

Team Project Oral Presentation – Evaluation Criteria
FSHN 311

Group: _____

Score	Points	Criteria	100% (Excellent)	75% (Good)	50% (Fair)	25% (Poor)
	8	Overall Presentation: Organization	Presentation is clear and logical. Listener can easily follow line of reasoning.	Presentation is generally clear. A few minor points may be confusing.	Listener can follow presentation with effort. Organization not well thought out.	Presentation is very confused and unclear. Listeners cannot follow it.
		Style	Level is appropriate for presentation of scientific results. Not too casual. Speakers are easy to hear and understand.	Level is generally appropriate. May have some trouble in hearing or understanding a speaker.	Presentation is too informal or unprepared. Difficult to hear or understand speakers. Much of information is read.	Presentation is consistently at an inappropriate level. Information is read. Speaker can't be heard or understood.
		Pace	Presentation is a planned conversation, paced for audience 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.	Presentation is far too long or far too short. Speaker generally is too fast or too slow.
		Visual Aids	Aids prepared in professional manner. Font is large enough to be seen by all. Well organized. Main points stand out.	Aids contribute, but not all material supported by aids. Font size is appropriate for reading	Aids are poorly prepared or used inappropriately. Font is too small. Too much information is included.	No aids are used or they are so poorly prepared that they detract from the presentation
	4	Introduction	Discusses why the study was done. Pertinent background information is presented. Hypothesis is clearly presented.	Gives general discussion of the purpose of the study. Some relevant information may be missing.	Some information on the purpose of the study is given, but not background information is provided. Hypothesis is not stated.	Provides little or no information on why the study was done. No background information given.
	4	Summary of Methods	Design of experiment and methods are clearly stated	Design of experiment and methods are well described, but some items may be left out or insufficiently described.	Methods insufficiently explained. Large gaps in information.	Methods are not explained.
	10	Discussion of Results and Conclusions	Results and conclusions are clearly stated. Implications of results and 'where do we go from here' discussed. Information given is consistently accurate.	Description of results is generally clear. Some discussion of what results mean and implications of results. No significant errors are made.	Little discussion of what results mean and implications of results. Enough errors are made to be distracting, but some information is accurate.	Discussion of results is very difficult to follow. No discussion of meaning of results. Listeners learn little. Information is so inaccurate that listener cannot depend on the presentation.
	4	Responsiveness to Audience	Responds well to questions. Restates and summarizes when needed.	Generally responsive to questions.	Reluctantly interacts with audience. Responds poorly to questions.	Avoids audience interaction. Not responsive to group.

_____ **Total Score (30 total points)**