




MARKING SHEET	
Branch	Cambridge
Award Age Group (Branch)	Under 18 <input type="radio"/> Under 25 <input checked="" type="radio"/> Under 30 <input type="radio"/>
Award Age Group (NE Rowe)	Under 22 <input checked="" type="radio"/> Under 30 <input type="radio"/>
Title of Paper	Microwaves: from death rays to dinner
Candidate	Full Name: William Eustace Date of Birth: 05/08/1998 Email:
Date of Presentation	6th March 2018
Duration of Lecture	Allocated: min Taken: min
ASSESSMENT	
Each section is to be scored following the criteria suggested below.	
Timing – Keeping the allotted time Comments:	Blew his time schedule due to misunderstanding the brief - but <30
Presentation of Case – Adequacy of introduction, development of theme or topic, relevancy of conclusion Comments:	It was never clear exactly what the lecture was aiming to achieve, apart from amuse + inform - which it did achieve in the process .
Standard of Oral Presentation – Spoken delivery, audibility, speed, flow Comments:	Excellent and amusing delivery but time keeping was an issue.
Standard of Visual Presentation – Relevance, ease of reading and assimilation Comments:	Good visuals but too many for the time.
Discussion – Ability to answer questions, ability to clarify and elaborate to get the message over Comments:	Little time for discussion. He answered confidently though.
General – Originality choice of subject, relevance, technical content, grasp of subject Comments:	Would have been far better, and scored much better, if time had been taken more seriously.
TOTAL SCORE	47 / 60
Additional Comments:	
Judge	Name: P. J. JENKINS Signature:
	Email: pete.j.jenkins@btinternet.com



MARKING SHEET	
Branch	Cambridge
Award Age Group (Branch)	Under 18 <input type="radio"/> Under 25 <input checked="" type="radio"/> Under 30 <input type="radio"/>
Award Age Group (NE Rowe)	Under 22 <input checked="" type="radio"/> Under 30 <input type="radio"/>
Title of Paper	Microwaves: from death rays to dinner
Candidate	Full Name: William Eustace Date of Birth: 05/08/1998 Email:
Date of Presentation	6th March 2018
Duration of Lecture	Allocated: min Taken: min
ASSESSMENT	
Each section is to be scored following the criteria suggested below.	
Timing – Keeping the allotted time Comments:	1 / 5
Presentation of Case – Adequacy of introduction, development of theme or topic, relevancy of conclusion Comments:	8 / 10
Standard of Oral Presentation – Spoken delivery, audibility, speed, flow Comments:	9 / 10
Standard of Visual Presentation – Relevance, ease of reading and assimilation Comments:	8 / 10
Discussion – Ability to answer questions, ability to clarify and elaborate to get the message over Comments:	5 / 10
General – Originality choice of subject, relevance, technical content, grasp of subject Comments:	13 / 15
TOTAL SCORE	44 / 60
Additional Comments: A big over run time wise marked down timing + time for discussion. otherwise v-entertaining	
Judge	Name: KARL JONES Signature:  Email:



MARKING SHEET	
Branch	Cambridge
Award Age Group (Branch)	Under 18 <input type="radio"/> Under 25 <input checked="" type="radio"/> Under 30 <input type="radio"/>
Award Age Group (NE Rowe)	Under 22 <input checked="" type="radio"/> Under 30 <input type="radio"/>
Title of Paper	Microwaves: from death rays to dinner
Candidate	Full Name: William Eustace Date of Birth: 05/08/1998 Email:
Date of Presentation	6th March 2018
Duration of Lecture	Allocated: min Taken: min
ASSESSMENT	
Each section is to be scored following the criteria suggested below.	
Timing - Keeping the allotted time Comments: For Branch, disastrous - 30 minutes versus 20. But quite acceptable for NE Rowe. Scored for Branch, not NE Rowe, would be lower	4/15
Presentation of Case - Adequacy of introduction, development of theme or topic, relevancy of conclusion Comments: Excellent, recognising air was at least somewhat of a historical review. Sometimes seemed chaotic but the end was tied up in time.	9/10
Standard of Oral Presentation - Spoken delivery, audibility, speed, flow Comments: A little rushed. Almost acceptable, but just a little too quick. However, very engaging, entertaining and educational. Excellent presentation - a natural pro.	9/10
Standard of Visual Presentation - Relevance, ease of reading and assimilation Comments: Generally very good. Not quite 'state of the art' but varied, clear, and supported entertainment content well.	8/10
Discussion - Ability to answer questions, ability to clarify and elaborate to get the message over Comments: Tired out, formally. Some informal chat is the basis of the score. Very capable except on this point.	6/10
General - Originality choice of subject, relevance, technical content, grasp of subject Comments: Historical review but some imaginative selection of content and presented with great originality. Very entertaining.	14/15
TOTAL SCORE	50/60
Additional Comments: An unusual entry, but an outstandingly entertaining presentation. We will hear of him again.	
Judge	Name: Brian Phillipson Signature: B Phillipson Email: brian.phillipson@gmail.com



MARKING SHEET

Branch	Cambridge
Award Age Group (Branch)	Under 18 <input type="radio"/> Under 25 <input checked="" type="radio"/> Under 30 <input type="radio"/>
Award Age Group (NE Rowe)	Under 22 <input checked="" type="radio"/> Under 30 <input type="radio"/>
Title of Paper	Microwaves: from death rays to dinner
Candidate	Full Name: William Eustace Date of Birth: 05/08/1998 Email:
Date of Presentation	6th March 2018
Duration of Lecture	Allocated: min Taken: min

ASSESSMENT	SCORE
Each section is to be scored following the criteria suggested below.	
Timing – Keeping the allotted time Comments: <i>Appears to have misunderstood Branch 20 mins for presentation, but matched 30 min limit</i>	3 / 5
Presentation of Case – Adequacy of introduction, development of theme or topic, relevancy of conclusion Comments: <i>good, but slightly muddled in a few places</i>	8 / 10
Standard of Oral Presentation – Spoken delivery, audibility, speed, flow Comments: <i>clear, idiosyncratic, entertaining</i>	8 / 10
Standard of Visual Presentation – Relevance, ease of reading and assimilation Comments: <i>good pictures / diagrams – a bit heavy on equations.</i>	8 / 10
Discussion – Ability to answer questions, ability to clarify and elaborate to get the message over Comments: <i>little time available for discussion, but answered competently</i>	7 / 10
General – Originality choice of subject, relevance, technical content, grasp of subject Comments: <i>A good presentation, constrained by time restriction.</i>	12 / 15
TOTAL SCORE	46 / 60

Additional Comments: *An unusual subject, but a clear and entertaining speaker*

Judge	Name: DAVID WHITEHEAD Signature: <i>[Signature]</i> Email: david.whitehead@marshalladg.com
--------------	--