|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Deficient | Needs improvement | Marginally Acceptable | Satisfactory | Excellent |
| Background | Theory and past research are not clearly or accurately described. | Some elements of theory/past research are clear or accurate, but important areas were left out or not clear. | Relevant theory and past research covered, but not integrated well. One or two important studies may be missing. | Theory and past research are relevant, accurate, and clear. They are integrated at about the right level. | Theory and past research are clear, accurate, seamlessly integrated and described at a level appropriate to the audience and time allotted. All important areas/studies are reviewed. |
| Link to current study | It is not clear how the current study and past research/theory are related to each other. | There is some logical link between past research/theory and the current study, but the links are inadequately expressed. | There is a stated link between past research/theory and the current study, but it is not explained sufficiently. | There is a clear and stated link between past research/theory and the current study. Most hypotheses clearly build on past research. | There is a clear and stated logical link between past research/theory and the current study. All hypotheses clearly build on past research, and the way they add to the literature and test the theory is very clear. |
| Method | Elements of the method are missing and/or not at all clear. | Some of the method is described clearly, but other elements are not clear. | The method section is mostly clear, but there may be some confusing or underdeveloped portions. | Methods, participants, and recruitment are all explained clearly and accurately. | Methods, participants, and recruitment are all explained clearly and accurately. Study design is very easy to follow. |
| Results | Results are analyzed incorrectly or are not described accurately. | Results are mostly analyzed correctly, but there are some deficiencies or inaccuracies in how they are described. | Results are analyzed correctly, but could be presented in a more understandable or engaging way. | Results are analyzed correctly and presented clearly, but may not contain all desired elements (e.g., effect sizes). | Results are analyzed correctly and presented clearly and engagingly, with tables and figures incorporating information on effect sizes, variability, and confidence intervals. No irrelevant information is shared. |
| Discussion | Discussion just repeats results, without explaining them and situating them with past research/theory | Some results are explained, and basic common limitations are addressed. More implications are needed. | Major results are explained, and at least some limitations are addressed. One or more implications are mentioned. | All results are explained. Limitations are adequately addressed. There is some discussion of implications. | All results are explained. Limitations that go beyond the basics (e.g., type of sample) are adequately addressed. There is clear and accurate discussion of theoretical and practical implications. |
| Oral presentation style | Reads from notes without looking up, speaks too softly, and/or is unfocused. | Little eye contact. Speaks loudly enough to hear, but may speak too quickly or have many disfluencies (e.g., “um”). | Some eye contact. Can be understood, but may be slightly unfocused. Uses some disfluencies. | Good presentation style, volume, and speed. Focused delivery. Few disfluencies. | Excellent presentation style, volume, and speed. Captures audience attention with excellent verbal skills. |
| Visual aids | No visual aids. | Several errors on slides. Font too small, or too much information or irrelevant information on slides. | Only 1-2 errors if any. Slides are easy to read, but there may be too much information or some missing information. | No errors. Little overcrowding on slides. All needed information is presented. | No errors. Slides are clear, with just the right amount of information. Easily readable, visually appealing, and supplement delivery well. |
| Questions | Unable to answer even basic questions. | Able to answer simple questions, but flounders with more complex ones. | Adequately answers some questions, but appears unsure or confused on others. | Adequately answers all questions. | Answers all questions well and thoughtfully, showing a clear understanding not just of the study, but of how it fits with other work and its implications. |