Chem 51LC/D Oral Presentations

Being able to communicate effectively will be an important aspect of any career. Communicating science effectively can be especially challenging, so we’re giving you a chance to practice that skill here in Chem 51L. Your goal for this presentation should be to teach the rest of the class what your group learned from the experiment. Here are some guidelines and suggestions to help you as you prepare for your group’s presentation.

General Information

• Don’t panic! Take a few deep breaths.
• Be sure to schedule meetings with your group members. Don’t leave preparation for this presentation to the last minute!
• Talk with your TA about your presentation. If you don’t understand some aspect of the experiment or need some help interpreting a result, ask your TA, but don’t wait until the day before your presentation!
• We are all adults in this class, so let’s remember to behave appropriately. Whether you are giving the presentation or are part of the audience, you should behave in a respectful and supportive manner toward your TA and classmates.

Time

• Presentations will be given at the beginning of the lab period following the period in which you conducted the experiment (when you would normally turn in a written discussion).
• Plan your presentation to be about 10 minutes. It’s a good idea to practice a few times and time yourselves.

Format

• The exact format of the presentation will be up to your group. There are, however, some guidelines that need to be followed.
• Each group member must participate in the actual presentation as well as preparation.
• Keep it interesting. Monotone lectures are not effective presentations. Think about how you would like someone to teach the material to you.
• Engage your audience. Feel free to ask your classmates questions during the course of your presentation.

Content

• Remember the goal of your presentation is to teach the rest of the class what your group learned from the experiment.
• The content of the presentation should be similar to what you write in the results and discussion section of your report, but you should not be simply reading a discussion to the class.
• If members of your group obtained different or conflicting results, be sure to discuss this in your
presentation. Think about (and explain in your presentation) why results differed, how discrepancies could be reconciled, and how the results relate to the purpose of the experiment and underlying theories and concepts.

• If you are presenting in the middle of a multi-week experiment instead of at the end, you should discuss the results you have obtained so far, how they relate to the objectives of the overall experiment, and what steps you plan to take next.

Grading

• Presentations are worth a total of 15 points.
• Each member of the group will receive the same Group Score for the actual presentation (12 pts maximum).
• Additionally, you will receive an Individual Score for participation (3 pts). TAs reserve the right to deduct points from the individual score for lack of participation or preparation.
• The rubric that will be used to determine you score is below.

Group Score

Explanation and Incorporation of Theory and Principles (3 pts)

3: Great—Group shows thorough understanding of the goals and underlying principles of the experiment. Group is able to explain these concepts to other students clearly and in their own words. Different members of the group are able to answer most questions from their audience. It is very clear to the audience and TA that the group understands and can explain what they did and why they did it.

2: O.K.—Group demonstrates understanding of several, but not all of the underlying principles of the experiment. Explanation of concepts are satisfactory, but could be elaborated upon. The group may be able to answer some questions adequately, but struggles with others. Group has satisfactory understanding of the purpose of the experiment.

1: Poor—Group demonstrates minimal, if any, understanding of concepts relating to the experiment and/or cannot communicate these concepts to the audience. Explanations, if present, are regurgitations of textbook information. Group is unable to answer most questions.

0: Absent—No or very poor incorporation or explanation of underlying theories and principles.

Discussion of Results and Error (3 pts)

3: Great—Group discusses results and their meaning in a way that is easily understandable to the audience. Differing or conflicting results among group members are explained thoroughly. Meaning of results is clearly related to purpose of experiment and underlying concepts. Group thoroughly analyzes and explains several possible
reasons for error and ties them into underlying principles of experiment.

2: O.K.—Group mentions results and provides limited explanation. Discussion of results may not be clear to audience at all times, but it is generally understandable. Differing or conflicting results are at least mentioned, but may not be explained well. Results are tied to purpose and underlying concepts minimally. Group analyzes and explains some possible reasons for error, but could elaborate further. Some important explanations may be missing. Explanation of error generally ties into underlying principles of experiment.

1: Poor—Group leaves out some results or fails to explain them at all. Results are related to purpose and underlying concepts superficially if at all. Group mentions reasons for error, but fails to provide a clear explanation of them. Explanations are related to underlying concepts superficially if at all.

0: Absent—No or very poor discussion of results and error.

Quality of Presentation (3 pts)

3: Good/Great—Presentation is well organized, flows well between presenters, and engages audience.

2: OK/Good—Presentation is somewhat organized, has ok flow between presenters, may not keep audience engaged.

1: Poor—Organization and flow are clearly lacking in presentation.

Individual Score

You will be rated by your group members on a scale of 0-3 (3=highest) in each of the following categories:

1. Attendance at meetings
2. Meeting preparedness
3. Willingness to participate
4. Positive attitude toward group members
5. Overall contribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average of all raters and ratings:</th>
<th>15-13</th>
<th>12-8</th>
<th>7-4</th>
<th>&lt;4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total individual points</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale for categories 1-4:

(3) His/her performance in this category was great. It highly exceeded my expectations.
(2) This person met my expectations in this category.
(1) His/her performance in this category was poor. It was slightly below my expectations.
(0) His/her performance in this category was very poor. It was way below my expectations.
**Scale for category 5:**

(3) Overall, this person was a great partner. He/she was always prepared and shared their strengths with the group. He/she highly exceeded my expectations for a group member.

(2) Overall, this person was a good partner. He/she did not do more than was necessary, but they pulled their own weight. He/she met my expectations for a group member.

(1) Overall, this person was ok. He/she put in more than minimal effort, but I don’t feel they did as much as they should have. He/she did not meet my expectations for a group member.

(0) Overall, this person could not be counted on. He/she put in minimal effort.