Presentation Rubric

Team (or individual) presentations are evaluated on a variety of aspects of the presentation including content, style, graphics, and teamwork.

Presentation Component	Unacceptable 0 Points	Acceptable 1 Point	Good 2 Points	Excellent 3 Points
Overview: introduction of presenter(s), case or problem and background described, agenda described	☐ no introduction or overview, background or agenda	☐ introduction of presenter(s) 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
☐ **Vocabulary**: appropriate and fluent use of terms and concepts	☐ 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
Rationale: 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 points
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; original graphics
☐ **Team Roles**: team members have equivalent roles (this part is excluded in individual presentations)	☐ unclear team roles	☐ clear team roles but unequal contribution	☐ clear roles, equal contribution	☐ clear roles, balanced contribution, good transition between presenters, cross reference each other
☐ **Discussion**: team (individual) 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
☐ **Reflection**: team (individual) can identify what they would do differently to improve	☐ little or no reflection	☐ ask for feedback; some defensiveness	☐ ask for feedback and clarify responses; generally nondefensive	☐ request feedback, clarify responses and link to performance changes; positive & curious