

Scoring Rubric for Oral Presentation/Written Summary of Scientific Research Papers (for written omit Style/Delivery column)

Adapted from Brewer, C.A., and D. Ebert-May. 1998. Hearing the case for genetic engineering: breaking down the barriers of anonymity through student hearings in the large lecture hall. Journal of College Science Teaching 28 (2): 97-101.

Level of Achievement	Clarity	Content	Style/Delivery	Use of Visual Aids	Integration of Knowledge	Ability to Answer Questions
Excellent 25 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well thought out Use of proper language Significance clearly stated Previous work sets the stage for this study Handout and bibliography provided for audience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies the research question or work Has advanced understanding of the experimental approach and significance Critically evaluates results, methodology and/or conclusions Scientifically rigorous and well researched 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses time wisely Logical progression Speaks with good pacing Makes eye contact and does not read information Uses engaging tone and vocabulary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well placed images Charts summarize data and/or conclusions Size and labels are clear Very little text Figures and images explained and described well AV set up properly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrates research findings to broader context Understands implication of data or method Identifies future avenues of investigation Supports arguments or explanation with references 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anticipates audience questions Understands audience questions Can integrate knowledge to answer questions Thoroughly responds to questions
Good 20 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well thought out Use of proper language Significance clearly stated Handout and bibliography provided for audience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies the research question or work Has basic understanding of the experimental approach and significance Critically evaluates results, methodology and/or conclusions Well researched 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spends too much time on introduction Speaks well, but often back tracks Makes good eye contact and looks at notes occasionally Uses good vocabulary and tone 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent images but not always well placed Size and labels are clear Very little text Figures and charts are explained well AV mishaps resolved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimally integrates research findings to broader context Has some understanding of the implications of data or method Identifies some future avenues of investigation Supports arguments or explanation with references 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not anticipate audience questions Understands the audience questions Can integrate knowledge to answer the question Thoroughly responds to most questions

<p>Adequate 15 point</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Talk a bit disorganized • Shows some effort to use proper language • Significance a bit unclear • Handout and bibliography are not well formatted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research question a bit unclear • Description of experimental approach a bit confusing • Results and conclusions stated but not critically evaluated • No use of outside readings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation poorly timed • Presentation jumping from different topics • Some hesitation and uncertainty are apparent • Makes little eye contact • Monotone and non-engaging delivery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labels and legends are a bit unclear • Size might be a bit too small • Too much detail • Blocks of text on handouts or slides • Figures are explained well • AV mishaps resolved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not integrate the work or method into the broader context • Supports argument or explanation with few references • Makes some errors in interpretation and application of data or method • Makes few connections between data, method, and conclusions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not anticipate audience questions • Makes an effort to address question • Can address some questions • Overlooks obvious questions • Often responds poorly to questions
<p>Inadequate 10 points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Talk difficult to follow • Unclear language • Does not understand significance of paper • No handout or bibliography 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not understand research or work • Does not understand experimental approach • Does not understand conclusions or recognize implications for future work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation poorly timed • Jumbled with no logical progression • Makes no eye contact and reads from notes • Hesitation and uncertainty are apparent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labeling is not clear • Too small to see • No logical placement • Mostly text and very few images • Figures are not explained • AV mishaps unresolved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not integrate the work or method into the broader context • Makes little effort to use data to support arguments • Misinterprets information • Makes no connections between data, method, and conclusions • Lacks logic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Either makes no effort to respond to questions or does so poorly
<p>No effort 0 points</p>						