

Cockcroft PGR Conference Mark Scheme

<i>Marks</i>	<i>Slides/poster structure and quality</i>	<i>Presentation skills and clarity</i>	<i>Scientific understanding, rigour and detail</i>	<i>Insight and ability to answer questions</i>
5	Clear, structured slides or poster with great design choices. Excellent and well-chosen figures which are intuitive and easy to understand.	Excellent and innovative presentation with a clear and exciting message. Outstanding delivery in good time and pitched ideally for the audience.	Relevant background and context excellently described and well referenced. Shows deep understanding of the techniques and results and their limitations.	Great engagement with questions and insight into implications and impact of the work. Ability to link the work to other talks and posters.
4	Good choice of structure which helps to lead the reader through the slides or poster. Figures are relevant and well presented, e.g. with useful units and informative captions.	A strong and clear message, with good explanations. Enthusiasm and command of the material off-script, mostly within good time and at an appropriate level.	Context is well described and relevant to the work. Techniques and results are described in detail and appropriate references are given where necessary.	Good answers to questions which draw on knowledge or insight from outside the presentation. An understanding of why the work is important.
3	Slides or poster have a structure which makes sense and is helpful, but might be a bit fragmented. Figures are informative but not always easy to understand or with all the necessary detail.	A decent attempt to convey the message. Material is explained but talks may be overly reliant on a script, go over or under time, or be pitched at the wrong level.	Some background is presented and one or two references might be given. Techniques are mentioned and results are presented, but without great detail or understanding.	Questions are generally answered correctly with relatively few hesitations or unknowns. There may be a reliance on the presentation alone with little further insight.
2	Poor structure leaving the talk or poster unclear. Design decisions were not well considered or figures are not helpful. Potentially some missing sections or information.	Message of the talk or poster unclear. Some attempt to explain the material but without success. Talks well over or under time.	Little attempt to place the work into context. Methods or results may be incorrect. Not much display of understanding or description of the science.	More questions than not are left unanswered or attempted incorrectly. Little or no reflection on the work, its implications or flaws.
1	Very little structure or clarity. Figures are missing or make no sense. Missing or incorrect units, captions, or material.	Slides or poster impossible to understand, with material missing or unexplained. Student just reading the text line by line. Timings completely off.	No referencing or understanding of prior work. Majorly flawed or missing methods or results.	No attempts to engage with questions. No consideration into why techniques were chosen or the implications of the work.