

Assessment : final podcast episode (Josephine Hoegaerts)

<b>Criteria to be assessed</b>	<b>1 passable</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3 good</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5 excellent</b>
Intellectual honesty and scholarly transparency	The host does not take credit for other scholars' work but does not identify them consistently or clearly, interviews are included in the podcast, but interviewees' are introduced in an unclear manner, or their voices are not given enough space		Other scholars are clearly identified, some citations or paraphrases may not be flagged obviously; literature consulted is mentioned but is not given a clear place of its own, the host acknowledges contributions of interviewees but occasionally talks over them, or fails to give them significant space		Citations or paraphrases of other scholars are recognizable and clearly flagged, the literature consulted to put together the podcast is showcased clearly, either in the narrative or in shownotes, interviewees are identified clearly and correctly and their contributions to the narrative acknowledged by the host
Use of sonic elements	The narrative is carried out as spoken word, but does not take into account the pace and style necessary for it to be clearly understandable. The podcast contains sonic elements other than speech, but they are poorly timed, not clearly relevant, or integrated clumsily		The narrative differs from written text, and shows adaptation to its sonic nature, some sonic elements other than speech have been integrated in relevant places, the tone of the narrative may not have been adapted perfectly to the intended audience or content of the episode, the coherence between content, tone, and host has been thought of but is not consistent throughout the episode		The narrative is fully supported by the sonic nature of the podcast, all sonic elements integrated are relevant and well-timed, all sounding material is analyzed, the tone of the narrative matches the goal and intended audience of the episode, the language and pace of speech are adapted to the spoken nature and content of the narrative
Relevant use and understanding of concepts in sound studies	The podcast refers to one or two concepts in the field of sound studies but does so clumsily, or revealing an incomplete understanding of the concepts		The narrative integrates some concepts in a relevant manner, the concepts are used elucidate the case presented in the episode, but the conceptual and analytical development of the episode does not contribute anything new to the field of sound studies		The narrative integrates the concepts of soundstudies seamlessly and correctly, the podcast presents a novel contribution to sound studies as a field of study
Formal requirements	The episode is several minutes too short or too long, the episode shows some signs of editing but they are carried out clumsily, parts of the narrative are unclear because of the audio quality or the lack of overall structure of the episode		The episode is no more than 2 minutes too long or too short, the episode is edited but not all edits are equally smooth or well-chosen, audio and narrative are clear overall but have occasional patches of noise or structural unclarity		The episode is between 10-15 mins long, obvious hesitations or sonic obstacles have been smoothly edited out, all audio is audible, the narrative has a clear overall structure

Assessment : final podcast episode (Josephine Hoegaerts)