Article presentation: Grading criteria and self/peer evaluations

Presentation grading criteria

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

	Excellent (A)	**Competent (B~C)**	**Needs work (D~F)**
Overall content (group)	• Article content accurate • Big-picture RQs – insightful	• Content {mostly|partly} accurate • BPQs identified somewhat	• Content inaccurate • BPQs insuffcient
Mechanics (group)	• At least 25 min long • Slides submitted on time • Slides easy to read/understand • Appropriate citations given	• Presentation <25 min • Slides submitted late • Slides {partly|very} hard to follow • Some citations given	• Pres <15 min • No slides used • No citations given
Mechanics (invidivuidal)	• Slides submitted on time • Slides communicate well	• Slides submitted late • Slides show too little information • Slides hard to read	• No slides
RQs and experiment design (role 1)	• Measurable RQs insightfully disc. • Measurable RQs quantitative • Stimuli exx linked to meas. RQs • Task explained • Participants explained	• Meas RQ missing some insights • Meas RQs not quantitative • Exx not shown |not linked to RQs • Methodology partly explained	• Meas RQ discussion insufficient • No stimuli discussed • No methodology
Results and data graphics (role 2)	• Results insightfully explained • At least one data graphic shown • Data graphics parsed • DGs insightfully interpreted • Results linked to meas RQs	• Results disc. not fully insightful • Only a data *table* shown • DGs {mostly|partly} parsed • DGs {mostly|partly} interpreted • Results somewhat linked to mRQs	• No results discussed • No data visual • Parsing insufficient • Interpretation insuff • No return to mRQs
RQs and experiment design (role 3)	• Measurable RQs insightfully disc. • Measurable RQs quantitative • Stimuli exx linked to meas. RQs • Task explained • Participants explained	• Meas RQ missing some insights • Meas RQs not quantitative • Exx not shown |not linked to RQs • Methodology partly explained	• Meas RQ discussion insufficient • No stimuli discussed • No methodology
Results and data graphics (role 4)	• Results insightfully explained • At least one data graphic shown • Data graphics parsed • DGs insightfully interpreted • Results linked to meas RQs	• Results disc. not fully insightful • Only a data *table* shown • DGs {mostly|partly} parsed • DGs {mostly|partly} interpreted • Results somewhat linked to mRQs	• No results discussed • No data visual • Parsing insufficient • Interpretation insuff • No return to mRQs
Interactive activities (role 5)	• Interactive activities included • Insightfully related to article • Audience task is made clear • Debriefing insightful	• Minimal activities included • Relation to article not insightful • Task not made fully clear • Debrief. not insightful / unclear	• No activities • Unrelated to article • Task very unclear • No debriefing
Discussion (role 6)	• If relevant, criticisms of the study clearly raised and supported • Results linked to big-picture RQs • Article related to course themes	• Criticisms unclear or insufficiently supported • Results somewhat linked to bpRQs • Somewhat related/course themes	• Discussion of criticisms problematic • No return to bpRQs • Not rel to course

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

- Your **self and peer evaluation** is due on Canvas (in Assignments) by **11:59pm** 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?