

## Chemistry 681: Literature Seminar Presentation Rubric

Student Name:

Faculty Evaluator:

	<b>Excellent (4 pts)</b>	<b>Good (3 pts)</b>	<b>Fair (2 pts)</b>	<b>Poor (1 pt)</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<i>Abstract is 200-300 words and includes topic, problem, background, method, results, conclusions and a figure. There are no grammatical errors.</i>	<i>Abstract is 200-300 words and includes topic, problem, background, method, results, conclusions and a figure. There are one or two grammatical errors.</i>	<i>One or two of the required components is missing and/or there are three to four grammatical errors.</i>	<i>More than two of the required components is missing and/or there are more than four grammatical errors.</i>	
<b>Delivery</b>	<i>Speaker presents a polished 40 minute talk. Speaker makes eye contact with and faces the audience while projecting his/her voice. Speaker does not read from slides/notes or exhibit any distracting habits.</i>	<i>One to two of the requirements are not met and/or the talk is less than 37 minutes or more than 43 minutes in length.</i>	<i>Three to four of the requirements are not met and/or the talk is less than 35 minutes or more than 45 minutes in length.</i>	<i>More than four of the requirements are not met and/or the talk is less than 30 minutes or more than 50 minutes in length.</i>	
<b>Organization and Visual Aids</b>	<i>Slides are well organized and legible with a good balance of text and figures. Citations are included and are correctly formatted. No important figures or diagrams are missing.</i>	<i>Slides are well organized and legible, however one to two of the other requirements are not met.</i>	<i>Slides are well organized in some places, but not others and/or three to four of the other requirements are not met.</i>	<i>Slides are not well organized and/or four or more of the other requirements are not met.</i>	
<b>Content Level, Depth, and Scope</b>	<i>The content level of the entire talk is appropriate for an audience of chemists. Experimental methods and results are described in appropriate detail. The scope of the research presented is appropriate.</i>	<i>Throughout most of the presentation the content level, depth and scope are sufficient.</i>	<i>In places the presentation content level, depth and scope are not sufficient or expectations for a single area is consistently not met.</i>	<i>Requirements for the appropriate content level, depth and scope are consistently not met.</i>	

	<b>Excellent (4 pts)</b>	<b>Good (3 pts)</b>	<b>Fair (2 pts)</b>	<b>Poor (1 pt)</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Integration of Chemical Principles</b>	<i>Seminar topic is chemical. The speaker integrates chemical principles into both the introduction and the body of the talk.</i>	<i>Seminar topic is chemical. The speaker integrates chemical principles into the introduction and at least once during the body of the talk.</i>	<i>Seminar topic is chemical. The speaker integrates chemical principles into the introduction of the talk, but not the body of the talk.</i>	<i>Seminar topic is not chemical or the speaker does not relate the topic to any underlying chemical principles.</i>	
<b>Analysis</b>	<i>Describes the relevance of specific results and discusses these results within the broader context of the seminar topic. Critiques the assumptions of others throughout the talk and/or offers suggestions for future work.</i>	<i>Describes the relevance of specific results and discusses these results within the broader context of the seminar topic.</i>	<i>Describes the relevance of specific results, but does not discuss these results within the broader context of the seminar topic.</i>	<i>Does not highlight the relevance of specific results or discuss the results within the broader context of the seminar topic.</i>	
<b>Ability to Answer Questions</b>	<i>Speaker correctly interprets questions. Responses demonstrate an in-depth understanding of chemical principles and the current literature.</i>	<i>Speaker correctly interprets questions. Responses demonstrate a sufficient understanding of chemical principles and the current literature.</i>	<i>Speaker interprets some questions correctly. Responses demonstrate a basic understanding of chemical principles and the current literature.</i>	<i>Speaker struggles to interpret questions. Responses demonstrate little or no understanding of chemical principles or the current literature.</i>	
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	

**Comments:**