

# Assessment details for Seminar Numerik – Numerical Methods for Symmetric Eigenvalue Problems

## Assessment structure

1. Seminar \_\_\_\_\_ 60%
  - (a) Scientific content [20%]
  - (b) Structure of seminar [20%]
  - (c) Clarity of presentation & quality of exposition [20%]
  
2. Report \_\_\_\_\_ 30%
  - (a) Scientific content [10%]
  - (b) Presentation & structure of report [10%]
  - (c) Clarity & quality of exposition [10%]
  
3. Peer assessment \_\_\_\_\_ 10%
  - (a) Accuracy/consistency of assessment [5%]
  - (b) Critical analysis & feedback [5%]

# Assessment Criteria

## 1. Seminar

Total marks: 60

### Scientific content

Marks: 20

**0–6** : None, or only a partial amount, of the basic information is included.

**7–12** : The basic information is presented, and the background material is satisfactory. Some attempt is made to link the content with the overall topic of the seminar series. The mathematics and/or numerical results may contain errors/inconsistencies, and somewhat contribute to the overall message of the seminar. Some attempt is made to ensure the content is appropriate for the intended audience.

**13–20** : All the necessary information is included, with a minimal amount of unnecessary information. The relevant background material is included, and is linked well to the main topic of the presentation. The content is well linked to the overall topic of the seminar series, and the key concepts are highlighted. The mathematics and/or numerical results are correct, and strongly contribute to the overall message of the seminar. The content is well-suited for the intended audience.

### Structure

Marks: 20

**0–6** : The presentation does not follow a clear structure, or the structure is somewhat unclear. Poor use of visual aids.

**7–12** : The presentation follows a basic structure. Some attempt is made to link the different concepts. The visual aids are somewhat well prepared, and are partially successful in presenting the desired information.

**13–20** : The presentation follows a clear and logical structure. The different concepts presented are linked together well. The visual aids are well prepared, and successfully present the desired information. The length of the seminar is within the allowed time limit.

### Clarity & quality of exposition

Marks: 20

**0–6** : The explanation of the content is unsatisfactory or not clear. The presentation is not engaging, and little attempt is made to engage with the audience.

**7–12** : The content is explained in a satisfactory manner, and is somewhat engaging. Some attempt to link ideas throughout the presentation. Some mathematical objects and/or environments are not clearly defined and/or are incorrectly labelled. Some engagement with the audience.

**13–20** : Excellent exposition: the content is well explained, well motivated and integrated throughout. The whole presentation is clear and engaging, with the key concepts highlighted. All mathematical objects and environments are clearly defined. Good engagement with the audience.

## 2. Report

Total marks: 30

### Scientific content

Marks: 10

**0–2** : None, or only a partial amount, of the basic information is included.

**3–6** : The basic information is presented, and the background material is satisfactory. Some attempt is made to link the content with the overall topic of the seminar series. The mathematics and/or numerical results may contain errors/inconsistencies, and somewhat contribute to the overall message of the report.

**7–10** : All the necessary information is included, with a minimal amount of unnecessary information. The relevant background material is included, and is linked well to the main topic of the report. The mathematics and/or numerical results are correct, and strongly contribute to the overall message of the report. The content is well linked to the overall topic of the seminar series.

### Presentation & structure

Marks: 10

**0–2** : The report does not follow a clear structure, or the structure is somewhat unclear. Poor and/or inconsistent formatting or use of references.

**3–6** : The report follows a basic structure. Some attempt is made to link the different concepts. The formatting and use of references is satisfactory. Some mathematical objects and/or environments are not clearly defined and/or are incorrectly labelled.

**7–10** : The report follows a clear and logical structure. The different concepts presented are linked together well. The report is well formatted with attention to detail, and makes correct use of references. All mathematical objects and environments are clearly defined and correctly labelled. The length of the report is within the allowed page limit.

### Clarity & quality of exposition

Marks: 10

**0–2** : The explanation of the content is unsatisfactory or not clear.

**3–6** : The content is explained in a satisfactory manner. Some attempt to link ideas throughout the report. Some motivation and emphasis on different concepts.

**7–10** : The whole report is clear and reads well. The content is well explained, well motivated and integrated throughout. The key concepts are highlighted, and the context of the topic within the whole seminar series is explained well.

### **3. Peer assessment**

Total marks: 10

#### **Accuracy/consistency of assessment**

Marks: 5

**0–1** : Assessment is not at all consistent with other assessments.

**2–3** : Comments and marks are somewhat consistent with each other, and somewhat consistent with other assessments.

**4–5** : All aspects of the assessment are consistent.

#### **Critical analysis & feedback**

Marks: 5

**0–1** : No feedback, or little feedback provided.

**2–3** : Some feedback provided, and some indication of how marks were awarded.

**4–5** : Clear indication of how marks were awarded. Comments are well motivated, constructive and helpful.

# Seminar Assessment Form

Name of assessor:

Seminar topic:

Seminar presenters:

---

<b>Scientific content</b>	Mark awarded:	/ 20
Comments & feedback:		

<b>Structure of seminar</b>	Mark awarded:	/ 20
Comments & feedback:		

<b>Clarity &amp; exposition</b>	Mark awarded:	/ 20
Comments & feedback:		

---

## Mark for Peer Assessment

<b>Accuracy of assessment</b>	Mark awarded:	/ 5
<b>Critical analysis &amp; feedback</b>	Mark awarded:	/ 5