given constraints
- G. The research project is too broad and unfeasible

Extent of literature review

Depth

The extent to which key relevant articles, books and other references have been used in the research.

Achievement level

- A. The literature review has made use of all key relevant articles, books and other references.
- B. The literature review has made use of most key relevant articles, books and other references.
- C. The literature review has made use of more than the required number of key relevant articles, books and other references.
- D. The literature review has made use of a moderate number of key relevant articles, books and other references
- E. The literature review has made use of an insufficient number of key relevant articles, books and other references
- F. The literature has made use of very few key relevant articles, books and other references
- G. The literature review has made use of none of the key relevant articles, books and other references

Breadth

The extent to which alternative sources of ideas, disciplines, literature, situations and/ or experiences have been brought to bear and provided a source of parallel learning for the research project

Achievement level

- A. The literature review extensively and imaginatively uses alternative sources of ideas, disciplines, literature, situations and/ or experiences
- B. The literature review has mostly and somewhat creatively made use of alternative sources of ideas, disciplines, literature, situations and/ or experiences
- C. The literature review has made significant use of alternative sources of ideas, disciplines, literature, situations and/ or experiences
- D. The literature review has made moderate use of alternative sources of ideas, disciplines, literature, situations and/ or experiences
- E. The literature review has made insufficient use of alternative sources of ideas, disciplines, literature, situations and/ or experiences

- F. The literature review has made very little use of alternative sources of ideas, disciplines, literature, situations and/ or experiences
- G. The literature review has made no use of alternative sources of ideas, disciplines, literature, situations and/ or experiences

Up-to-date

Does the literature review include the most up-to-date references, research and documents?

Achievement level

- A. The literature review contains all recent references, research and documents
- B. The literature review contains most recent references, research and documents
- C. The literature review contains more than the required recent references, research and documents
- D. The literature review contains a moderate number of recent references, research and documents
- E. The literature review contains an insufficient number of recent references, research and documents
- F. The literature review contains very few recent references, research and documents
- G. The literature review contains no recent references, research and documents

Understanding

The extent to which the paper defines, organises, discusses and uses relevant assumptions, concepts, models and frameworks presented in the literature.

Achievement level

- A. The literature review uses existing assumptions, concepts, models and frameworks on the basis of own structures and formulations and fully develops own critical views and insights
- B. The literature review uses existing assumptions, concepts, models and frameworks on the basis of own structures and formulations and substantially develops own critical views and insights
- C. The literature review uses existing assumptions, concepts, models and frameworks on the basis of own structures and formulations and partially develops own critical views and insights
- D. The literature review uses existing assumptions, concepts, models and frameworks on the basis of incomplete own structures and formulations and hardly develops own critical views
- E. The literature review reproduces existing assumptions, concepts, models and frameworks on the basis of poor own structures and formulations
- F. The literature review reproduces literally existing assumptions, concepts, models and frameworks
- G. The literature review hardly reproduces existing assumptions, concepts, models and frameworks

Relevance of approach

Fit

Is the methodological approach and/or examination procedures applicable to the research question?

Achievement level

- A. The method/ procedures are demonstrated to be the best available to deal with the research question
- B. The method/ procedures chosen are substantially applicable to address the research question
- C. The method/ procedures chosen are partially applicable to address the research question
- D. The method/ procedures chosen have some shortcomings in addressing the research question
- E. The method/ procedures chosen have serious shortcomings in addressing the research question
- F. The method/ procedures chosen bear little relationship with the research question
- G. The method/ procedures are not applicable to the research question

Availability of information and data

The extent to which the process of search and collection of data has provided the necessary information to address the research question.

Achievement level

- A. All the evidence to address the research question has been furnished
- B. Most of the evidence to address the question has been furnished
- C. More than the required amount of evidence to address the research question has been furnished
- D. A moderate amount of evidence to address the research question has been furnished
- E. An insufficient amount of evidence to address the research question has been furnished
- F. Hardly any evidence to address the research question has been furnished
- G. No evidence to address the research question has been furnished

Treatment of data

The extent to which available data has been organised into tables, diagrams, descriptive statistics or other relevant way of classifying quantitative or qualitative data.

Achievement level

- A. Data has been fully classified into a set of quantifications and/or underlying themes that begin providing an answer to the research question
- B. Data has been largely classified into a set of quantifications and/or underlying themes that begin providing an answer to the research question
- C. Data has been more than required classified into a set of quantifications and/or underlying themes
- D. Data has been moderately classified into a set of quantifications and/or underlying themes
- E. Insufficient data has been classified into a set of quantifications and/or underlying themes
- F. Hardly any data has been classified into a set of quantifications and/or underlying themes
- G. No data has been classified

Reliability of data and measurements

The extent to which the thesis questions the accuracy and reliability of the data and measurements. The intention here is to assess the Thesis's recognition of possible data limitations.

