

Design and Professional Practice 2

Demonstration Day Mark Sheet

Aspect	Criteria
Poster Visuals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the text readable or is it too big / small? • Are there too many words? • Do graphs have sensible legends? • Has good use been made of colour / pictures? • Is the poster visually attractive?
Poster Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the poster well structured (e.g. aims, results conclusions)? • Is the material linked into a single clear story – or is it a random collection of observations? • Is the problem tackled clearly explained? • Does the team demonstrate expert knowledge in the area (including for example the correct use of technical language)?
Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the answers use technical language correctly? • Were the answers correct?
Technology Design Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the technology implemented in an appropriate manner? • Does the proposed solution use appropriate materials? • Is the proposed solution safe?
Technology Function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the design likely to meet the user requirements?

Grade	Mark Range	Characterisation
A*	85-100	<p>Conference quality poster suitable for publication.</p> <p>Poster is easy to follow, good quality images and clear readable text demonstrating strong content and knowledge of the topic.</p> <p>Technology is appropriate, well presented and suitable for implementation.</p>
A	70-84	<p>Excellent quality poster with good quality images, clear readable text demonstrating strong content, and good knowledge of the topic.</p> <p>Poster is easy to follow.</p> <p>Technology is appropriate, well presented and a suitable solution.</p>
B	60-69	<p>Decent quality poster suitable with reasonable images and readable text demonstrating good knowledge of the topic.</p> <p>Poster can be understood.</p> <p>Technology is applicable, well-presented and requires only little modification to be implemented.</p>
C	50-59	<p>Reasonable poster with images and clear text demonstrating reasonable knowledge of the topic.</p> <p>Technology is reasonable and would be a suitable solution with modification.</p>
D	40-49	<p>Lower quality poster with/without images and poorly laid out text demonstrating some knowledge of the topic.</p> <p>Technology is questionable and requires reconsideration.</p>
E	30-39	<p>Weak poster with/without poor images and difficult to follow, demonstrating little knowledge of the topic.</p> <p>Technology is unfeasible and requires significant modification.</p>

Group #	Project	Score	Comments
Mol Group 1	Cutaneous Leishmaniasis		
Mol Group 2	Drug Delivery		
Mol Group 3	Smart Packaging		
Mol Group 4	Plant Imaging		
Mol Group 5	Yeast		
BMI Group 1	AR Learning		
BMI Group 2	Simulator		
BMI Group 3	Gaming		
BMI Group 4	VI Baby Buggy		

Marker Name: _____.