

# Overview of the Presentation Rubric

	Excellent	Very Good	Fair	Poor
<b>Awareness of Audience &amp; Delivery</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Builds trust and holds attention of the audience;</li> <li>Fluctuation in volume and inflection help to maintain audience interest and emphasise key points.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quick recovery from minor mistakes;</li> <li>Fairly consistent use of direct eye contact with the audience;</li> <li>Satisfactory variation of volume and inflection.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some tension or indifference apparent;</li> <li>Occasional but unsustained eye contact with audience;</li> <li>Uneven volume with little or no inflection.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nervous tension obvious;</li> <li>No effort to make eye contact with audience;</li> <li>Low volume and/or monotonous tone cause audience to disengage.</li> </ul>
<b>Technical Content &amp; Organisation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major technical details summarised and effectively persuades the audience re the validity of the approach taken.</li> <li>Conclusions/ideas are supported by evidence where appropriate.</li> <li>Excellent organisation and use of illustrations.</li> <li>Innovation beyond the specification.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear description of approach taken although audience may not be persuaded of it's validity/ appropriateness.</li> <li>Reasonable attempt at providing evidence to support claims.</li> <li>Very good structure, consistency and use of illustrations.</li> <li>Innovation beyond the specification.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some major technical details left un-clear.</li> <li>Includes very thin data or evidence in support of ideas or conclusions;</li> <li>Minor issues in relation to the structure, consistency and general organisation of the presentation.</li> <li>No innovation beyond the specification.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fails to effectively persuade the audience of usefulness of the approach taken.</li> <li>Very weak or no support of technical proposal by way of examples, facts, and/or statistics;</li> <li>No major ideas proposed and/or audience left confused.</li> <li>No innovation beyond the specification.</li> </ul>
<b>Timing &amp; Handling of Questions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excellent answers given for all questions;</li> <li>Excellent use of allocated time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear and satisfactory answers given for all questions;</li> <li>Finished presentation of relevant content on time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reasonable answers given to all most questions;</li> <li>Covered most of the relevant content in the allotted time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incomplete or vague answers for the majority of questions;</li> <li>Fails to cover the main points of the presentation in the allotted time.</li> </ul>

Note: Specified criteria points for each grading category are examples only.