

**School of Biomedical Sciences**  
**BIOM6401 – Special Topics in Biomedical Sciences**  
**Proposal Seminar Feedback**

**Candidates** are strongly encouraged to review the criteria carefully during the preparation of their proposal seminar.

**Examiners** are to circle the relevant achievement level of the candidate on the accompanying criteria sheet and insert any relevant comments on specific aspects. Specific comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's presentation are to be made at the bottom of the criteria sheet.

The assessment has been divided into three major components:

<b>Content</b>	<b>60%</b>
<b>Presentation</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>Questions</b>	<b>20%</b>

Note that each component **does not contribute equally** to the final mark.

**Candidate:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Topic:** \_\_\_\_\_

Examiners, please note the general assessment criteria below when awarding final mark:

<b>&gt;80 (Hons 1)</b>	Work of superior quality in all aspects of the seminar, containing clear examples of excellent critical skills and personal insights into research area.
<b>70-79 (Hons IIa)</b>	Work of very good quality in all aspects of the seminar, but showing lesser critical skills and personal insights into research area.
<b>60-69 (Hons IIb)</b>	Good quality in all aspects of the seminar, but with inadequacies in understanding, critical skills, organisation and presentation.
<b>50-59 (Hons III)</b>	Adequate quality work, but with significant deficiencies in understanding, critical skills, organisation and presentation.
<b>&lt;50 (Fail)</b>	No understanding of area or incomprehensible.

**Mark:** \_\_\_\_\_ %

**Examiner:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Examiner's Signature:**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

## Proposal Seminar Feedback

Candidate: \_\_\_\_\_

	Comments	High Honours I (>85%)	Med-Low Hons I (80-85%)	High Hons IIA (76-79%)	Med-Low Hons IIA (70-75%)	Honours IIB (60-69%)	Honours III (50-59%)	Fail (<50%)
<b><u>CONTENT</u></b> <b><u>60%</u></b>		Aims and hypotheses clearly and thoroughly outlined and rationalised in the context of previous work.	Aims and hypotheses clearly outlined and rationalised in the context of previous work.	Aims and hypotheses stated with rationalisation in the context of previous work.	Aims or hypotheses stated with some rationalisation in the context of previous work.	Aims or hypotheses stated with little rationalisation in the context of previous work.	Aims or hypotheses stated.	No aims or hypotheses apparent.
		All field specific concepts and terminology described clearly and appropriately for a non-expert audience.	All field specific concepts and terminology described clearly.	All field specific concepts and terminology described.	Some field specific concepts and terminology described.	Some field specific concepts and terminology described with minor omissions.	Some field specific concepts and terminology described with significant omissions.	No attempt to describe field specific concepts and terminology.
		Experimental strategy and expected outcomes outlined clearly and thoroughly. Fully consistent with aims / hypotheses.	Experimental strategy and expected outcomes outlined clearly. Fully consistent with aims / hypotheses.	Experimental strategy and expected outcomes outlined clearly. Few inconsistencies with aims / hypotheses.	Experimental strategy not fully clear. Some inconsistencies with aims / hypotheses.	Experimental strategy not fully clear. Many inconsistencies with aims / hypotheses.	Experimental strategy not fully clear. No links to aims / hypotheses apparent.	No definitive experimental strategy apparent.
<b><u>PRESENTATION</u></b> <b><u>20%</u></b>		Fully aligned with principles of Powerpoint. Figures labelled clearly and informatively. No errors. Clear and logical structure throughout.	Aligned with most principles of Powerpoint. Figures labelled clearly and informatively. Few errors. Logical structure throughout.	Aligned with most principles of Powerpoint. Figures labelled clearly. Minor omissions. Few errors. Mostly logical structure.	Mostly aligned with principles of Powerpoint. Figures labelled clearly. Minor omissions. Many errors. Minor errors in structure.	Some major deviations from principles of Powerpoint. Figures not always clearly labelled. Minor omissions. Many errors.	Many major deviations from principles of Powerpoint. Figures not clearly labelled. Major omissions. Many errors.	Consistently not aligned with principles of Powerpoint. Figures not labelled. Significant errors. No clear structure.

		Delivery clear, well paced, articulate and professional throughout. Confident stance and body language. Enthusiastic and interesting.	Delivery clear, well paced, articulate and professional. Confident stance and body language. Enthusiastic.	Delivery clear, well paced and articulate. Mostly confident stance and body language. Enthusiastic.	Delivery clear and well paced. Mostly confident stance and body language.	Delivery mostly clear. Some major lapses in body language observed.	Delivery unclear / inaudible. Some major lapses in body language observed.	Delivery unclear / inaudible. Not confident with poor body language.
<b><u>QUESTIONS</u></b> <b><u>20%</u></b>		All responses demonstrated clear understanding of complex technical and contextual issues.	Responses demonstrated clear understanding of complex technical and contextual issues.	Responses demonstrated understanding of technical and contextual issues.	Responses demonstrated some understanding of technical and contextual issues.	Responses demonstrated some understanding of technical or contextual issues but not both.	Responses demonstrated little understanding of technical and contextual issues.	Responses did not demonstrate any understanding of the project.
		Consistently strongly argued and accurate answers to questions drawing from related literature.	Strongly argued and accurate answers to questions drawing from related literature.	Accurate answers to questions drawing from related literature.	Mostly accurate answers to questions drawing from literature.	A number of minor errors made in responses to questions.	A number of major errors made in responses to questions.	Significant errors made in responses to questions.

**Specific comments (strengths / weaknesses / suggestions):**