

# Project marking criteria – Live event

For **Assessment 3**, students will undertake a **Public Engagement Project** which will develop throughout the course and will involve any aspect of Public Engagement. This will make up 50% of your final mark.

The Public Engagement Project will be a **group project**. Each person will write a **reflective piece** of 1,500 words on their project, and 75% of the project marks will be awarded for this reflective piece which will reveal individual contribution to group work as well as success and scope of the project as a whole. 25% of the project assessment will be for the public engagement presentation **live-event**.

Both of these assessment types will require you to demonstrate your knowledge and application of some general principles of **Public Engagement best practice** as studied and developed in our module. These involve principally:

- Clear and engaging presentation of high-quality information
- Considered thought on the best methods of engaging the required audience with the chosen material
- Recognition of the needs and interests of that audience and tailoring your engagement to fit accordingly

Your **Live event** will demonstrate all of the above and in addition needs to cover:

- Clear communication of the planning/aims/goals and success of your project tailored to the target audience
- Good use of technology to demonstrate your points and enliven your presentation
- Ability to clearly, confidently and convincingly answer questions from the audience

Below you will find the assessment criteria for the **Live event**.

Class	Scale	Numerical Equivalent	Descriptor
<b>Excellent First</b>	Excellent first	100 94	<p><b>Exceptional event of the highest quality, combining excellence and originality of content, engaging and impressively compelling communicational performance, and technical expertise in production</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evidence of exceptional planning and design of the event, incorporating public engagement best practice</li> <li>2. The event is clearly targeted to and appropriate for a specific audience</li> <li>3. The event is extremely well structured and clearly and accurately communicated</li> <li>4. The event is very well paced and produced in a professional manner</li> </ol>

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Excellent interaction with the audience (including, where required, responding to questions which may be complex or difficult with clear and engaging answers)</li> <li>6. Excellent use of technology to enhance the event</li> <li>7. The communicational performance is engaging, compelling and of the highest professional standard</li> </ol>
First	High 1st	88	<p><b>Very high quality event given with flair and in a highly professional manner.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evidence of extensive planning and design of the event incorporating public engagement best practice</li> <li>2. The event is clearly targeted to and appropriate for a specific audience</li> <li>3. The event is extremely well structured and clearly and accurately communicated</li> <li>4. The event is very well paced and very well produced</li> <li>5. Excellent interaction with the audience (including, where required, responding to questions which may be complex or difficult with clear and engaging answers)</li> <li>6. Confident use of technology to enhance the event</li> <li>7. The communicational performance is engaging and of a high professional standard</li> </ol>
	Mid 1st	82	
	Low 1st	74	
Upper Second	High 2.1	68	<p><b>High quality event demonstrating good understanding of audience and presented in an engaging and professional manner.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evidence of planning and design of the event and incorporating public engagement theory</li> <li>2. The event is mostly targeted to and appropriate for a specific audience</li> <li>3. The event is generally well structured and clearly and accurately communicated</li> <li>4. The event is appropriately paced and competently produced</li> <li>5. Some good interaction with the audience (including, where required, responding to questions with coherent answers)</li> <li>6. Competent use of technology to produce the event</li> <li>7. The communicational performance is of a good standard</li> </ol>
	Mid 2.1	65	
	Low 2.1	62	
Lower Second	High 2.2	58	<p><b>Competent event with some consideration of a target audience, presented in an intelligible but not necessarily especially persuasive or well organised or entirely successful fashion.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Limited evidence of planning, design and public engagement best practice</li> </ol>
	Mid 2.2	55	
	Low 2.2	52	

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Some consideration of target audience</li> <li>3. The event is coherently structured but there may be some localised areas of confusion</li> <li>4. The event is intelligible but may not be appropriately paced, clearly communicated or accurate</li> <li>5. There is some sound interaction with the audience including, where required, responding to questions but there may be some hesitancy which undermines audience confidence in the quality of the answers presented</li> <li>6. Use of technology hinders the presentation and detracts from the overall event</li> <li>7. The communicational performance is of a fair standard</li> </ol>
Third	High 3rd	48	<p><b>Competent event with some consideration of a target audience, presented in an intelligible but not necessarily especially persuasive or well organised or entirely successful fashion.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Limited evidence of planning, design and public engagement best practice</li> <li>2. Some consideration of target audience</li> <li>3. The event is coherently structured but there may be some localised areas of confusion</li> <li>4. The event is intelligible but may not be appropriately paced, clearly communicated or accurate</li> <li>5. There is some sound interaction with the audience including, where required, responding to questions but there may be some hesitancy which undermines audience confidence in the quality of the answers presented</li> <li>6. Use of technology hinders the presentation and detracts from the overall event</li> <li>7. The communicational performance is of a fair standard</li> </ol>
	Mid 3rd	45	
	Low 3rd	42	
Fail		38	<p><b>Presentation does not meet standards required for the appropriate stage of an Honours degree:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No evidence of planning, event design or public engagement theory</li> <li>2. A misleading or very unclear event</li> <li>3. Little or no consideration of target audience</li> <li>4. The event is likely to be very badly structured</li> <li>5. The presentation will be badly paced and may very well be communicated in such a way as to seriously impede audience understanding of many key points</li> <li>6. There is little or no meaningful interaction with the audience including, where required, responding to questions. A sense is projected of not knowing the material well so as to entirely undermine audience confidence in the quality of the presentation.</li> <li>7. Use of technology seriously undermines the event</li> <li>8. The communicational performance is of poor quality.</li> </ol>

|