

## English C2.1

### Presentation Assessment Rubric

Criterion	Excellent (19–20)	Very Good (17–18)	Good (15–16)	Satisfactory (10–14)	Needs Improvement (0–9)
<b>1. Content &amp; Accuracy (25%)</b>	Deep, precise, and original analysis of the translation issue. Demonstrates excellent understanding and critical insight. Clear relevance to professional translation practice.	Accurate and detailed discussion with minor gaps or limited depth. Clear relevance to translation.	Generally accurate, though descriptive rather than analytical. Some oversimplification or minor conceptual issues.	Some inaccuracies or lack of focus. Discussion remains surface-level or inconsistent.	Missing, inaccurate, or irrelevant content. Shows minimal understanding of the topic.
<b>2. Engagement with Theory (20%)</b>	Sophisticated integration of scholarly sources and theories; strong critical engagement with key debates in translation studies.	Strong engagement with theory; references are well integrated though not always critically examined.	Adequate use of literature but mostly descriptive. Some attempt at linking theory to practice.	Limited or weak theoretical grounding. Reliance on few or outdated sources.	No relevant theory used or sources not cited appropriately.
<b>3. Professional Communication (20%)</b>	Clear, confident, and engaging delivery. Excellent pacing, pronunciation, and audience interaction. Professional tone throughout.	Mostly clear and confident delivery with minor hesitation or pacing issues. Maintains professional tone.	Adequate delivery; some unevenness in clarity, tone, or pacing. Moderate reliance on notes.	Hesitant or unclear delivery; limited engagement with audience. Tone occasionally informal or unfocused.	Ineffective delivery; reading directly from notes or slides. Poor time management.
<b>4. Use of Examples &amp; Application (20%)</b>	Highly relevant and insightful examples (texts, corpora, MT output, subtitling, etc.) that clearly illustrate theory-to-practice links.	Good selection of examples, generally well integrated and explained.	Some examples used; connection to theory or topic not always clear.	Minimal examples or poorly explained. Weak link to research question.	No examples or examples irrelevant to the topic.
<b>5. Visuals &amp; Organisation (15%)</b>	Highly professional slides/handout; logical structure and visual coherence. Transitions are smooth and easy to follow.	Clear slides; well-structured and visually appealing.	Adequate structure, though flow or visual design could be improved.	Weak structure or overcomplicated visuals. Limited coherence.	Disorganised slides, missing visuals, or confusing flow.