

## Module Assignment – 7 Poster & Presentation (CPHSP)

	Assessment Criteria	%	Distinction 70+	Merit 60-69	Pass 50-59	Fail <50
<b>Supporting Documentation</b>	<p><b>Abstract</b></p> <p><b>200 words</b></p> <p>with headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Background</li> <li>• Aims &amp; Objectives</li> <li>• Findings</li> <li>• Conclusions</li> </ul>	10	<p>Demonstrates a strong understanding of the domain and specific topic selected.</p> <p>Detailed and focussed overview of topic background description suitably introducing the area and themes of the poster.</p> <p>Clear and convincing rationale for the need for the poster with aims and objectives well identified, and the target audience clearly understood.</p>	<p>Demonstrates a good understanding of the domain and specific topic selected.</p> <p>Appropriate overview of topic background, although minor errors introducing the area and themes of the poster.</p> <p>Good rationale for the need for the poster with aims and objectives identified, and the target audience well understood.</p> <p>Well-presented findings with some attempt at critical</p>	<p>Demonstrates an understanding of the domain and specific topic selected.</p> <p>Appropriate overview of topic background, although some minor/major errors and digression introducing the area and themes of the poster.</p> <p>Some rationale for the need for the poster with some aims and objectives identified, and the target audience understood.</p>	<p>Demonstrates a poor understanding of the domain and specific topic selected.</p> <p>Inadequate/limited/erroneous overview of topic background.</p> <p>No clear rationale for the need for the poster identified. Weak aims and objectives and the target audience is poorly understood.</p>

	<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Distinction</b> 70+	<b>Merit</b> 60-69	<b>Pass</b> 50-59	<b>Fail</b> <50
			<p>Succinct and balanced critical evaluation of the findings of the research into the topic.</p> <p>Distinctly drawn conclusions with clear evidence presented to support their assertions.</p>	<p>evaluation of the findings of the research into the topic.</p> <p>Clearly drawn conclusions with evidence presented to support them.</p>	<p>Some attempt at critical evaluation of the findings of the research into the topic.</p> <p>Clearly drawn conclusions with some evidence presented to support their assertions.</p>	<p>No attempt at critical evaluation of the findings of the research into the topic.</p> <p>Ambiguously drawn conclusions with little evidence presented to support their assertions.</p>
	<b>Literature Review</b>	20	<p>Full appreciation of the work already done in the subject area and critical evaluation of the literature represented in the review.</p> <p>Good synthesis of ideas and creative application to the topic explored. Sources supporting the development of the idea/both sides of the discussion are presented.</p>	<p>Good appreciation of the work already done in the subject area and some critical evaluation of the literature represented in the review.</p> <p>Good application and analysis of the concepts to the essay topic/theme.</p>	<p>Some appreciation of the work already done in the subject area and mostly descriptive with some elements of critical evaluation of the literature represented in the review.</p>	<p>Little appreciation of the work already done in the subject area and purely descriptive – absence of any critical evaluation of the literature represented in the review.</p> <p>Only thematic supportive sources are used and opposing articles are not mentioned.</p>
	<b>Academic Referencing</b>	10	<p>Very high standard of referencing conforming to a recognised style with an excellent range of pertinent,</p>	<p>High standard of referencing conforming to a recognised style with a good range of pertinent, recent, and</p>	<p>Satisfactory standard of referencing conforming to a</p>	<p>Inconsistent or insufficient referencing. Not sufficiently conforming to a recognised style. Poor range of pertinent,</p>

	Assessment Criteria	%	Distinction 70+	Merit 60-69	Pass 50-59	Fail <50
			recent, and academically rigorous sources.	academically rigorous sources.	recognised style with a range of pertinent, recent sources.	recent, and academically rigorous sources.
<b>Poster</b>	<b>Content</b>	40	Full appreciation of the most recent information about the pathophysiology and critical evaluation of the literature represented in the review. Well referenced with excellent quality sources cited. Good synthesis of ideas and creative application to the topic explored. Sources supporting the development of the idea/both sides of the discussion are presented.	Good appreciation of the work already done in the subject area and some critical evaluation of the literature represented in the review.  Well referenced with good quality sources cited. Good application and analysis of the concepts to the topic.	Some appreciation of the work already done in the subject area and mostly descriptive with some elements of critical evaluation of the literature represented in the review.  Adequately referenced with reasonable quality sources cited.	Little appreciation of the work already done in the subject area and purely descriptive – absence of any critical evaluation of the literature represented in the review. Only thematic supportive sources are used and opposing articles are not mentioned.  Poorly referenced with poor quality sources cited.

	<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Distinction</b> 70+	<b>Merit</b> 60-69	<b>Pass</b> 50-59	<b>Fail</b> <50
	<b>Style/Visual Presentation</b>	10	<p>Clear, logical flow of thought and excellent standard of written, appropriately targeted English.</p> <p>Excellent use of illustrations, graphics, and charts/tables as appropriate.</p> <p>Very visually attractive and easy to understand.</p>	<p>Clear, mostly logical flow of thought and good standard of written, appropriately targeted English.</p> <p>Very good use of illustrations, graphics, and charts/tables as appropriate.</p> <p>Visually attractive and easy to understand.</p>	<p>Mostly clear, some evidence of logical flow of thought and reasonable standard of written, appropriately targeted English.</p> <p>Good use of illustrations, graphics, and charts/tables as appropriate.</p> <p>Visually acceptable and mostly easy to understand.</p>	<p>Lack of clarity and logical flow of thought and poor standard of written, English with inappropriate level of words for target audience.</p> <p>Poor (or no) use of illustrations, graphics, and charts/tables as appropriate.</p> <p>Visually unattractive and hard to understand.</p>

	Assessment Criteria	%	Distinction 70+	Merit 60-69	Pass 50-59	Fail <50
Presentation Skills	<b>Professional conduct in the presentation of the material</b>	10	<p>Professionally presented with a clear opening statement tailored to the audience, clearly organised and coherent material, and a very good pace of presentation allowing the audience to follow it easily whilst keeping closely to the time allotted.</p> <p>Excellent use of voice in terms of audibility, tone and expression.</p> <p>Superb use of body language in terms of eye contact with the audience, posture, movement, and gestures.</p>	<p>Well presented with an introductory opening statement, logically organised material with structure containing ideas and facts that are well paced in the talk and keeping to the time allotted.</p> <p>Good use of voice in terms of audibility, tone and expression.</p> <p>Effective use of body language in terms of eye contact with the audience, posture, movement, and gestures.</p>	<p>Rather weak introduction to the talk with some attempt to organise material, but dry due to the lack of ideas and facts <b>or</b> confusing as there are too many concepts included, marring the pacing and over- or under-running slightly.</p> <p>Acceptable use of voice, but somewhat inaudible at times and lacklustre in delivery.</p> <p>Sufficient use of body language in terms of eye contact with the audience, posture, movement, and gestures, but plenty of scope for improvement.</p>	<p>Poorly presented with no statement of the purpose, badly organised material, which is confusing and hard to follow and which significantly over- or under-runs the time allotted.</p> <p>Poor use of voice – inaudible, flat delivery and delivered much too fast or much too slowly.</p> <p>Poor use of body language – either insufficient or too much eye contact, inappropriate posture (too rigid or too relaxed) and bad use of movement and gestures (either too static or too much movement with awkward use of gesture). Frequently repeated phrases and poorly chosen verbal tics or colloquialisms.</p>