

Name of Student(s):

Date:

Topic of Presentation:

presentation: 10th December 2024, 1:00 p.m. (during the seminar)

presentation slides (PDF) due: 10th December 2024, 11:59 p.m.

each student will present a live presentation (10-15 min) to the class on Teams on a philosophical / cosmological concept, text, theologian/philosopher or tradition viewed in the seminars (except for the specific creation myths). Ideally, this should focus on a specific intellectual dimension of the concept, text, theologian/philosopher or tradition examined. The student should introduce the topic and its context, explain the key concept(s)/arguments related to the topic, and consider its significance for religious cosmology, potentially showing its reception or development in later thought. The presentation will be followed by a 5-minute Q&A session.

instructions:

- students will select a topic of their choosing for the presentation, which must be approved by the module coordinator. Presentation topics for each student will be discussed and confirmed individually with the module coordinator closer to the time of the presentation.
- each student will present a presentation (10-15 min) to the class on Teams using PowerPoint slides (the presentation will be recorded). This should include 8-12 PowerPoint slides, excluding introductory and bibliographic slides.
- students will submit their PowerPoint slides as a PDF file to Moodle (in the "assessments"> "assessment 1" section) by 10th December 2024, 11:59 p.m.

Late submission of assessments will result in a late penalty mark. Penalties for late submission: Up to one week late, maximum mark of 40%. Over one week late, 0%. Only the Extenuating Circumstances Panel may approve a change to submission dates.

Name of Student(s):

Date:

Topic of Presentation:

Comments

CONTENT – Structure / Ideas

Introduction				
Introduced the topic clearly	Yes	To some extent	No	
Outlined the main areas to be covered	Yes	To some extent	No	
Created interest in the topic	Yes	To some extent	No	
Body of presentation				
Main idea /thesis was communicated clearly	Yes	To some extent	No	
Supporting ideas were communicated clearly	Yes	To some extent	No	
Backed up ideas with examples where necessary	Yes	To some extent	No	
Ideas well linked / sequenced.	Yes	To some extent	No	
Visual aids				
Clear / well prepared	Yes	To some extent	No	
Added to presentation, relevant	Yes	To some extent	No	
Well managed	Yes	To some extent	No	
Conclusion				
Strong concise summary	Yes	To some extent	No	
Thought provoking	Yes	To some extent	No	
Ideas drawn together	Yes	To some extent	No	

LANGUAGE & DELIVERY

Language				
Used language appropriate to discipline	Yes	To some extent	No	
Used appropriate level of formality for audience	Yes	To some extent	No	
Explained specialist vocabulary where necessary	Yes	To some extent	No	
Delivery				
Spoke at appropriate volume	Yes	To some extent	No	
Spoke at appropriate speed (didn't rush)	Yes	To some extent	No	
Spoke fluently	Yes	To some extent	No	
Used lively / appropriate intonation	Yes	To some extent	No	
Sounded confident	Yes	To some extent	No	
Question time				
Questions well answered	Yes	To some extent	No	
Other				
Notes and visuals well managed.	Yes	To some extent	No	

Overall effectiveness of presentation:

Name of Student(s):

Date:

Topic of Presentation:

The following descriptions can be used when making a global assessment of a student's performance.

	Knowledge & Content	Methodology & Structure, Language & Style	Understanding, Reflection & Critique	Integrative thinking & demonstration of experiential learning
70% +	Interesting topic handled with intelligence, originality, and depth; wealth of supporting material, smoothly integrated into the presentation; tone is evident and Maintained throughout, no factual inaccuracies	Material is unified and well-focused; organization is clear, logical and purposeful throughout the presentation; well-chosen examples. Uses sophisticated sentences effectively, usually chooses words aptly; makes few minor or technical errors	Well-chosen examples: persuasive reasoning used to develop and support thesis consistently: uses quotations and citations effectively, causal connections between ideas are evident	Gives full insight into the nature of an event, experience, or artefact; achieves complete integration of knowledge from diverse disciplines to interpret an issue. Shows clear understanding of cultural impact through appropriate examples
60% +	Content is above average; worthwhile topic; satisfactory depth of development; supporting details for the thesis and topic sentences are specific, concrete, and plentiful; has only minor factual inaccuracies	Material is unified and well-focused; pattern of organization is clear, logical, and well executed; tries to organize paragraphs topically. Some mechanical difficulties or stylistic problems; may make occasional problematic word choices or awkward syntax errors; a few spelling or punctuation errors or cliché; usually presents quotations effectively	Pursues thesis consistently: develops a main argument with clear major points and appropriate textual evidence and supporting detail; makes an effort to organize presentation topically	Gives some insights into the nature of an event, experience, or artefact; achieves partial integration of knowledge from diverse disciplines to interpret an issue; some understanding of cultural impact through appropriate examples
50% +	Worthwhile topic; supporting material for thesis and topic sentences are general and abstract rather than specific and concrete; most information is correct	Organization is clear, logical, and coherent; some ideas unsupported; fails to integrate quotations appropriately. More frequent wordiness; several unclear or awkward sentences; imprecise use of words	Only partially develops the argument; shallow analysis; some ideas and generalizations undeveloped or unsupported; makes limited use of textual evidence; fails to integrate quotations appropriately	Able to explain to a limited extent, the quality of a performance, event, or artefact; gives few insights into event, experience; discusses few qualities of an experience; a limited understanding of cultural impact with few examples
40% +	Trivial subject; very few supporting details for the thesis and topic sentences; has some correct & incorrect information	Not logically organized; digresses from one topic to another; no clear organizational pattern; language marred by Clichés	Frequently only narrates; digresses from one topic to another without developing ideas or terms; makes insufficient or awkward use of textual evidence	Little integration of experience and narrative; limited insight of issues and insufficient understanding of cultural impact