Achievement level

- A. The paper comprehensively discusses the sources of omissions and biases arising from interviewer/data collector and/or interviewee/data provider background and interests and/or the conditions in which the data was collected
- B. The paper discusses most of the sources of omissions and biases arising from interviewer/data collector and/or interviewee/data provider background and interests and/or the conditions in which the data was collected
- C. The paper discusses more than what would be required the sources of omissions and biases arising from interviewer/data collector and/or interviewee/data provider background and interests and/or the conditions in which the data was collected
- D. The paper moderately discusses the sources of omissions and biases arising from interviewer/data collector and/or interviewee/data provider background and interests and/or the conditions in which the data was collected
- E. The paper insufficiently discusses the sources of omissions and biases arising from interviewer/data collector and/or interviewee/data provider background and interests and/or the conditions in which the data was collected
- F. The paper has very little discussion of the sources of omissions and biases arising from interviewer/data collector and/or interviewee/data provider background and interests and/or the conditions in which the data was collected
- G. The paper has no discussion of the sources of omissions and biases

Scope of analysis

Application of concepts

The extent to which clear relations are made between the findings and the theories, models and frameworks presented in the literature review

Achievement level

- A. The findings are scrupulously discussed in the terms, complexities and nuances of own conceptual framework
- B. There is significant care and precision in discussing findings in the terms, complexities and nuances of own conceptual framework
- C. There is partial care and precision in discussing findings in the terms, complexities and nuances of own conceptual framework
- D. There is more than required care and precision in discussing findings in the terms, complexities and nuances of own conceptual framework
- E. There is insufficient care and precision in discussing findings in the terms, complexities and nuances of own conceptual framework
- F. There is very little care and precision in discussing findings in the terms, complexities and nuances of own conceptual framework
- G. There is no care and precision in discussing findings in the terms, complexities and nuances of own conceptual framework

Structure and consistency of argument/logic

The extent of the rigour in developing own arguments and/or views and following them throughout the analytical section of the inquiry.

Achievement level

- A. The findings are methodically reasoned through and all their underlying relations and interdependences thoroughly pursued
- B. There is a significant attempt at being methodical and thoroughly pursuing the underlying relations and interdependences in the findings
- C. There is a more than required attempt at being methodical and thoroughly pursuing the underlying relations and interdependences in the findings
- D. There is a moderate attempt at being methodical and thoroughly pursuing the underlying relations and interdependences in the findings
- E. There is an insufficient attempt at being methodical and thoroughly pursuing the underlying relations and interdependences in the findings
- F. There is hardly any attempt at being methodical and thoroughly pursuing the underlying relations and interdependences in the findings
- G. There has been no attempt at being methodical and thoroughly pursuing the underlying relations and interdependences in the findings

Interpretation and evaluation of evidence

The extent to which an explanation and assessment of the data and its components, including identification of weaknesses, is performed.

Achievement level

- A. A fully informed, systematic, complete and convincing meaning to the findings is provided, based on their relationship with theory and/or the conceptual framework, available data and adequate data handling techniques
- B. A substantially informed, systematic, complete and convincing meaning to the findings is provided, based on their relationship with theory and/or the conceptual framework, available data and adequate data handling techniques
- C. A more than required informed, systematic, complete and convincing meaning to the findings is provided, based on their relationship with theory and/or the conceptual framework, available data and adequate data handling techniques
- D. A moderately informed, systematic, complete and convincing meaning to the findings is provided, based on their relationship with theory and/or the conceptual framework, available data and adequate data handling techniques
- E. An informed, systematic, complete and convincing meaning to the findings is insufficiently provided, based on their relationship with theory and/or the conceptual framework, available data and adequate data handling techniques
- F. An informed, systematic, complete and convincing meaning to the findings is hardly provided, based on their relationship with theory and/or the conceptual framework, available data and adequate data handling techniques,
- G. An informed, systematic, complete and convincing meaning to the findings is not at all provided

Discrimination between results

The extent to which similar and discrepant data and findings are discussed and critically discriminated

