

Presentations (novice-level)

	Excellent	Getting there	Needs work
<i>Myth and evidence</i>	• Myth explicitly stated • Evidence from article clear • Ev from art linked to myth	• Myth assumed but not stated • Ev from art shown, but unclear • Link somewhat unclear	• No clear myth used • No ev from art • Ev not linked to myth
<i>Audience design</i>	• Technical terms defined/avoided • Content engaging/relatable • Document stands alone; communicates info well	• Some tech terms not accessible • Content somewhat engaging • Document partly stands alone; may have communication gaps	• Heavy on tech terms • Not very engaging • Doesn't stand alone
<i>General structure</i>	• Article content accurate • Doc & pres relevant, focused • Course concepts used insightfully	• Content {mostly partly} accurate • {Mostly partly} relevant, focused • Some course concepts applied	• Many inaccuracies • Not relevant, focused • Crs concepts missed
<i>Mechanics</i>	• 5-8 min long • Document submitted on time • Document visually clear • Citations given (at end?)	• Presentation >8 min • Document submitted late • Doc't {partly very} hard to look at	• Pres <5 min • No document used • No citations given

Comments:

- Data graphic may, but need not, be used
 - You can create your own or alter the original to make it clearer / more focused
- Not required to fully parse/interpret data graphic *in your document*
 - Do what you need to do in order to make it clear (this can be done orally if slides)
 - But you might want a one-bullet-point statement of the take-away message
- Your document needs to be stand-alone (although you will also be presenting it)
 - This means: It is *comprehensible* and *communicates the main point* when only viewed (without a presentation)
 - Your presentation can definitely *add more detail* if you like