Case-study presentation: Detailed assignment information

This is an *individual* and *group* component of the case-study presentation assignment.

- **Objectives:** This assignment gives you an opportunity to sharpen your skills in...
  - Clearly articulating big-picture research questions (and language myths), measurable research questions, and experiment design and methodology, as well as how these aspects are related to each other
  - Creating or selecting a data graphic, parsing and interpreting the data graphic, and relating the results presented in the data graphic to research questions, experiment design, and ultimately a language myth
  - Working with your group to support each other's contributions to the project and to incorporate the individual contributions into a unified presentation
  - Giving a presentation to an expert or specialist audience (your classmates)

Structure and format of presentation

Please see the case-study presentation overview handout for more on presentation **content**.

- Your **presentation** will take place as shown on the Schedule of topics course web page. All group members must be present for presentation credit (30 points) unless special arrangements are made in advance.
- Each presentation should be **10–12 minutes** long. (Hard stop at 13 minutes!)
- Prepare **slides** for your audience that include your main points and any example stimuli, numerical data, or data graphics you will be discussing.
  - Each student will contribute their own slides for their area of responsibility, but when you give the presentation, have all content combined into **one set of slides**.
  - The group is encouraged to collaborate and discuss even the individual slides.
  - Feedback on the individual slides can be used to revise the final, combined slides.
- Keep the data graphic on screen while you are parsing and interpreting it. You can repeat the graphic with new commentary!
- **Deadlines** for slide submission:
  - Slides may be submitted as **PDF or .ppt files** or as a **link** (with download access!).
  - Submit your **individual** slides by **5pm one class day** before your presentation day (F for a M presentation) — *worth 15 points* (see *blue* items in grading rubric).
  - I will give you feedback by **5pm one calendar day later** (Sa for a M presentation).
  - Submit the **final combined version** of the slides on Canvas (in "Assignments") by **11:30am** on the day of your presentation so that I can read them before class and make notes. You may edit and update your submission after 11:30am, but please let me know if you have done this. (Only one combined submission per group.)
- Your **self and peer evaluation** (see below) is due on Canvas (in "Assignments") by **11:59pm** on the class day following your presentation (W for a M presentation)

Roles within the group

In a 4-person group, assign one member to each of the following roles (see overview handout for more details):

Role 1: Myth and big-picture research question (at beginning) + discussion of how the results addressed the measurable research question, and what this means for the big-picture research question and the myth (at end)

Role 2: Measurable research question(s) and methodology (structure of experiment / conditions / example stimuli) for the results represented in your group's data graphic

Role 3: Finalize the data-graphic slide; parse (orient the audience toward) and interpret (tell the story in) the data graphic

Role 4: Prepare the exam question for your group's presentation (details coming later)

- In a 3-person group, all group members do this piece together

All members: Work together to select or create the data graphic and understand how it relates to the research questions and the methodology!

Grading criteria (role ***4***: details later) *Individual part (blue) = 15 pts; group part (green) = 30 pts*

	Excellent (A)	**Competent (B~C)**	**Needs work (D~F)**
Content (group)	• Article content accurate, focused • Course concepts insightful	• {Mostly|partly} accurate, focused • Some course concepts applied	• Inaccurate, unfocused • Crs concepts missed
Mechanics (group)	• 10-12 min long • Group slides submitted on time • Slides easy to read/understand • Appropriate citations given	• Presentation >13 min • Group slides submitted late • Slides {partly|very} hard to follow • Some citations given	• Pres <10 min • No slides used • No citations given
Mechanics (invidivuidal)	• Slides submitted on time • Slides communicate well • *Revised* slides address feedback	• Slides submitted late • Slides show too little information • Slides hard to read	• No slides
*RQs, myth, discussion (role **1**)*	• Big-picture RQs insightful • Results linked to meas RQs • mRQs, bpRQs linked to myth	• bpRQs identified somewhat • Results somewhat linked to mRQs • Somewhat linked to myth	• bpRQs insufficent • Results not discussed • Myth not linked
*mRQs and experiment design (role **2**)*	• Meas RQs insightfully discussed • Measurable RQs quantitative • Stimuli exx linked to mRQs • Task explained • Participants explained	• Meas RQ missing some insights • Meas RQs not quantitative • Exx not shown|not linked to mRQ • Methodology partly explained	• Insufficient mRQ discussion • No stimuli discussed • No methodology discussed
*Results and data graphics (role **3**)*	• Data graphic shown • Data graphic parsed • DG insightfully interpreted	• Only a data *table* shown • DG {mostly|partly} parsed • DG {mostly|partly} interpreted	• No data visual • Parsing insufficent • Interpretation insuff

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

- Your **grade** for the self and peer evaluation component is determined as follows:
  - Up to 2 points for filling out **peer evaluations** thoughtfully
  - Up to 2 points for thoughtful answers on the **self evaluation**, including the reflection questions
  - Up to 1 point for the peer evaluation **scores and comments** you receive

Here is what you will see on Canvas (via GDocs) 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 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?