Undergraduate Oral Presentation Evaluation
Oklahoma Collegiate Academy of Science

Student(s) Name:_____

Presentation Title: _____

_____

Institution: _____ OAS Section: _____

One award for "**Outstanding Undergraduate Oral Presentation**" will be awarded in each section; based on combined results of judging forms. Use the rubric on the following page to evaluate each undergraduate student's presentation.

rubric points_____

Does this paper merit consideration for the "Best Paper of Academy" award?
If "Yes" then you may award "tie-breaker points" from 1 to 5 points. **tie-breaker points**_____

Comments (optional): **total points awarded**_____

Reviewer Name: _____ Initials:_____

Reviewer Email (for additional questions if needed: _____

Return completed form to the registration/info table or email to Jerry Bowen (jbowen@rsu.edu)

Undergraduate Oral Presentation Evaluation – Oklahoma Collegiate Academy of Science

Criterion	1 - Unacceptable	2 - Acceptable	3 - Good	4 - Exemplary	Rating (1-4)
Project Overview (Purpose Or Goal)	The central idea is unclear throughout the presentation. It is never clearly stated.	By the time the speaker gets to the end of the presentation, the main idea is clear, but it took real work for the audience to figure out that main idea.	The main idea is generally clear, but the presentation sometimes wanders off topic. The importance of the project may need to be inferred rather than being explicit.	The central idea of the project is immediately clear to the audience. The overall idea clearly has merit.	
Disciplinary Context & Importance	Neither the broad context for the project nor the existing background that justifies the current narrow project are presented. The project's importance is unclear.	The project is presented with a narrow focus. Wider connections aren't fully presented, but a solid background for the narrow focus area is included.	The broader context of the project is presented, although not clearly. The audience has to infer those interconnections or the project's importance.	The project is clearly placed within the broader context of the discipline. The importance of the project is clearly explained.	
Organization	The flow of ideas is unclear. The audience struggles to see organization, and has trouble figuring out how things are interconnected.	The main ideas are understandable, but there is a sense of disorder or awkwardness in the flow. There are small problems throughout the talk.	The reasoning flows well overall, but there are detours along the way, distracting the audience. The main points come through clearly, nonetheless.	The ideas flow smoothly. The progression from thesis to background to evidence and discussion is clear, with good flow and transitions.	
Mechanics	The talk is unclear and prevents the audience from understanding a significant portion of the ideas. Presentation issues are frequent and annoying.	The talk is just standard, without distinction. Presentation issues occur repeatedly, but are not excessive. The audience perceives the talk as just "okay".	The talk is clear, but not unusually interesting. There are a few problems that distract the audience, but they are not major disruptions to the flow of the talk.	The talk is interesting, and the audience would describe the speaker as well spoken. Presentation mannerisms, if any, do not distract the audience.	
Presentation Aids (PowerPoint, Visual Aids, Handouts)	Presentation aids aren't used, or are used poorly. The aids interfered with communication of ideas rather than enhancing communication. The audience finds them annoying more often than not.	Presentation aids are used, but clearly have issues. They may be too detailed, or just text, or generally unclear. Main ideas are still present, but the presentation aids are only adequate.	Appropriate presentation aids are used. Material is clearly displayed, and both text and graphics are used. A few issues with level of detail or graphic style are present, but do not interfere with communicating ideas.	Presentation aids clearly enhance the presentation and have a professional feel. Visual material is clear, with sufficiently large fonts and an appropriate mix of text and graphic material. The level of detail is appropriate.	
Results & Discussion	The discussion is significantly unclear or the conclusions are unsupported. The project appears incomplete or incorrect.	The discussion is sometimes incomplete or the logic for a conclusion is incorrect. However, the core content and conclusions are present.	Arguments/experimental analysis/ creative explanations are clear. The depth of discussion may sometimes be lacking a little, or the logic for a conclusion is incomplete.	Main student ideas/creations or experimental ideas are clearly presented and discussed. The logic behind conclusions is laid out clearly.	
Overall Depth	The project does not have much complexity. The ideas and analysis are lower level undergraduate only. The feel of the project is one of being scattered or incomplete.	A good amount of work is represented in this project. The presentation of that work is uneven, and connections with published work are incomplete, as is some of the analysis.	The content of this project has good detail, but not an unusual amount. The integration of fresh work with past knowledge is good, but not perfect.	The content of this project is rich and deep. Ideas are fleshed out with ideas from references and from fresh knowledge or analysis. The level is clearly upper level undergraduate.	
				TOTAL RUBRIC POINTS (Maximum Rubric Score = 28 Points)	