Achievement level

- A. An evaluation and comparison of other explanations, results and experiences is fully performed and assumptions, errors, fallacies and beliefs of alternative views are rationally identified and judged
- B. An evaluation and comparison of alternative explanations, results and experiences is substantially performed and serious attempts are made to rationally identify and judge the assumptions, errors, fallacies and beliefs of alternative views
- C. An evaluation and comparison of alternative explanations, results and experiences are to a more than required extent are performed and above average
- D. attempts are made to rationally identify and judge the assumptions, errors, fallacies and beliefs of alternative views
- E. An evaluation and comparison of alternative explanations, results and experiences is moderately performed and moderate attempts are made to rationally identify and judge the assumptions, errors, fallacies and beliefs of alternative views

- F. An evaluation and comparison of alternative explanations, results and experiences are insufficiently performed and mediocre attempts are made to rationally identify and judge the assumptions, errors, fallacies and beliefs of alternative views
- G. An evaluation and comparison of alternative explanations, results and experiences are hardly performed and very few attempts are made to rationally identify and judge the assumptions, errors, fallacies and beliefs of alternative views
- H. An evaluation and comparison of alternative explanations, results and experiences are not performed nor are attempts made to rationally identify and judge the assumptions, errors, fallacies and beliefs of alternative views

Strength of conclusions and recommendations

Validity

The extent to which the conclusions are clearly and succinctly stated and allow drawing cause-effect and/or other sought relations from the analysis

Achievement level

- A. The conclusions are short, accurate and unambiguous and are fully substantiated in the theory, framework and evidence presented.
- B. The conclusions are fairly short and are substantially accurate, unambiguous and substantiated in the theory, framework and evidence presented
- C. The conclusions are short and accurate and to some extent unambiguous and substantiated in the theory, framework and evidence presented
- D. The conclusions are moderately short, accurate, unambiguous and substantiated in the theory, framework and evidence presented
- E. The conclusions are fairly long and are insufficiently accurate, unambiguous and substantiated in the theory, framework and evidence presented
- F. The conclusions are long, highly inaccurate and ambiguous and hardly are substantiated in the theory, framework and evidence presented
- G. The conclusions are exceedingly long, wholly inaccurate and ambiguous and not at all are substantiated in the theory, framework and evidence presented

Generalisability

The extent to which the key conclusions of the study can be applied to other settings

Achievement level

- A. The research provides a full account of the potential (or lack of it) for applying the conclusions to other situations, organisations, research projects and/or contexts
- B. The research provides a substantial account of the potential (or lack of it) for applying the conclusions to other situations, organisations, research projects and/or contexts
- C. The research provides a more than required account of the potential (or lack of it) for applying the conclusions to other situations, organisations, research projects and/or contexts
- D. The research provides a moderate account of the potential (or lack of it) for applying the conclusions to other situations, organisations, research projects and/or contexts
- E. The research provides an insufficient account of the potential (or lack of it) for applying the conclusions to other situations, organisations, research projects and/or contexts
- F. The research provides hardly any account of the potential (or lack of it) for applying the conclusions to other situations, organisations, research projects and/or contexts
- G. The research provides no account of the potential (or lack of it) for applying the conclusions to other situations, organisations, research projects and/or contexts

Internal coherence

The extent to which the recommendations are logically derived from the conclusions and address all required levels

Achievement level

- A. Recommendations totally follow stated conclusions and include a combination of theoretical, practical and policy proposals
- B. Recommendations substantially follow stated conclusions and include a combination of theoretical, practical and policy proposal



- C. Recommendations moderately follow stated conclusions and include a combination of theoretical, practical and policy proposal
- D. Recommendations to a more than required extent follow stated conclusions and include a combination of theoretical, practical and policy proposal
- E. Recommendations insufficiently follow stated conclusions and include a combination of theoretical, practical and policy proposal
- F. Recommendations hardly follow stated conclusions and include a combination of theoretical, practical and policy proposal
- G. Recommendations neither follow stated conclusions nor include a combination of theoretical, practical and policy proposal

Awareness of limitations

The extent to which limitations and areas for further research are disclosed and explained.

Achievement level

- A. The research provides a full explanation of weaknesses in analysis, unresolved issues and new questions that have emerged during the research process
- B. The research provides a substantial explanation of weaknesses in analysis, unresolved issues and new questions that have emerged during the research process
- C. The research provides a more than required explanation of weaknesses in analysis, unresolved issues and new questions that have emerged during the research process
- D. The research provides a partial explanation of weaknesses in analysis, unresolved issues and new questions that have emerged during the research process
- E. The research provides an insufficient explanation of weaknesses in analysis, unresolved issues and new questions that have emerged during the research process
- F. The research provides hardly any explanation of weaknesses in analysis, unresolved issues and new questions that have emerged during the research process
- G. The research provides no explanation of weaknesses in analysis, unresolved issues and new questions that have emerged during the research process

