

Presenter: _____

Reviewer: _____

Grading Guidelines:

Following the assignment guidelines, your score is based on total possible points per feature of your presentation. For specific suggestions and comments, please see what is written in the comments section below.

Content Review*Background information, current research and gaps in knowledge.*

10	Excellent	8	7	Good	5	4	Needs Improvement	2
Background information and current research set the stage for the gaps in knowledge in this particular field. Information presented is scientifically correct.			More or an insufficient amount of background information and current research is presented than needed, leaving little/no time for gaps in knowledge. Information is for the most part scientifically correct.			Most/all of the presentation is background, and is mostly scientifically incorrect. No current research and/or gaps in knowledge are presented.		

Hypothesis/goal, research + controls, and the broad impact of proposed study.

20	Excellent	18	17	Good	15	14	Needs Improvement	12
Hypothesis/goal is clearly stated and explicitly "fills" any gaps in knowledge. The experimental design is clearly described (with appropriate controls) and directly addresses the hypothesis. Audience understands the broad impact of the research.			Hypothesis/goal is not overtly stated, but can be deduced. Experimental design (including controls) is somewhat discussed, and may or may not address the hypothesis/goal. Broad impact not clearly discussed.			Hypothesis/goal is not presented whatsoever. Experimental design leaves audience confused and/or how the plan addresses the hypothesis is lacking. No broad impact of studies is mentioned.		

Expected Outcomes & Potential Pitfalls.

10	Excellent	8	7	Good	5	4	Needs Improvement	2
Expected outcomes are scientifically correct given the proposed experimental approach. Potential pitfalls are meaningful and appropriate given the method.			Expected outcomes are mostly scientifically correct given the proposed experimental approach. Potential pitfalls are mostly appropriate/accurate.			Expected outcomes are incorrect or not presented. Potential pitfalls are not appropriate or not presented.		

Expertise*Confident delivery and clear answers to questions.*

10	Excellent	8	7	Good	5	4	Needs Improvement	2
Presenter persuades audience of expertise. Answers to questions are easily understandable.			Presenter mostly conveys topic expertise to audience. Answers to questions are somewhat understandable.			Presenter demonstrates a lack in confidence about topic presented – either throughout the presentation or in answers to questions.		

General chemistry knowledge.

10	Excellent	8	7	Good	5	4	Needs Improvement	2
Presenter demonstrates senior-level chemical knowledge in presentation and answers to questions.			Presenter demonstrates junior-level chemical knowledge in presentation and/or question answers.			Presenter demonstrates a minimal amount of chemical knowledge in presentation and/or question answers.		

Organization*Is the overall presentation organized in a logical manner and presented on time?*

10	Excellent	8	7	Good	5	4	Needs Improvement	2
Presented material clearly builds off of itself throughout the presentation in a logical manner. Presentation is on time.			Ideas mostly flow, however a few ideas are presented out of order, causing some confusion. Presentation ends early or late.			Ideas are scattered with no clear organization. Presentation ends very early or late, demonstrating a lack of practice.		

Use of clear visual aids.

10	Excellent	8	7	Good	5	4	Needs Improvement	2
Writing is easily legible. Figures are neatly drawn, clearly labeled, and aid in understanding the material.			Writing is mostly legible. Figures are somewhat neat and labeled and aid in audience comprehension for the most part.			Writing and/or figures are too messy to understand, detracting audience's attention from the presenter/material.		

Style & Delivery*Is your presentation slow, clear, and loud enough for the audience to hear? Did you make frequent eye contact with your audience?*

5	Excellent	4	Good	3	2	Needs Improvement	1	
Presentation is easily audible and slow enough for the audience to follow. Presenter makes eye contact with multiple audience members.			Presentation is somewhat audible, and slightly too fast for the audience to easily follow. Eye contact is made, but with only a few audience members.			Presenter is difficult to hear and speaks too fast to follow the material. Eye contact is very limited or missing altogether.		

Enthusiasm and audience engagement.

5	Excellent	4	Good	3	2	Needs Improvement	1	
Material is presented in an enthusiastic and professional manner. Audience is clearly engaged in understanding.			Presentation is mostly lacking enthusiasm and/or professionalism. Audience struggles to be engaged.			Material is presented in a dull manner (as if the presenter does not care her/himself). Audience clearly loses interest.		

Mental Acuity*Did you demonstrate the ability to think on your feet?*

5	Excellent	4	Good	3	2	Needs Improvement	1	
Presenter responds to errors in presentation and/or questions fluidly, demonstrating deftness in thought.			Presenter somewhat fumbles with any errors in presentation and/or questions, demonstrating a need for more practice in thinking on her/his feet.			Presenter lacks any ability to recover from any errors in presentation and/or questions.		

Logical and deductive critical thinking.

5	Excellent	4	Good	3	2	Needs Improvement	1	
Presenter demonstrates the ability to logically deduce answers to questions in the even she/he does not know the answer outright.			Presenter demonstrates the ability to deduce answer to questions with guidance from the audience.			Presenter does not attempt and/or cannot deduce answers to questions, even with guidance from the audience.		

Total Score:**Comments:**