Oral Presentation Rubric
University of California, San Francisco

UCSF Office of Career & Professional Development
Student Academic Affairs

A. Content - Introduction

	Outstanding (5)	4	Intermediate (3)	2	Needs Improvement (1)	Absent (0)
1. Main research question	The main research question is clearly explained		The main research question is somewhat clear		The main research question is unclear	No main question
2. Significance	Makes clear what motivates them to explore this question and its significance		Motivation <u>or</u> significance for this research are not clear		Motivation <u>and</u> significance are unclear	No significance
3. Background	Clearly explains what others have done to set the stage for their research, explains background on the problem		The background is unclear or incomplete, or lacks information on what others have done before		It is unclear what the story behind this problem is, and what others have done before	No background
4. Introduction to the topic	All slides in the introduction are necessary and contribute to the listener's understanding of the science presented		Some slides in the introduction are not directly related to the science presented in this talk		Most of the introduction does not directly relate to the science presented in this talk	No introduction
Suggestions for improvement						

B. Content – Data, Conclusion and Inferences

	Outstanding (5)	4	Intermediate (3)	2	Needs Improvement (1)	Absent (0)
1. Methods	Adequately explains the methodology, and clearly explains how these experiments allow an answer to the question(s)		The methodology is explained, but it is not clear whether it allows the an answer to the question(s)		The methodology is poorly described and does not seem to answer the question(s)	No description of methods
2. Results	Presents just enough data, explains results well		Although there is too little or too much data, it is explained well		The results are poorly explained and confusing	No results
3. Conclusions	The main conclusions logically follow the data and are clearly justified		The conclusions are justified but don't follow the data logically		The conclusions do not follow the data, and are not justified	No conclusions
4. Inferences	Explains what the work infers or means. If competing explanations or theories were considered, they were also well addressed		Inferences could be explained further OR competing theories are not addressed.		Meaning of the work is insufficient, and competing theories are not addressed.	No inferences
Suggestions for improvement						

C. Q&A

	Outstanding (5)	4	Intermediate (3)	2	Needs Improvement (1)	Absent (0)
1. Active listening	Pays attention to questioners and lets them finish their questions		Pays attention but **occasionally** interrupts the questioner		Begins answering the question before it's finished	Doesn't listen to the question

2. Repeating / clarifying	Before answering, repeats the question or rephrases and clarifies it, when needed	Sometimes forgets to repeat or clarify the question	Often forgets to repeat or clarify the question	Doesn't clarify or repeat question
3. Flaws	Gracefully acknowledges any flaws or defects pointed out by questioner	Acknowledges flaws pointed out by questioner, but could do it with more gracefulness	Is defensive about flaws or defects pointed out by questioner	No acknowledgement of flaws
4. Brevity	Answers are short but clear and complete	Answers are clear/complete, but lack brevity	Answers are confusing and too long	No answers
Suggestions for improvement				

D. Interaction with Audience

	Outstanding (5)	4	Intermediate (3)	2	Needs Improvement (1)
1. Eye contact	Faces audience nearly **all of the time,** makes eye contact **frequently**		Faces **away** from the audience **frequently,** makes eye contact **occasionally**		Faces **away** from the audience **most of the time,** makes **little or no eye contact**
2. Body language	Displays open body language, is engagingly animated (gestures, moving around)		Body language **sometimes** closed, is **somewhat** animated		Displays **closed** body language most of the time, stands **still** most of the time
3. Clarity	Speaks clearly and loudly enough to be heard and understood throughout		Some hesitation and uncertainty are apparent during presentation, or volume is not always loud enough		Volume is insufficient to be heard and/or understood, or speech lacks clarity; hesitation and uncertainty throughout the presentation
4. Delivery	Does not read from slides or notes		Reads **some** materials from slides or notes		Reads from slides or notes most of the time
5. Pace	Pace is easy to understand		Pace is **sometimes** too fast or too slow (difficult for listener to stay connected)		Pace is too fast or too slow throughout talk
6. Disfluency	No noticeable disfluencies **(ahs/uhms)**		Some occasional disfluencies		Frequent disfluencies
Suggestions for improvement					

E. Organization of Presentation

	Outstanding (5)	4	Intermediate (3)	2	Needs Improvement (1)	Absent (0)
1. Purpose of slides	Purpose of each slide is clear to the listener **(Important: Title of slide contains full-sentence premise)**		Some slides lack a clear purpose or title is unclear		Many slides lack a clear purpose and could be deleted	No slides
2. Continuity	Effective transitions between slides contribute to a continuous sequence of connected ideas, slides flow well		Some transitions are confusing, but the overall flow is fine		Slide flow lacks continuity, ideas seem disconnected from each other	No slides
3. Roadmap	Provides a roadmap/preview then several reminders/signposts during the talk so that the listener never feels lost		Provides an inadequate preview OR insufficient reminders so that listeners occasionally feel lost		Provides inadequate preview AND insufficient reminders so that listeners often feel lost	No preview and signposts
4. Figures	Every figure and image is clearly labeled and		Some figures and images are not		Many figures are not labeled	No figures

	all figures are fully explained by the presenter	labeled or not explained clearly	and are not explained clearly	
Suggestions for improvement				

F. Content – Speculations (Optional for short talks)

	Outstanding	Intermediate	Needs Improvement	Absent
1. **Impact**	The impact of the work for the field is clearly explained	The impact of the work for the field could be explained better	The impact of the work for the field is unclear and confusing	Impact not mentioned
2. **Future Research**	Suggests what should be done next, points out new questions raised by work	Future research is mentioned but could be developed further	Future research is superficially mentioned	No future research

G. Summary evaluation prompts

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not able to assess (N/A)
1. I can repeat the main question the presenter is addressing with their research talk to someone else					
2. I am convinced that the work is significant for the field					
3. I am convinced that the presenter used the appropriate methodology to answer his/her question(s)					
4. I agree with the presenter's conclusions					
5. I was excited by the potential impact of the future directions of this work					
6. The speaker convinced me that he/she can *think critically* about their own work					
7. Overall, this presentation has had a positive impact on me					

References:

How To Give a Good Talk.
Uri Alon, *Molecular Cell* , Volume 36 , Issue 2 , 165 – 167

Guest post: How to give a science talk
Blog post reproducing Andrew Murray's article, August 19, 2011
It Takes 30: A blog from the Department of Systems Biology @ Harvard Medical School
https://ittakes30.wordpress.com