**Science and Policy Presentations: Grading Rubric**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Numerical scale: 5 = excellent, 4 = good, 3 = meh, 2 = weak, 1 = totally missed the mark

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Talk attribute | Notes | Score |
| They presented | 5 = yes, 0 = no |  |
| Slide formatting | 5 = slides simple, clear, minimal text, reliance on images, charts/graphs; 4 = mostly good, but heavy on text or poor choice of images 3 = mix of good and bad: 2-1 = poor use of best practices |  |
| Targeted for general audience | Avoids jargon, complex ideas, and convoluted logic; uses relatable ideas/concepts |  |
| Main “ask” is made clearly | 5 = there is no doubt what they are asking for; 4 = it’s clear but could be stronger; 3 = mostly clear, but somewhat muddled; 2-1 = didn’t present an ask or muddled it badly |  |
| Information presented in logical fashion | 5 = solid logic and flow; 4 = mostly good logic; 3 = some confusion as to where they were going; 2-1 = very messy message. |  |
| Case is convincing | 5 = would convince a hostile audience; 4 would cause anyone to reconsider their position; 3 = meh; 1-2 didn’t try or try hard |  |
| 5 minutes or less | 5 = hit target time; - 1 pt per each minute under or over |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | Final Score out of 35 |  |
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