

## Evaluation criteria for your 20 minutes seminar talks in the “sustainable energy infrastructure” module

(note that criteria are ordered in significance – content: high weight, delivery: low weight)

	Scientific content 40%	Structure 30%	Discussion 15 %	Visual aids / slides 10%	Talk delivery style 5%
Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies the topic question/research field</li> <li>Has advanced understanding of topic and significance</li> <li>Critically evaluates information and conclusions</li> <li>Scientifically rigorous and well researched</li> <li>Uses chemical and materials science knowledge</li> <li>Excellent balance between technical details and clear discussion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Well thought out with logical progression</li> <li>Use of proper chemical language, equations and reaction mechanisms</li> <li>Significance clearly stated</li> <li>Content level appropriate for audience</li> <li>Abstract and bibliography are well constructed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anticipates audience questions</li> <li>Understands audience questions</li> <li>Can integrate knowledge to answer questions</li> <li>Thoroughly responds to questions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tables/graphs summarize data and/or conclusions</li> <li>Size and labels are clear</li> <li>Very little text</li> <li>Figures and images explained and described well</li> <li>No misspellings or grammar errors</li> <li>Makes effective use of laser pointer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uses time wisely</li> <li>Speaks with good pacing and enthusiasm</li> <li>Makes eye contact and does not read information</li> <li>Uses engaging tone and appropriate vocabulary</li> </ul>
Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies the topic question/research field</li> <li>Has basic understanding of the topic and its significance</li> <li>Limited evaluation of information and conclusions</li> <li>Well researched</li> <li>Uses chemical and materials science knowledge</li> <li>Balance between technical details and clear discussion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Talk easy to follow</li> <li>Use of proper chemical language equations and reaction mechanisms</li> <li>Significance clearly stated</li> <li>Content level not always appropriate</li> <li>Abstract and/or bibliography have some errors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not anticipate audience questions</li> <li>Understands audience questions</li> <li>Can integrate knowledge to answer questions</li> <li>Thoroughly responds to most questions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Text appropriately sized</li> <li>Very little text</li> <li>Most figures and images explained and described well</li> <li>Presentation has an occasional misspelling or grammatical error</li> <li>Uses laser pointer effectively</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Speaks well, but often repeats comments</li> <li>Exhibits few disfluencies (“ahs”, “uhms”, etc.)</li> <li>Makes eye contact</li> <li>Uses good vocabulary and tone</li> </ul>
Marginal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>topic question/research field somewhat unclear</li> <li>Description of experimental approach somewhat confusing</li> <li>Results and conclusions stated but not critically evaluated</li> <li>Does not integrate outside readings</li> <li>Little chemical and materials science knowledge</li> <li>Poor balance of technical details and general discussion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Talk somewhat disorganized</li> <li>Effort to use proper language</li> <li>Significance somewhat unclear</li> <li>Includes some irrelevant content and inappropriate content level</li> <li>Abstract and bibliography are not well constructed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not anticipate audience questions</li> <li>Makes an effort to address question</li> <li>Can address some questions</li> <li>Often responds poorly to questions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Labels and legends somewhat unclear, pagenumbers missing</li> <li>Text size somewhat small</li> <li>Too much detail on slides</li> <li>Blocks of text on slides</li> <li>Figures are explained</li> <li>Presentation has multiple misspellings, grammatical errors</li> <li>Uses laser pointer unnecessarily</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation poorly timed</li> <li>Some hesitation and uncertainty are apparent</li> <li>Exhibits many disfluencies</li> <li>Makes little eye contact and looks at notes</li> <li>Monotone and non-engaging delivery</li> </ul>
insufficient	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not understand the topic</li> <li>Does not understand conclusions or recognize implications for future efforts</li> <li>Insufficient chemical and materials science knowledge</li> <li>Too many or too little technical details and no clear discussion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Talk difficult to follow</li> <li>Unclear language</li> <li>Does not understand significance of aspects</li> <li>Inadequate content</li> <li>Abstract and bibliography lack proper content and construction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Either makes no effort to respond to questions or does so poorly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Labeling is not clear</li> <li>Size is too small to see</li> <li>No logical placement of information</li> <li>Mostly text and very few images</li> <li>Figures are not explained</li> <li>Many misspellings, grammar errors</li> <li>Use of laser pointer is distracting</li> <li>technical mishaps unresolved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation poorly timed</li> <li>Makes no eye contact and reads from notes</li> <li>Hesitation and uncertainty are very apparent</li> <li>Speaks too quietly or quickly for audience to hear and understand</li> </ul>