Managerial Implications of Recommendations

Relevance

The extent to which the proposed managerial actions and resource requirements are directly related to the recommendations

Achievement level

- A. The proposed managerial actions and resource requirements are unambiguously related to the recommendations
- B. Most of the proposed managerial actions and resource requirements are unambiguously related to the recommendations
- C. Some of the proposed managerial and some of the resource requirements are unambiguously related to the recommendations
- D. Some of the proposed managerial actions or some of the resource requirements are unambiguously related to the recommendations
- E. There is an ambiguous relationship between managerial actions and resource requirements and the recommendations
- F. The relationship between managerial actions and resource requirements and the recommendations is highly ambiguous
- G. There is no relationship whatsoever between managerial actions and resource requirements and the recommendations

Comprehensiveness

The extent to which the proposed managerial actions and resource requirements address the main issues and functional areas required for solving the problem at stake

Achievement Level

- A. The proposed managerial actions and resource requirements fully address the main issues and functional areas required for solving the problem at stake
- B. The proposed managerial actions and resource requirements mostly address the main issues and functional areas required for solving the problem at stake

- C. The proposed managerial actions and resource requirements partially address the main issues and functional areas required for solving the problem at stake
- D. The proposed managerial actions and resource requirements address some of the main issues or some of the functional areas required for solving the problem at stake
- E. The proposed managerial actions and resource requirements only limitedly addresses the main issues and functional areas required for solving the problem at stake
- F. The proposed managerial actions and resource requirements hardly addresses the main issues and functional areas required for solving the problem at stake
- G. The proposed managerial actions and resource requirements doesn't at all address the main issues and functional areas required for solving the problem at stake

Feasibility

The extent to which the proposed managerial actions and resource requirements are appropriate to addressing the problem at stake

Achievement level

- A. The proposed managerial actions and resource requirements will fully achieve the intended results
- B. Proposed managerial actions & resource requirements will significantly achieve the intended results
- C. Proposed managerial actions & resource requirements will partially achieve the intended results
- D. Proposed managerial actions & resource requirements will achieve some but not many of the intended results
- E. Proposed managerial actions & resource requirements will achieve just a few of the intended results
- F. Proposed managerial actions & resource requirements will hardly at all achieve the intended results
- G. Proposed managerial actions & resource requirements will not at all achieve the intended results

Timeliness

The extent to which the proposed managerial actions and resource requirements are in a time framework that will allow addressing the problem at stake

Achievement level

- A. The proposed timeline of managerial actions and resource requirements is highly compatible with the intended objectives
- B. The proposed timeline of managerial actions and resource requirements is significantly compatible with the intended objectives
- C. The proposed timeline of managerial actions and resource requirements is partially compatible with the intended objectives
- D. The proposed timeline of managerial actions and resource requirements is less than partially compatible with the intended objectives
- E. The proposed timeline of managerial actions and resource requirements is to a very limited extent compatible with the intended objectives
- F. The proposed timeline of managerial actions and resource requirements will be hardly compatible with the intended objectives
- G. The proposed timeline of managerial actions and resource requirements is not at all compatible with the intended objectives

Holism

Personal engagement

Does the thesis reflect unusual efforts to achieve its objectives? This criterion refers to over and above what would normally be expected and could be marked in consultation with the supervisor.

Achievement level

- A. The thesis shows extraordinary efforts to obtain and use literature, data or other necessary material and solve research related problems
- B. The thesis shows substantial efforts to obtain and use literature, data or other necessary material and solve research related problem
- C. The thesis shows more than required efforts to obtain and use literature, data or other necessary material and solve research related problem
- D. The thesis shows reasonable efforts to obtain and use literature, data or other necessary material and solve research related problem

- E. The thesis shows insufficient efforts to obtain and use literature, data or other necessary material and solve research related problem
- F. The thesis shows hardly any effort to obtain and use literature, data or other necessary material and solve research related problem
- G. The thesis shows no effort to obtain and use literature, data or other necessary material and solve research related problem

Originality

The extent to which the thesis has produced unique insights into the research question. The benchmark in this case should not be the field of research or science as a whole but Theses presented at MSM.

Achievement level

- A. The thesis is innovative and imaginative in its dealings with the literature review, methodological approach and/or interpretation of the data
- B. The thesis is substantially innovative and imaginative in its dealings with the literature review, methodological approach and/or interpretation of the data
- C. The thesis is to a more than required extent innovative and imaginative in its dealings with the literature review, methodological approach and/or interpretation of the data
- D. The thesis is moderately innovative and imaginative in its dealings with the literature review, methodological approach and/or interpretation of the data
- E. The thesis is insufficiently innovative and imaginative in its dealings with the literature review, methodological approach and/or interpretation of the data
- F. The thesis is hardly innovative and imaginative in its dealings with the literature review, methodological approach and/or interpretation of the data
- G. The thesis is not at all innovative and imaginative in its dealings with the literature review, methodological approach and/or interpretation of the data

Depth of understanding

The extent to which the thesis has cumulatively built on its own literature review, approach, findings and conclusions to provide even further insights.

