

## Article presentation: Grading criteria and self/peer evaluations

### Presentation grading criteria

- The following rubric will be used to assign **group and individual grades**. (Only you will see your individual feedback and grade.)

|   | <b>Excellent (A)</b>  | <b>Competent (B~C)</b>   | <b>Needs work (D~F)</b>  |
|---|---|--|--|
| <i>Overall content (group)</i>            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Article content accurate</li> <li>Big-picture RQs – insightful</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Content {mostly partly} accurate</li> <li>BPQs identified somewhat</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Content inaccurate</li> <li>BPQs insufficient</li> </ul>  |
| <i>Mechanics (group)</i>                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 25 min long</li> <li>Slides submitted on time (Tu)</li> <li>Slides easy to read/understand</li> <li>Appropriate citations given</li> <li>Responsibility list submitted</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation &lt;25 min</li> <li>Slides submitted late</li> <li>Slides {partly very} hard to follow</li> <li>Some citations given</li> <li>Responsibility list submitted late</li> </ul>                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pres &lt;15 min</li> <li>No slides used</li> <li>No citations given</li> <li>No responsibility list</li> </ul>                                  |
| <i>Mechanics (individual)</i>             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slides submitted on time (Mon)</li> <li>Slides communicate well</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slides submitted late (Mon)</li> <li>Slides show too little information</li> <li>Slides hard to read</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No slides (Mon)</li> </ul>  |
| <i>RQs and experiment design (role 1)</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measurable RQs insightfully disc.</li> <li>Measurable RQs quantitative</li> <li>Stimuli exx linked to meas. RQs</li> <li>Task explained</li> <li>Participants explained</li> </ul>         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meas RQ missing some insights</li> <li>Meas RQs not quantitative</li> <li>Exx not shown  not linked to RQs</li> <li>Methodology partly explained</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meas RQ discussion insufficient</li> <li>No stimuli discussed</li> <li>No methodology</li> </ul>  |
| <i>Results and data graphics (role 2)</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results insightfully explained</li> <li>At least one data graphic shown</li> <li>Data graphics parsed</li> <li>DGs insightfully interpreted</li> <li>Results linked to meas RQs</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results disc. not fully insightful</li> <li>Only a data <i>table</i> shown</li> <li>DGs {mostly partly} parsed</li> <li>DGs {mostly partly} interpreted</li> <li>Results somewhat linked to mRQs</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No results discussed</li> <li>No data visual</li> <li>Parsing insufficient</li> <li>Interpretation insuff</li> <li>No return to mRQs</li> </ul> |
| <i>RQs and experiment design (role 3)</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measurable RQs insightfully disc.</li> <li>Measurable RQs quantitative</li> <li>Stimuli exx linked to meas. RQs</li> <li>Task explained</li> <li>Participants explained</li> </ul>         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meas RQ missing some insights</li> <li>Meas RQs not quantitative</li> <li>Exx not shown  not linked to RQs</li> <li>Methodology partly explained</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meas RQ discussion insufficient</li> <li>No stimuli discussed</li> <li>No methodology</li> </ul>  |
| <i>Results and data graphics (role 4)</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results insightfully explained</li> <li>At least one data graphic shown</li> <li>Data graphics parsed</li> <li>DGs insightfully interpreted</li> <li>Results linked to meas RQs</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results disc. not fully insightful</li> <li>Only a data <i>table</i> shown</li> <li>DGs {mostly partly} parsed</li> <li>DGs {mostly partly} interpreted</li> <li>Results somewhat linked to mRQs</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No results discussed</li> <li>No data visual</li> <li>Parsing insufficient</li> <li>Interpretation insuff</li> <li>No return to mRQs</li> </ul> |
| <i>Interactive activities (role 5)</i>    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interactive activities included</li> <li>Insightfully related to article</li> <li>Audience task is made clear</li> <li>Debriefing insightful</li> </ul>                                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimal activities included</li> <li>Relation to article not insightful</li> <li>Task not made fully clear</li> <li>Debrief. not insightful / unclear</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No activities</li> <li>Unrelated to article</li> <li>Task very unclear</li> <li>No debriefing</li> </ul>  |
| <i>Discussion (role 6)</i>                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If relevant, criticisms of the study clearly raised and supported</li> <li>Results linked to big-picture RQs</li> <li>Article related to course themes</li> </ul>                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Criticisms unclear or insufficiently supported</li> <li>Results somewhat linked to bpRQs</li> <li>Somewhat related/course themes</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion of criticisms problematic</li> <li>No return to bpRQs</li> <li>Not rel to course</li> </ul>  |

---

**Self and peer evaluation** (to be completed as an online form)

- Your **self and peer evaluation** is due on Canvas (in Assignments) by **5:00pm** on the weekday following your presentation, generally a Wednesday.
- Your **grade** for the self and peer evaluation component is determined as follows:
  - Up to 10 points for filling out **peer evaluations** thoughtfully
  - Up to 6 points for thoughtful answers on the **self evaluation**, including the reflection questions
  - Up to 4 points for the peer evaluation **scores and comments** you receive

Here is what you will see on Canvas (possibly via GDoc) for the self and peer evaluations:

Please assess your work and that of your group colleagues by using the following criteria. Be honest and fair in your assessment. You may use the open-ended questions at the end of the ratings for any additional information that you would like to provide.

*Rating scale:*

5 = Above and beyond; was crucial component to group's success ("**extra credit**")

4 = **Very strong work; contributed significantly to group**

3 = **Sufficient effort; contributed adequately to group**

2 = Insufficient effort; met minimal standards of group

1 = Little or weak effort; was detrimental to group

0 = Did not contribute to the group at all

- The typical **good** participant in a group project performs at **level 4 or maybe 3**. **Level 5 participation is truly above and beyond: a score of 5 should not be given lightly.**
- If you assign any ratings at levels 5, 1, or 0, please explain the basis for your rating in the space provided.

***SELF evaluation***

\_\_\_ Participation in developing ideas, finding resources, writing slides, and/or presenting project, according to group's planned division of labor

\_\_\_ Willingness to discuss the ideas of others

\_\_\_ Cooperation with other group members

\_\_\_ Attendance/participation in group meetings (or shared documents)

\_\_\_ Ease and familiarity with relevant material from the article and our course

***PEER evaluation*** (to be filled out for each group collaborator)

\_\_\_ Participation in developing ideas, finding resources, writing slides, and/or presenting project, according to group's planned division of labor

\_\_\_ Willingness to discuss the ideas of others

\_\_\_ Cooperation with other group members

\_\_\_ Attendance/participation in group meetings (or shared documents)

\_\_\_ Ease and familiarity with relevant material from the article and our course

***Reflection questions***

- What did you learn from the experience?
- What do you think went well?
- What would you have done differently, given the opportunity?
- Do you have any other comments or suggestions about the presentation assignment?