

Name of Presenter: _____ Semester _____

Title of Presentation: _____

Address the following categories listed below. The most critical aspects are underlined. Use comments to identify both the good and the bad. The idea is to give feedback to the presenters so they can evaluate their performance and make the necessary adjustments in future presentations. In addition to the comments, identify each category on a scale of 1 to 5.

- 5 – Superior performance
- 4 – Very good performance
- 3 – Average performances (several minor problems or one major problem)
- 2 – Multiple major problems
- 1 – Making of effort in that area.

I. Abstract: Did the abstract give a clear and concise description of the presentation?	Rating: _____
II. Background: Did the speaker adequately describe the <u>purpose</u> of the presentation and the scientific <u>principles</u> involved.	Rating: _____
III. Science: Did the speaker adequately describe <u>the chemical system</u> and the experimental <u>techniques</u> under investigation in the study. Did the speaker make a logical <u>interpretation</u> of the results.	Rating: _____
IV. Clarity: Did the speaker maximize the clarity of the presentation with an appropriate <u>organization</u> and <u>style</u> . Were <u>visual aids</u> effectively used.	Rating: _____
V. Understanding: Did the speaker demonstrate comprehension of the subject matter. Were <u>questions</u> from the audience effectively handled.	Rating: _____
VI. Overall	Overall Rating: _____

Proposed Grade: _____ Peer/Student Signature: _____

Date: _____ Faculty Signature: _____