Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Topic

Group Members

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presentation Component** | **Unacceptable**  **0-1 Points** | **Acceptable**  **1-2 Point** | **Good**  **2-4 Points** | **Excellent**  **4-5 Points** |
| **Overview**: introduction of presenters, case or problem   and background described, agenda described | no introduction or overview, background or agenda | introduction of presenters but awkward, sketchy or unclear overview/agenda and background | confident and fluent introduction; clear overview/agenda and background, but could be more complete or polished | confident introduction of roles and contribution; clear purpose, overview, and agenda; relevant & clear background |
| **Style**: use effective verbal and nonverbal communication skills (e.g., voice volume, inflection, eye contact, etc.) | poor style (long pauses, reading speech, "Umm..." and other mannerisms, poor eye contact, monotone, etc.) | Either fluent delivery but reading, or awkward delivery but spontaneous | generally good delivery and spontaneity but could improve | Excellent style involving matching verbal and nonverbal style, good projection with inflection, spontaneous speaking |
| **Mechanics & Vocab** : appropriate and fluent use of terms and concepts, attention to spelling & grammar | little or no attempt to include terms, concepts, authors | use of terms but not well related, sporadic, misused or mispronounced | good use of terms but still uses jargon or forces or is awkward with use of terms | fluent vocabulary and pronunciation without pretention |
| **Application**: appropriate and insightful application of procedures and practices | little or no inclusion of techniques, application, or practices | inaccurate or incomplete use of techniques | generally good application, but lack polish, fluency, or originality | strong application with good fit, rationale, fluency, and originality |
| **Coverage**: thorough and balanced in treatment of topic | very incomplete, significant gaps, or biased treatment of topic | either thorough but biased, or incomplete and balanced | generally thorough and balanced but awkward, needs more evidence, or better sequencing | thorough coverage of topic per assignment with balanced treatment of perspectives |
| **Organization & Rationale**: logical and interesting format, explains reasoning and provides evidence | little or no reasoning, explanation, or evidence provided | reasoning and evidence presented but not well organized or poor sources | good logical reasoning and evidence, but not integrated | logical reasoning integrated with authoritative references on key pts |
| **Graphics**: attractive & balanced layout, legible font | no graphics (may be appropriate in some cases) | graphics present but poor quality (illegible, inconsistent, , etc.) | well done graphics but too much or too little, and not on key points | well-designed and attractive graphics that simplify or summarize key ideas |
| **Team Roles**: team members have equivalent roles | unclear team roles | clear team roles but unequal contribution | clear roles, equal contribution | clear roles, balanced contribution, good transition between presenters, cross ref |
| **Discussion**: team is prepared to facilitate discussion and is receptive to feedback | little or no discussion | discussion but without clear organization or purpose | prepared discussion questions | prepared questions on key areas, and responsive to and elicit participant reaction and questions |
| **Bibliography:** | No Bibliography is included | Bibliography in incorrect format | Partial bibliography with some weak references | Bibliography with proper format |
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