Presentation Title and Authors:

Members of Evaluating Team:

Evaluate each presentation for each criterion on a scale of 5 (unacceptable) through 8 (good) to 10 (perfect). (Evaluation criteria are found starting on the next page.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation Title:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>× 0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Research</td>
<td>× 0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Thinking</td>
<td>× 0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Effectiveness</td>
<td>× 0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constructive criticism:

What aspect(s) of the presentation did you find to be the most impressive?

What aspect(s) of the presentation do you think could use the most improvement?
Evaluation criteria:

- **Quality of the presentation’s research – 35%**
  Judgment of this will be based on:
  - How thoroughly did the authors research the presentation’s topic?
  - Did the authors come up with any surprising information about the topic?
  - Number of references
    - Don’t, however, ‘pad’ the presentation’s presentation with unnecessary fluff, information that doesn’t help the presentation get the presentation’s point(s) across, just up the number of references.
  - Quality of the presentation’s references (based roughly on how rigorously material would have been peer-reviewed). An ordered list:
    1. Publications – including review articles – from journals such as *Science, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Nature, Toxicon, Ecology*, or others from the list posted on the web site.
    2. Scientific books, especially edited volumes that contain individual chapters on the presentation’s topic.
    3. General science magazines aimed at a scientifically literate audience (e.g., *Scientific American, Science Weekly*).
    4. Other science-related sources, such as *Natural History* magazine, or the BBC or MSNBC science news web sites, press releases from universities, research groups, the FDA or CDC, etc. where the information may be valid, but there’s no rigorous review of the content by scientists. Such sources would be best used as a starting point for the presentation’s research. Ditto those sources listed after this.
    5. Encyclopedias, other ‘general’ reference books.
    6. Popular media (magazine & newspaper articles, TV documentaries, etc.)
    7. Personal experience
    8. 
    9. 
    10. Something the presentation “heard” or “read” somewhere.

- **Organization of presentation – 30%**
  Keep in mind that old aphorism about how to deliver an effective presentation:
  1. First the presentation tell ‘em what you’re going to tell ‘em. – the Introduction
  2. Then you tell ‘em. – the Results & Discussion
  3. Then you tell ‘em what the presentation just told ‘em. – the Summary.
  That’s somewhat tongue-in-cheek, of course, but it’s nevertheless full of wisdom. Keeping it in mind, the following criteria will be used to evaluate the presentation’s presentation, listed in rough order of their importance in assigning points:
    - **Introduction**
      - This should give the presentation’s audience the background they need to understand the presentation, tell the audience why the particular topic was selected (personal interest, ecological or medical importance, relevance to our everyday lives, etc.), and catch their interest...why should they care about the topic? It should also conclude with a concise statement of how the presentation is structured and what the audience is going to learn from it.
      - The presentation should provide the members of the audience with the information they need to understand the topic and its significance.
o **Results and Discussion**
  - This should involve a concise presentation of what was learned during the research phase and its significance for what the authors are trying to convey.

o **Summary and Conclusions**
  - This should involve a concise, effective presentation of what the audience should learn from viewing the presentation.
  - If appropriate, the authors could also add something about what they feel is the significance of their results, how they could be used, etc.
  - If appropriate, the authors could also use this section to discuss possible directions future research might take, etc.

o **References**
  - List the sources the presentation used to prepare the presentation’s presentation, *in acceptable science bibliography format*.

- **Evidence of original thinking? – 15%**
  o Did the presentation go beyond a simple ‘laundry list’ of facts?
  o Did the presentation convey anything new or particularly interesting?
  o Did the authors use the results of their research to come up with new insights, a new direction for research, a new hypothesis to be tested by future research, etc.?

- **Presentation Effectiveness – 20%**
  1. How well does the presentation convey information and inform the viewer?
  2. Was each slide in the presentation well-focused on a particular bit of information, and did it present/discuss that information effectively?
  3. How easy was it to read the slides and obtain information from them?
    - DO Google “how make effective PowerPoint presentation” and take to heart the information that’s available on the Web.
    - DON’T use garish or jarring backgrounds! The presentation should encourage the audience to focus on the information contained in the slide.
    - DON’T use dark fonts on dark backgrounds or light fonts on light backgrounds. Don’t make the audience have to work in order to read the text on the slides. The Web is full of sites that help one choose effective color combinations – use them!
    - DON’T use animated text unless it really helps the audience better understand a particular slide. Letters and words flying across a slide on their way to a landing site generally isn’t as cool as many web authors seem to think; usually it’s just irritating.
    - DO keep the amount of text and information on a single slide within reasonable limits. Don’t force the audience to read an entire paragraph – or even long sentences – to get the gist of a slide.
    - DO highlight the key point(s) on each slide.
    - DO pick a theme for the slides’ overall appearance (color, background pattern, etc.) and use it, insofar as possible, for all of the slides. It can be really irritating and distracting for the audience if each slide has a different appearance to it. They’ll end up paying more attention to the slides’ appearance than to the information they contain.
  4. If the presentation used animation, audio and/or video, was it necessary and effective, or simply a distraction?
    - Remember, as your mother told you, just because you *can* do something doesn’t mean you *should*. Resist the temptation to show off your web-authoring skills by adding bells and whistles to your presentation, unless doing so really helps convey the message.