

Collaborative Presentation Rubric – In-Class or Online (with Oral Delivery)

Adapted from Denise Kreiger (2014, Instructional Design and Technology Services, SC&I, Rutgers University)

Criteria	Unsatisfactory-Beginning 0-27 points	Developing 28-31 points	Accomplished 32-35 points	Exemplary 36-40 points	Total
Presentation/ Content (Group grade)	Presentation content shows a lack of understanding of the topic. There is inadequate evidence of research and insufficient relevant information and facts. Content is confusing and/or contains frequent inaccuracies. Required elements are missing and/or randomly organized. Sources, if included, generally lack proper citation format (APA 6 th ed.).	Presentation content shows general understanding of the topic. There is limited evidence of research in locating relevant information and facts and/or supporting statements made. Content contains some inaccuracies, inconsistencies, misinterpretations, and/or somewhat unclear. A required element may be missing and/or some sources may be improperly cited (APA 6 th ed.).	Presentation content shows an adequate understanding of the topic. Some research effort is evident in locating relevant information and facts. Content is mostly accurate and reasonably organized. May contain some inconsistencies in content or some connections made may not be supported. Required elements are included and sources are properly cited (APA 6 th ed.) for the most part.	Presentation content shows a thorough understanding of the topic. Substantive research effort is evident in locating relevant information and facts. Content is accurate and sequenced in a clear, logical way. All required elements are included and sources are properly cited (APA 6 th ed.).	/40
Presentation/ Design (Group grade)	Slides generally lack visual appeal and are text-heavy with little or no visuals and/or exhibit an overuse of color or animations. Media, (e.g., images), if used, are rarely cited on each slide. No theme is evident and the presentation appears disjointed rather than unified and/or frequent errors (grammar, punctuation, spelling, formatting, etc.) on the slides	Slides generally include a mix of white space, visuals, and/or text but not consistently and/or some overuse or inappropriate use of color or animations. Theme (e.g., template) is not consistently evident throughout the presentation and/or some errors (grammar, punctuation, spelling, formatting, etc.) on the slides.	Slides are effectively designed with visual appeal including white space, visuals, and minimal text for the most part. Color and animations are used appropriately. Theme (e.g., template) is evident in the presentation for the most part to produce a cohesive presentation and/or minor errors (grammar, punctuation, spelling, formatting, etc.) on the slides.	Slides are visually well designed, aesthetically pleasing with appropriate use of white space, visuals, and minimal text, on each slide. Color and animations are used judiciously. Theme (e.g., template) is evident throughout to produce a highly cohesive presentation. Basically free from errors (grammar, punctuation, spelling, formatting, etc.) on the slides.	/15
Presentation/ Oral Delivery (Group grade)	Ineffective in delivering the oral presentation demonstrating below average/poor communication skills. Substantially over/under the time limit to present and/or not all members presented. Lack of preparation was evident.	Somewhat effective in delivering the oral presentation demonstrating average communication skills. Slightly over/under the time limit. Some members presented more than others. More preparation was needed.	Effective in delivering the oral presentation demonstrating good communication skills and generally close to the time limit for the group to present (20 minutes total). All group members presented and preparation was evident for the most part.	Highly effective in delivering a well-polished oral presentation within the time limit for the group to present (20 minutes total). All group members presented equally. Preparation was strongly evident.	/15

Collaborative Presentation Rubric – In-Class or Online (with Oral Delivery)

Adapted from Denise Kreiger (2014, Instructional Design and Technology Services, SC&I, Rutgers University)

