Senior Seminar Evaluation Form: Presentation Student Speaker Rate the student in each category by assigning numerical grades (1-5, with 5 being the best); use the space on the right to comment constructively but critically. Please consider the rubric (next page) when rating each category. **Subject Matter** Understanding Context Depth **Presentation** Organization Delivery Visual Aids Clarity Overall Presentation Grade and general comments (you may use + or - modifiers, such as A- or C+)

Evaluator

Grading Rubric

Numerical grades are part of the departmental self-assessment process. Students should consider both the ratings and comments as valuable feedback for improving future presentations.

Subject Matter

Understanding: did the student show an understanding of the material appropriate to an undergraduate chemistry major?

- 5: The student understood all the material deeply.
- 4: The student understood all of the material, but the understanding of some points was superficial.
- 3: The student has almost complete understanding, but there are some errors.
- 2: The student showed understanding of many issues, but errors are frequent.
- 1: The student committed many errors, and demonstrated little understanding of the material.

Context: did the student place the work in its appropriate scientific context?

- 5: The student showed deep awareness of the previous work in the area, and other current work.
- 4: The student showed some awareness of both current work and previous work, but not exhaustively.
- 3: The student showed awareness, not deep, of the current context or the previous work.
- 2: The student barely touched on issues of context.
- 1: The student presented no contextual information.

Depth: was the subject treated in detail and not superficially?

- 5: The student covered all the necessary topics in depth.
- 4: The student covered most topics, and all essential ones, in depth.
- 3: The student covered some topics in depth, but not all of the essential ones.
- 2: The student covered few topics in depth.
- 1: The student covered all topics only at a superficial level.

Presentation

Organization

- 5: The presentation followed a logical sequence, and flowed smoothly from one section to the next.
- 4: The order of the presentation was logical, but the transitions were not all smooth.
- 3: The order of presentation was mostly good, but was awkward in one or two places.
- 2: The organization was awkward or jarring in several places.
- 1: The topics in the presentation were presented haphazardly, with no logical sequencing evident.

Delivery

- 5: The delivery was smooth, confident, well paced, and at the right volume.
- 4: There was some awkwardness in pacing or volume.
- 3: The delivery was poor enough to be noticeable but not poor enough to impair understanding.
- 2: Poor delivery impaired the clarity of the presentation.
- 1: The delivery prevented clear understanding of the presentation.

Use of Visual Aids

- 5: Visual aids were clearly laid out, appropriate in number, and easily legible. Figures and tables from outside sources were appropriately cited.
- 4: Most slides were good but some lacked clarity.
- 3: Slides were difficult to read and consistently had too much or too little information, but did not substantially impair understanding of the material.
- 2: Slides were sufficiently poor to make the material difficult to understand.
- 1: Slides showed little or no effort, poor organization, are unattractive, are inappropriate in number, and did not have the appropriate amount of information. Citations were lacking for figures and tables from outside sources.

Clarity

- 5: Everything was expressed very clearly.
- 4: All but the most difficult concepts were clearly explained.
- 3: Several points were not clearly explained.
- 2: Much of the presentation was difficult to understand.
- 1: The presentation was extremely garbled.

Overall Grade

The overall grade is the letter grade the evaluator wishes to assign the student for the presentation portion of the seminar course.