

## Final project: Slides and presentation

The final stages of the final project consist of:

### Slides & appendix document

- Organize your slides according to the categories specified on the grading criteria (below)
- Make sure the slides are legible: not too much information on a page, fonts and graphics not too small
- Keep the content streamlined, organized, and relevant
- Use the appendix document to present your full stimulus list, raw data, and other supporting details (no discussion necessary; simple table or outline format is fine, but provide headers to identify content)
- Upload slides & appendix document by 10:00am on the day of your presentation

### Presentation

- Your group may choose one of two presentation modes
  - In class, **M Nov 28** or **W Nov 30**
  - Asynchronous (recorded): **slides** uploaded by **Tu Nov 29** and **presentation** uploaded by **W Nov 30**
- See below for presentation grading criteria
- **Asynchronous** presenters will provide **forum comments** for 3 other asynchronous presentations (details on Sakai)

### Slides — Revision (optional)

- The expectations for the revised slides will be similar to those of the first submission
- One additional expectation: Slides edited to respond to feedback
- If revision is not submitted, grade for revision is same as original slides grade

Slides & appendix document: Grading criteria (blue = may be in appendix document instead of slides)

	Excellent (A)	Competent (B-C)	Needs work (D-F)
<b>Intro, research questions, justification</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has clear big-picture RQ - why should someone care about this topic?</li> <li>• Has clear measurable RQ, connected to BP RQ but specific &amp; quantitative</li> <li>• RQs, results stated in introduction</li> <li>• RQs given justification (with a citation)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Big-picture RQ not 'big' enough</li> <li>• Measurable RQ not stated</li> <li>• Measurable RQ relationship to BP RQ not made clear</li> <li>• One is missing in intro</li> <li>• RQs partially justified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No discernable big-picture RQ</li> <li>• No discernable measurable RQ</li> <li>• Two or more missing in intro</li> <li>• No discernable RQ justification</li> </ul>
<b>Methodology, data collection, measurement</b>  <b>'Fully described' = in replicable detail</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Materials are appropriate to RQ, and connection to RQ made explicit</li> <li>• Materials organized linguistically; structure/experiment conditions clear</li> <li>• Full set of stimuli presented</li> <li>• Approp. amt of data collected/used</li> <li>• Participants' task fully described, including how stimuli were ordered</li> <li>• Equipment settings fully described</li> <li>• Participant information included</li> <li>• Measurement criteria, landmarks clear; measurements appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minor problems with materials/RQ connection, or not made explicit</li> <li>• Materials not organized, or structure/conditions not discussed</li> <li>• Stimuli are summarized only</li> <li>• Materials have minor confounds</li> <li>• Data collection insufficient</li> <li>• Task partly described</li> <li>• Equip. settings partly described</li> <li>• Participant info partly included</li> <li>• Meas. criteria not fully clear, or not completely appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very unclear how materials relate to RQ, or explanation of connection has major problems</li> <li>• Expt had no comparison/control</li> <li>• Stimuli not presented</li> <li>• Materials have major confounds</li> <li>• Data collection not reported</li> <li>• Task not described</li> <li>• Equip. settings not described</li> <li>• No participant information</li> <li>• Meas. criteria very unclear, or very inappropriate</li> </ul>
<b>Results &amp; discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All data presented, well organized</li> <li>• Relevant data comparisons made</li> <li>• Helpful graphics for data or analysis; graphics interpreted in words</li> <li>• Analysis/interp explicitly justified with well-organized evidence</li> <li>• Discussion relevant/focused on RQ</li> <li>• Discn has clear, logical structure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data presented, but not well org</li> <li>• Some comparisons made</li> <li>• Data graphics but not fully helpful, or not explained/interpreted</li> <li>• Some justification; needs more</li> <li>• Needs more focus on RQ</li> <li>• Logic of discn not fully clear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not all data presented</li> <li>• Few or no comparisons made</li> <li>• Graphics needed but not used</li> <li>• No justification or arguments</li> <li>• No discernable RQ</li> <li>• Order of ideas unclear/illogical</li> </ul>
<b>Growth/learning (higher weight)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Class concepts used where approp.</li> <li>• Significant attempt made to find, discuss patterns</li> <li>• Responds to analysis-plan feedback</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some class concepts used</li> <li>• Some attempt to find, discuss patterns</li> <li>• Responds to some plan feedback</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient use of cls concepts</li> <li>• Little or no attempt to find, discuss patterns</li> <li>• Plan feedback not addressed</li> </ul>
<b>Mechanics (lower weight)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citations in discussion if applicable</li> <li>• Bibliography complete, consistent</li> <li>• Academic prose style; very few typos</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too many direct quotations</li> <li>• Bib inconsistent, or refs missing</li> <li>• Minor style deviations, some typos</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Few or no citations, if needed</li> <li>• Few or no refs in bibliography</li> <li>• Inconsistent with academic prose</li> </ul>

**Presentation: Grading criteria**

	<b>Excellent (A)</b>	<b>Competent (B-C)</b>	<b>Needs work (D-F)</b>
<b>Analysis, discussion of project</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RQs clearly stated up front, motivated</li> <li>• Findings clearly presented</li> <li>• Analysis/interpretation explicitly justified</li> <li>• Claims supported w/ organized evidence</li> <li>• Data graphics insightful, informative</li> <li>• Discussion relevant/focused on RQ</li> <li>• Class knowledge used appropriately</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has RQs, but not made fully clear</li> <li>• Findings not fully clear</li> <li>• Some justification; needs more</li> <li>• Evidence sparse or not well organized</li> <li>• Data graphics not fully insightful</li> <li>• Needs more focus on RQ</li> <li>• Some class knowledge used</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No discernable RQs</li> <li>• Findings very unclear</li> <li>• No justification or argumentation</li> <li>• No supporting evidence</li> <li>• No data graphics</li> <li>• Project seriously incomplete</li> <li>• Lacks focus</li> <li>• Serious underuse/cls knowledge</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness of handout/slides</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slides have crucial info</li> <li>• Slides legible and organized</li> <li>• New terms/formalisms explained</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slides: crucial info missing</li> <li>• Slides hard to read</li> <li>• New terms/formalisms not explained</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No slides provided</li> </ul>
<b>Timing, scope of presentation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time: 12 min, <math>\pm 2</math></li> <li>• Pres is of appropriate scope for time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too long (&gt;14 min) or short (&lt;10 min)</li> <li>• Scope somewhat too wide/narrow</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scope much too wide/narrow</li> </ul>