**Sample Scoring Rubrics for PresentationsScoring Rubric for Oral Presentations: Example #1**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Scoring Criteria** | **Total Points** | **Score** |
| **Organization**  **(15 points)** | The type of presentation is appropriate for the topic and  audience. | 5 |  |
| Information is presented in a logical sequence. | 5 |  |
| Presentation appropriately cites requisite number of references. | 5 |  |
| **Content**  **(45 points)** | Introduction is attention-getting, lays out the problem well, and  establishes a framework for the rest of the presentation. | 5 |  |
| Technical terms are well-defined in language appropriate for  the target audience. | 5 |  |
| Presentation contains accurate information. | 10 |  |
| Material included is relevant to the overall message/purpose. | 10 |  |
| Appropriate amount of material is prepared, and points made  reflect well their relative importance. | 10 |  |
| There is an obvious conclusion summarizing the presentation. | 5 |  |
| **Presentation**  **(40 points)** | Speaker maintains good eye contact with the audience and is  appropriately animated (e.g., gestures, moving around, etc.). | 5 |  |
| Speaker uses a clear, audible voice. | 5 |  |
| Delivery is poised, controlled, and smooth. | 5 |  |
| Good language skills and pronunciation are used. | 5 |  |
| Visual aids are well prepared, informative, effective, and not  distracting. | 5 |  |
| Length of presentation is within the assigned time limits. | 5 |  |
| Information was well communicated. | 10 |  |
| **Score** | **Total Points** | **100** |  |

Scoring Rubric for Oral Presentations: Example #2

Content and Scientific Merit (60 points)

*Introduction:*

○ Defines background and importance of research.

○ States objective, and is able to identify relevant questions.

*Body*:

○ Presenter has a scientifically valid argument.

○ Addresses audience at an appropriate level (rigorous, but generally understandable to a scientifically-minded group).

○ Offers evidence of proof/disproof.

○ Describes methodology.

○ The talk is logical.

*Conclusion*:

○ Summarizes major points of talk.

○ Summarizes potential weaknesses (if any) in findings.

○ Provides you with a “take-home” message.

Speaking Style/Delivery (20 points)

○ Speaks clearly and at an understandable pace.

○ Maintains eye contact with audience.

○ Well rehearsed (either extemporaneous or scripted presentation).

○ Limited use of filler words (“umm,” “like,” etc.).

○ Speaker uses body language appropriately.

○ Speaker is within time limits.

○ Speaker is able to answer questions professionally.

○ Speaker is dressed appropriately.

Audio/Visual (20 points)

○ Graphs/figures are clear and understandable.

○ The text is readable and clear.

○ Audio/Visual components support the main points of the talk.

○ Appropriate referencing of data that is/was not generated by presenter

General Comments

Scoring Rubric for Oral Presentations: Example #3

**PRESENCE 5 4 3 2 1 0**

-body language & eye contact

-contact with the public

-poise

-physical organization

**LANGUAGE SKILLS 5 4 3 2 1 0**

-correct usage

-appropriate vocabulary and grammar

-understandable (rhythm, intonation, accent)

-spoken loud enough to hear easily

**ORGANIZATION 5 4 3 2 1 0**

-clear objectives

-logical structure

-signposting

**MASTERY OF THE SUBJECT 5 4 3 2 1 0**

-pertinence

-depth of commentary

-spoken, not read

-able to answer questions

**VISUAL AIDS 5 4 3 2 1 0**

-transparencies, slides

-handouts

-audio, video, etc.

**OVERALL IMPRESSION 5 4 3 2 1 0**

-very interesting / very boring

-pleasant / unpleasant to listen to

-very good / poor communication

**TOTAL SCORE \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ / 30**

Scoring Rubric for Oral Presentations: Example #4

Poor Excellent

**PRESENTATION SKILLS 1 2 3 4 5**

Were the main ideas presented in an orderly and clear manner?

Did the presentation fill the time allotted?

Were the overheads/handouts appropriate and helpful to the audience?

Did the talk maintain the interest of the audience?

Was there a theme or take-home message to the presentation?

Was the presenter responsive to audience questions?

**KNOWLEDGE BASE**

Was proper background information on the topic given?

Was the material selected for presentation appropriate to the topic?

Was enough essential information given to allow the audience to effectively

evaluate the topic?

Was irrelevant or filler information excluded?

Did the presenter have a clear understanding of the material presented?

**CRITICL THINKING**

Were the main issues in this area clearly identified?

Were both theoretical positions and empirical evidence presented?

Were the strengths and weaknesses of these theories, and the methods used to

gather this evidence adequately explained?

Did the presenter make recommendations for further work in this area?

Did the main conclusions of the presentation follow from the material presented?

Were competing explanations or theories considered and dealt with properly?

**OVERALL IMPRESSION** **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** **/ 15**

**COMMENTS**

**TOTAL SCORE \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ / 100**