

Case-study presentation: Detailed assignment information**Deadlines and expectations**

Please see the [Assignment overview handout](#) for more on the content of the presentation.

- Your **presentation** will take place on the date listed on the [Schedule of topics](#) course web page. Some or all group members may present remotely as needed. Presentations will be recorded (and posted in Panopto on Sakai) unless your group requests and is granted an exception.
- Your **slides** are due on Sakai (in “Assignments”) by 1:00pm on the day of your presentation so that I can read them before class and make notes. (You may make minor edits and update your submission after 1pm, but please let me know if you do.)
- Your **self and peer evaluation** (see below) is due on Sakai by 1:00pm on the weekday following your presentation (Monday for a Friday presentation).
- **Division of labor:** It is not the case that every group member must participate in every phase of the project (including speaking during the presentation). Your group may divide up the tasks in any way that the group finds acceptable.

Group grading criteria

- The following grading rubric will be used to assign the presentation a **base grade**.

	Excellent (A)	Competent (B~C)	Needs work (D~F)
<i>Overall content</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article content accurate • Kaplan content accurate • Big-picture RQs - insightful • RQs/each study - insightful • Study results linked back to RQs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article: {mostly partly} accurate • Kaplan: {mostly partly} accurate • BPQs identified somewhat • Study RQs {mostly partly} disc'd • Results somewhat linked to RQs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article inaccurate • Kaplan inaccurate • BPQs insufficient • Study RQs insuffic. • No return to RQs
<i>Results and data graphics</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one data graphic shown • Data graphics decoded • DGs insightfully interpreted • Results insightfully explained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only a data <i>table</i> shown • DGs {mostly partly} decoded • DGs {mostly partly} interpreted • Results disc. not fully insightful 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No data visual • Decoding insufficient • Interpretation insuff • No results discussed
<i>Criticisms of the studies</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If relevant, criticisms of the study clearly raised and supported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criticisms unclear or insufficiently supported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of criticisms problematic
<i>Mechanics</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25-35 min of presentation • Insightful disc'n opportunities • Slides submitted on time • Slides easy to read/understand • Appropriate citations given 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation <25 min or >35 min • Disc'n opps too few/less insightful • Slides submitted late • Slides {partly very} hard to follow • Some citations given 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pres <15 min • No discussion opps • No slides used • No citations given

Self and peer evaluation (to be completed on Sakai)

- **Individual adjustments** to the base grade for each group member **may** be made according to the self and peer evaluation scores submitted for that individual. The self and peer evaluation will be submitted on Sakai when the presentation is given in class.

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 = Excellent work; was crucial component to group's success

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 participant in a group project performs at level 3 or 4. Level 5 participation is truly above and beyond.
- If you assign any ratings at levels 5, 1, or 0, please explain the basis for your rating in the space provided.

(1) 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 their equivalent)

___ Ease and familiarity with relevant material from the Kaplan chapter

(2) 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 their equivalent)

___ Ease and familiarity with relevant material from the Kaplan chapter

(3) 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 project?