Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## PRESENTATION TITLE:

## GROUP MEMBERS:

Criteria	Strong (3)	Good (2)	Minimal (1)	Score
Structure and Organization	Presentation followed a clear and logical progression (introduction, body, and conclusion). Slides were utilized to enhance main points.	Presentation mostly followed a logical progression, but some slides were out of sort.	Presentation seemed disorganized and main concepts weren't effectively explained.	
Content	Presenters interpreted information on slides for audience. Terms/graphs/charts were effectively explained and labeled.	Some explanations were confusing, and/or labels missing.	Interpretation missing. Labels missing and/or inappropriate.	
Presence	All presenters spoke directly to audience, appeared comfortable, and natural.	Most of the members spoke to the audience, though frequently read from slides.	Read directly from slides. Presenters do not appear to be prepared.	
Impact	Main message was clear and presenters were enthusiastic and confident in their material. Audience appeared engaged.	Presenters didn't appear fully confident in the material. Audience seemed sometimes bored/unengaged	Presenters seemed uncomfortable with material. Audience appeared bored/confused.	
Voice and Time	All members use a loud voice and presentation is within the allotted time $(20 - 25 \text{ minutes})$ .	Most of the members use a loud voice and presentation is within the allotted time $(20 - 25 \text{ minutes})$ .	Presentation is not within the allotted time $(20 - 25 \text{ minutes})$ .	
Peer Review	Strong (10)	Good (8)	Minimal (6)	AVG

Does the presentation include all of the required components? 1 2 3 4 5

<ul><li> Issue stated?</li><li> History?</li></ul>	YES / NO YES / NO
• Activity?	YES / NO
<ul><li> Positions?</li><li> Summary?</li></ul>	YES / NO YES / NO

COMMENTS...