Achievement level

- A. The paper denotes a highly advanced level of understanding of the issues at stake
- B. The paper denotes a significantly high level of understanding of the issues at stake
- C. The paper denotes a more than required level of understanding of the issues at stake
- D. The paper denotes a satisfactory level of understanding of the issues at stake
- E. The paper denotes an unsatisfactory level of understanding of the issues at stake
- F. The paper denotes hardly any understanding of the issues at stake
- G. The paper denotes no understanding of the issues at stake

Flair

The extent to which the thesis is well argued and developed in a persuasive yet exciting and enticing fashion.

Achievement level

- A. The structure and flow of the ideas, arguments, evidence and conclusions presented in the thesis are fully convincing and fascinating to follow
- B. The structure and flow of the ideas, arguments, evidence and conclusions presented in the thesis are largely convincing and fascinating to follow
- C. The structure and flow of the ideas, arguments, evidence and conclusions presented in the thesis are more than sufficiently convincing and fascinating to follow
- D. The structure and flow of the ideas, arguments, evidence and conclusions presented in the thesis are sufficiently convincing and fascinating to follow
- E. The structure and flow of the ideas, arguments, evidence and conclusions presented in the thesis are insufficiently convincing and fascinating to follow
- F. The structure and flow of the ideas, arguments, evidence and conclusions presented in the thesis are hardly convincing and fascinating to follow
- G. The structure and flow of the ideas, arguments, evidence and conclusions presented in the thesis are neither convincing nor fascinating to follow

Title

The extent to which the title of the thesis reflects its content.

Achievement level

- A. The title fully reflects the content of the Thesis
- B. The title substantially reflects the content of the Thesis
- C. The title to a more than required extent reflects the content of the Thesis
- D. The title sufficiently reflects the content of the Thesis
- E. The title insufficiently reflects the content of the Thesis
- F. The title hardly reflects the content of the Thesis
- G. The title does not reflect the content of the Thesis

Assessment criteria for form (10%)

Style

The extent to which the text of the thesis is clear and easy to read

Use of language

The extent to which grammar, syntax, spelling and punctuation have been properly used.

Structure

The extent to which the thesis is divided into self-contained and clearly indicated chapters, sections, subsections and/or advance organisers.

Abstract

The extent to which within the word limit a faithfully yet concisely synopsis of the thesis is provided.

Bibliography and references

The extent, to which all references are properly noted, listed and accurately used and the bibliography reflects all the books, articles, documents and internet sources used.

Abiding by formal guidelines

The extent to which the thesis has followed all the length, letter type, front page, text, tables, sources of tables, footnotes and endnotes, page numbering and abbreviations and appendix guidelines provided beforehand by MSM. See Appendix 1.

Achievement level

- A. Excellent
- B. Very Good
- C. Good
- D. Acceptable
- E. Below standard
- F. Significantly below standard
- G. Unacceptable

Assessment criteria for presentations (20%)

There are six criteria for presentation: preparation, structure, content, delivery technique, use of visual aids and handling of questions. Each criterion has the same weight (1/6 or 16.7% of the presentation aspect) and is assessed by the same scale of achievement level.

Preparation

The extent to which the presentation has been rehearsed, timed, aids pre-arranged and nerves dealt with.

Structure

The extent to which the presentation includes what the research is about, the approach chosen and why, the main findings and the key conclusions and recommendations.



Content

The extent, to which a persuasive case for the main findings, conclusions and recommendations is made.

Delivery technique

The extent, to which the student engages the audience attention, takes the proper posture, speaks clearly and interestingly, explains accurately and concisely and is courteous to the addressees.

Use of visual aids

The extent to which PowerPoint (PP) and within PP a variety of clearly expressed and visible means including text, diagrams, graphs, tables, pictures, video clips and handouts have been used.

Handling of questions

The extent to which careful listening and understanding of questions and arguments is shown and clear and convincing answers provided. Conceding on points and suggesting possible improvements where there may be a genuine weakness in the presentation can be as convincing as a 'correct' answer.

Achievement level

- A. Excellent
- B. Very Good
- C. Good
- D. Acceptable
- E. Below standard
- F. Significantly below standard
- G. Unacceptable