Criteria	Unsatisfactory-Beginning	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary	Total
Presentation/ Notes/ Transcript (Group grade)	0-1 points	2 points	3 points	4-5 points	/5
	Presentation lacks "Notes" on slides (or in a separate document) to explain each slide and/or, if included, the notes repeat the text provided on the slide. Writing demonstrates a below average/poor writing style with frequent errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, and/or usage.	Minimal "Notes" are included in the presentation slides (or in a separate document) and/or are sporadically provided. Writing demonstrates an average writing style with some errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, and/or usage.	"Notes" are included in the presentation (or in a separate document) for the most part to explain slides as a written transcript. Writing demonstrates an above average writing style with little grammar, punctuation, spelling, and or usage errors.	"Notes" are included in the presentation (or in a separate document) to fully explain each slide as a written transcript. Writing demonstrates a strong writing style basically free from grammar, punctuation, spelling, or usage errors.	
Contribution to Group (Individual grade)	0-16 points	17-19 points	20-22 points	23-25 points	/25
	Based on students' journal reflections or feedback evaluation forms, group member rarely participated or contributed to the project towards achieving the goals and meeting the deadline. Did not share workload fairly and/or was a disruptive influence.	Based on students' journal reflections or feedback evaluation forms, group member participated in the project but emphasis was in completing own work. Allowed others to assume leadership and/or may have not shared workload fairly towards achieving the project goals and meeting the deadline.	Based on students' journal reflections or feedback evaluation forms, group member participated in the project and shared the workload. Contributed to the development of the presentation. Worked towards achieving the project goals and meeting the deadline.	Based on students' journal reflections or feedback evaluation forms, group member participated fully in the project and shared the workload fairly. Contributed to the development of the presentation and assisted in editing others' work to produce a polished presentation. Coordinated group's efforts and/or demonstrated leadership to facilitate and achieve the project goals and meet deadline.	
Timeliness* and Length of Presentation (Group grade) <small>(* unexcused late)</small>	Deduct 11 points-overall failing	Deduct 6-10 points	Deduct 1-5 points	0 points deducted	/--
	Collaborative presentation is completed 2-3 days (49-72 hours) or more after the deadline and/or substantially lacks/exceeds the required length.	Collaborative presentation is completed 1-2 days (25-48 hours) after the deadline and/or is somewhat lacking (or exceeds) the required length.	Collaborative presentation is completed within 1 day (24 hours) after the deadline and meets the required length (10-15 slides).	Collaborative presentation is completed by the deadline and meets the required length (10-15 slides).	
TOTAL POINTS (sum of 6 Criteria)					/100

Instructor Guide and Notes

- Sharing and discussing your Rubric with students is a good idea so that you can all come to a common understanding of what is expected for the collaborative presentation assignment and how students' work will be graded. Students should be able to visibly see a link to the Rubric at the beginning of the assignment in web-enhanced, hybrid, or fully online courses if a course management system is used (e.g., eCollege, Sakai, etc.).
- Rubrics make the process of grading more objective, consistent, and quicker (in the long run) and can also be used when reviewing any grade appeals.
- When grading:
 - This rubric is designed for students to be graded as a “group,” rather than individually (i.e., we all ‘sink or swim’ together), to simulate team environments in real-world contexts. However, because not all students may contribute equally to a collaborative project, one of the criterion – **“Contribution to Group”** – has been included to acknowledge the efforts of those students who have done an outstanding job and have acted as a “leader” for the group (e.g., coordinating and communicating with the group, setting up a collaborative presentation tool such as Google-Presentation or Prezi to work collaboratively, uploading it to the Dropbox or posting to a Discussion Board, etc.).

Note: To help you determine the individual efforts and contributions of each student, it is recommended to include a **“Journal Reflection”** or **“Group Evaluation Form”** (that is graded) at the end of the collaborative project where students will self-assess their contribution, as well as the contributions of their group members for your consideration.
 - Pick two groups' presentations at random and “practice” grading them using the Rubric so you get a better feel for it.
 - Focus on the “Exemplary” mastery level (category) on each criterion before the other mastery levels (i.e., Accomplished, Developing, Beginning-Unsatisfactory) when evaluating and grading each group's presentation. The Exemplary mastery level articulates the highest learning outcome.
- If the rubric doesn't do what you want, adjust it, as needed. For example, modify mastery descriptions to add “context” for the collaborative presentation assignment, if needed. However, be careful to maintain a similar “weighting” of criteria (i.e., “content” should be a significantly higher weighting than the “mechanics” of the assignment). Also, be aware that the “points” assigned for each mastery level have been mathematically calculated and proportioned as follows: overall, Exemplary is ~ 90-100%; Accomplished is ~80-89%; Developing is ~ 70-79%; and Beginning-Unsatisfactory is ~ 0-69%.
- This Rubric will work with both “percentage-based” and “points-based” grading systems. For percentage-based grading systems, it is important that the overall points add up to 100 points to work properly with the Gradebook in the course management system (e.g., eCollege, Sakai, etc.).
- It is recommended that instructors include a “model” of an “Exemplary” presentation so students have a frame of reference before undertaking the assignment.