

**Florida International University**  
**Department of Biological Sciences**

Scoring rubric for an oral presentation

**Content and Critical Thinking**

? Scientific reasoning and problem solving

- [ 4 ] Explains clearly, thoroughly and concisely how scientific reasoning can be used to answer a biological question.
- [ 3 ] Explains only in a general way how scientific reasoning can be used to answer a biological question.
- [ 2 ] Has difficulty explaining how scientific reasoning can be used to answer a biological question.
- [ 1 ] Unable to explain how scientific reasoning is applied to biological questions. Cannot identify problems or approaches for solution.

? Presentation content

- [ 4 ] Background is relevant and thorough. Significance of topic is explained, content is focused. Conclusions are well supported.
- [ 3 ] Background relevant, but limited. Significance of topic is mentioned, content occasionally unfocused. Conclusions are mostly supported.
- [ 2 ] Background is sketchy or unrelated. Content tends to digress. Conclusions are poorly supported.
- [ 1 ] No background information. Does not address the significance of topic, content is unfocused. Conclusions are either not offered or unsupported.

? Logical organization

- [ 4 ] Presents information in logical sequence, at an appropriate level for a scientific audience, and holds audience interest.
- [ 3 ] Presents information in a mostly logical sequence, at an appropriate level for a more general audience.
- [ 2 ] Student's presentation is somewhat disjointed. Student has difficulty maintaining audience attention.
- [ 1 ] Information is not presented logically or is presented at an inappropriate level.

? Use of biological terms and concepts

- [ 4 ] Excellent grasp of biological terminology and concepts.
- [ 3 ] Generally correct application of biological terminology and concepts.
- [ 2 ] Some incorrect applications of biological terminology and limited understanding of biological concepts.
- [ 1 ] Incorrect use of biological terminology, poor understanding of biological concepts.

? Use of references

- [ 4 ] Uses references appropriately. Most references are to the primary literature. Credits all figures appropriately.
- [ 3 ] Uses references appropriately. Many references are to the primary literature. Credits some figures.
- [ 2 ] Uses few references to the primary literature. Does not credit figures.
- [ 1 ] Either no citations or references are entirely from secondary or non-scientific literature sources. Does not credit figures.

? Subject knowledge and spontaneous reasoning ability

- [ 4 ] Fully explains and elaborates subject matter. Able to provide cogent answers to questions.
- [ 3 ] Adequately explains subject matter. Can answer questions, but does not elaborate.
- [ 2 ] Inadequately explains subject matter. Able to answer only basic, expected questions.
- [ 1 ] Does not have a grasp of the subject matter and cannot understand or answer questions.

**Oral Presentation Delivery**

? Effective use of time

- [ 4 ] Balanced, finishes on time, leaving time for questions.
- [ 3 ] Generally balanced, finishes on time, but little if any time for questions.
- [ 2 ] Somewhat unbalanced, rushes to finish on time, no time for questions.
- [ 1 ] Too long, doesn't finish, or too short. Devotes too much or too little time to each component of the presentation.

? Body language and voice

- [ 4 ] Speaks clearly, projects voice, varies modulation, uses pauses effectively. Faces the audience, maintains eye contact, does not use notes.
- [ 3 ] Generally speaks well, stumbling occasionally. Mainly faces the audience, maintains eye contact most of the time, refers frequently to notes.
- [ 2 ] Speaks in a low voice, many audience members cannot understand. Occasionally makes eye contact but mostly reads from notes.
- [ 1 ] Voice inaudible, speaks in monotone, reads entire presentation, faces the projection screen with no eye contact.

? Presentation technology

- [ 4 ] Appropriate number and type of graphics, easily readable, with the appropriate amount of information. Graphics reinforce and explain oral presentation.
- [ 3 ] Reasonable number and type of graphics, that can be read. Graphics related to oral presentation.
- [ 2 ] Imbalance in number and type of graphics, many are difficult to read. Graphics are somewhat related to oral presentation.
- [ 1 ] Too many or too few graphics, illegible, poor contrast, too much information. Graphics not related to points made orally.