

Presentation Assessment Rubric

Criterion	Excellent (3 pt)	Good (2 pt)	Fair (1 pt)	Poor (0 pt)
Organization	Presentation is clear and logical.	Presentation is generally clear.	Listener can follow presentation with effort.	Presentation is very confused and unclear.
	Listener can easily follow line of reasoning.	A few minor points may be confusing.	Organization not well thought out.	Listeners cannot follow it.
	Time limit is kept and equally split among presenters.	Time limit is kept, slight unevenness in timing across presenters.	Time limit is not respected, or large differences in time taken by individual presenters.	Time limit/division is not respected.
	A good balance between the summary and the evaluation of the research work is achieved.	The summary and the evaluation of the research work are reasonably well balanced.	The summary and the evaluation of the research work are somewhat unbalanced.	The summary and the evaluation of the research work are clearly unbalanced.
Style & Pace	Level is appropriate (not too casual).	Level is generally appropriate.	Presentation is too informal or unprepared.	Presentation's level is consistently inappropriate.
	Speakers are easy to hear and understand.	May have some trouble in hearing or understanding a speaker.	Difficult to hear or understand speakers. Much of information is read.	Speakers can't be heard or understood. Information is read.
	Pace of presentation supports its understanding.	One speaker's pacing is too fast or too slow, repetitive or skipping important details.	More than one speaker is too fast or too slow, repetitive or skipping important details.	Speakers generally are too fast or too slow.
	Lively and inspiring presentation.	Presentation is generally enthusiastic.	Most of the presentation is monotonous.	Presentation is boring and not stimulating.
Content	Research work is well introduced.	Some components of the research are not covered or explained well.	Some components of the research are kept minimal or missing.	Major components of the research are missing.
	All components of the research are covered and clearly explained.	Research introduction and summary are generally clear.	Significant gaps in introduction and summary of the research.	Introduction and summary of the research are very difficult to follow. Listeners learn little.
	Research is well summarized. Information given is consistently accurate.	Some minor errors are made.	Enough errors made to be distracting, but some information is accurate.	Information is so inaccurate that listener cannot depend on the presentation.
Reflection	Research work is well motivated.	Lack of motivation of the presented research.	Minimal motivation of the research.	Research is not motivated.
	Key contributions of the work are made apparent.	Some contributions are vocalized.	Only few contributions are listed.	Contributions are not introduced.
	Relevance/importance of the paper for the research field and own work is clarified.	Relevance of the research is somewhat covered.	Research' relevance is not clear.	Relevance of the research is not provided.
	Validity of claims is carefully reviewed.	Validity of some claims is not reviewed.	Almost no claims are reviewed.	Claims are not reviewed.
	Assumptions and limitations of the work are discussed.	Not all limitations/assumptions are covered.	Few limitations/assumptions are mentioned.	Limitations/assumptions of the research are not covered.
	Own views on future research prospects are summarized.	Vision on future research prospects is not complete.	Vision on future research prospects is not clear.	Vision on future research is not presented.
	Strengths and weaknesses of the research are spotted.	No structured approach to highlighting research strengths/weaknesses.	Marginal strengths/weaknesses of the research are identified.	Analysis of strengths/weaknesses of the research not provided.
Use of Visual Aids	Aids prepared in professional manner. Legible and clear. Well organized. Main points stand out.	Aids contribute, but not all material supported by aids. Mostly legible and clear.	Aids are poorly prepared or used inappropriately. Hard to follow. Too much information is included.	No aids are used, or they are so poorly prepared that they detract from the presentation.
Discussion with Audience	Handling of discussion is done professionally.	Most of the discussion is handled professionally.	Discussion is not held in a professional manner.	Discussion is avoided.
	All questions are well addressed.	Majority of the questions are well-addressed.	Poor responses to questions.	Answers to questions are not meaningful or just wrong.
	Each of the presenters gets a chance to contribute.	Most of the presenters contribute to the discussion.	Few of the presenters take part in the discussion.	One presenter answers all questions for the group.