Group members: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Excellent (7-10 pts)** | **Satisfactory (4-6 pts)** | **Needs Improvement (0-3)** | **Points** |
| **Quality of slides** | Visuals are clear, legible, and interpretable. Text is not overwhelming but provides enough detail to support graphics. | Visuals are interpretable, but clarity (size, colors) is not great. Too much text on slides, or not enough to support the speakers | Visuals are not clear or interpretable. Text is poorly written and does not support research and presenters. |  |
| **Quality of Speakers** | Good transitions between members, everyone spoke clearly and loud enough to be heard and understood. Everyone demonstrated substantial understanding of the research project. | Good transitions, but some speakers were not loud enough to be heard or could not be understood. Not everyone demonstrated understanding of the research project. | Perhaps one group member dominated the presentation, and/or transitions were awkward. Group members are not demonstrating adequate understanding of the project. |  |
| **Organization** | Logical and organized flow of information. Could use the IMRD structure or another well-defined structure. | Presentation was structured/organized, but it was not well defined and was difficult to follow. | No organization to the presentation, making it difficult to follow along. |  |
| **Description of Research** | Research project/question well defined. Clear links to literature and/or broader context. Methods/results clearly explained | Research question was well-defined, but no attempt was made to put it in context. Methods/results were clearly explained | Difficult to assess what the research question was and how the group went about answering it. |  |
| **Overall impression** | Really well done talk. Students clearly engaged the topic and worked hard on the presentation. All members up to speed on the research and appearing to work well together | Talk has areas that could use improvement but the overall impression of the research is good. Most members seeming to participate in process while others could use more preparation | Speakers not well prepared and the presentation suffered. Members not obviously engaging with the research project. |  |
| **Final Comments & Score** |  | | |  |
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