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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