

Project marking criteria – Reflective Report

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 **Reflective piece** will demonstrate all of the above and in addition needs to cover:

- How you went about planning and designing your project
- How you decided on, and planned to target, your specific audience
- The key aims and goals of your project
- How you worked together as a team to deliver your project
- How you have chosen to define what success looks like for your project, how you intend to measure your success and any evidence gathered.

Below you will find the assessment criteria for the **project reflection**.

Class	Scale	Numerical Equivalent	Descriptor
Excellent First	Excellent first	100 94	Exceptional report of the highest quality, combining excellence and originality of content with flawlessly fluent and impressively compelling communication. 1. Evidence of exceptional planning and design of the project, incorporating public engagement best practice

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The project is extremely well structured, and careful thought has been put into the project's intended audience 3. The writing is well structured, clearly argued, engaging, compelling and of the highest professional standard, flowing excellently throughout 4. Appropriate guidance for references has been followed perfectly 5. The report shows excellent analysis of the success of the project and how this is determined (or will be determined for a future event) 6. Excellent evidence for teamwork.
First	High 1st	88	<p>Very high-quality report with a depth of understanding, written with flair and in a highly professional manner.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evidence of extensive planning and design of the project, incorporating public engagement best practice 2. The project is very well structured and is clearly targeted to and appropriate for a specific audience 3. The writing is well structured, clearly argued, engaging, compelling and of a strong standard, flowing throughout. 4. Appropriate guidance for references has been followed. 5. The report shows strong analysis of the success of the project and how this is determined (or will be determined for a future event) 6. Good evidence for teamwork.
	Mid 1st	82	
	Low 1st	74	
Upper Second	High 2.1	68	<p>High quality report demonstrating perceptive analysis presented in a coherent and professional manner.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evidence of planning and design of the project and incorporating public engagement best practice 2. The project is generally well structured and mostly targeted to and appropriate for a specific audience 3. The writing is generally well structured, clearly argued and is of a good standard. 4. Appropriate guidance for references has been followed for the most part. 5. The report shows strong analysis of the success of the project and how this is determined (or will be determined for a future event) 6. Generally good evidence for teamwork.
	Mid 2.1	65	
	Low 2.1	62	
Lower Second	High 2.2	58	<p>Competent report containing generally reliable information and generally sound analysis presented in an intelligible but not necessarily especially persuasive or well organised or entirely successful fashion.</p>
	Mid 2.2	55	
	Low 2.2	52	

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Limited evidence of planning, design and public engagement best practice 2. The project is coherently structured with some consideration of target audience, but there may be some localised areas of confusion in the report 3. The writing in the report is of a reasonable standard, generally well-structured and clearly argued, but there may be some localised areas of confusion 4. Some guidance for references has been followed. 5. The report shows adequate analysis of the success of the project and how this is determined (or will be determined for a future event) 6. Moderate evidence for teamwork
Third	High 3rd	48	<p>Blog of limited quality characterised by some or all of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Limited evidence of planning, design and public engagement best practice 2. The project is poorly structured with very limited thought put into the project's intended audience, and there may be some localised areas of confusion 3. The writing in the report is of a poor to moderate standard, with the whole incoherently structured and poorly argued 4. Some guidance for references has been followed in part. 5. The report shows limited analysis of the success of the project and how this is determined (or will be determined for a future event) 6. Moderate to poor evidence for teamwork
	Mid 3rd	45	
	Low 3rd	42	
Fail		38	<p>Blog does not meet standards required for the appropriate stage of an Honours degree:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No evidence of planning, event design or public engagement theory 2. The project is likely to be very badly structured with little or no consideration of target audience 3. The writing in the report is of a very poor standard with the whole incoherently structured and very poorly argued 4. Guidance for references has been ignored. 5. The report shows limited or no analysis of the success of the project and how this is determined (or will be determined for a future event) 6. Poor evidence for teamwork

