Assessing oral presentation skills in Electrical Engineering: developing a valid and reliable rubric

Authors:

INMACULADA GALVÁN-SÁNCHEZ*
DOMINGO VERANO-TACORONTE [a]
SARA M. GONZÁLEZ-BETANCOR[b]
MARGARITA FERNÁNDEZ-MONROY [c]
ALICIA BOLÍVAR-CRUZ[d]

* *(Corresponding author)* Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria. Dirección de Marketing, RSC y Empresa Familiar, Instituto Universitario de Ciencias y Tecnologías Cibernéticas, Facultad de Economía, Empresa y Turismo, Despacho 2.12, 35017 Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain.

- igalvan@dede.ulpgc.es
- Phone: +0034928458123
- Fax: 0034928458685

[a] Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria. Emprendimiento, Empresa Digital e Innovación, Instituto Universitario de Turismo y Desarrollo Económico Sostenible, 35017 Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain. E-mail: domingo.verano@ulpgc.es

[b] Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Economía de la Salud y Políticas Públicas, Departamento de Métodos Cuantitativos en Economía y Gestión, Facultad de Economía, Empresa y Turismo, 35017 Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain. E-mail: sara.gonzalez@ulpgc.es

[c] Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Dirección de Marketing, RSC y Empresa Familiar, Instituto Universitario de Ciencias y Tecnologías Cibernéticas, 35017 Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain. E-mail: margarita.fernandez@ulpgc.es

[d] Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria. Emprendimiento, Empresa Digital e Innovación, Instituto Universitario de Turismo y Desarrollo Económico Sostenible, 35017 Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain E-mail: alicia.bolivar@ulpgc.es

Accepted at: International Journal of Electrical Engineering Education
Year: 2016

Abstract. Oral presentation is one of the most important transversal competences for the professional career of Electrical Engineers. To develop and assess this competence, scoring rubrics are useful academic tools. The main purpose of this study is to contribute to the understanding of the learning and assessment of oral presentation skills of future Electrical Engineers by using a scoring rubric as a teaching resource. A pilot experiment was carried out in the 2011/2012 academic year in a course in the ninth semester of Electrical Engineering studies with sixty-four students. In order to acquire the oral competence, students had to present a marketing plan for an industrial electrical project in front of an audience. Feedback was collected in meetings held with teachers and students after the presentations. As a result, the need to review the rubric was detected, in order to make its use easier. The rubric's design was improved. In the 2012/2013 academic year, 86 students participated in a new experiment using the improved rubric in the same subject. Intra-rater consistency was shown by the scale's reliability, measured with Cronbach's alpha. Regarding inter-rater consistency, two procedures were used: holistic and analytic. The holistic procedure revealed a positive and relatively high correlation between the global scores given by each of the two raters. The analytic procedure showed an acceptable level of inter-rater consensus. Through a questionnaire, quantitative data were collected reflecting students' satisfaction with the use of the improved scoring rubric. The results reveal the rubric promotes students' learning by providing them with a clear orientation to improve their performance on current academic assignments and in future professional situations. So, the analyses show that the proposed rubric is valid, reliable and, suitable to teach and assess oral presentations in a simulated professional scenario for Electrical Engineers.

Keywords: utility, teaching experiment, satisfaction, assessment, scoring rubric

Assessing oral presentation skills in Electrical Engineering: developing a valid and reliable rubric

1. INTRODUCTION

University curricula should foster skills that develop students' capacity to become integrated in the job market and remain there in the long term. This means acquiring professional and cross-curricular competencies that will enable individuals to adequately face the challenges of their professional activity. Some of these competencies, also called 'soft skills'[1], are autonomous learning, teamwork, searching for information, problem-solving capabilities, and communication skills.

There is a strong consensus that future engineers, in addition to technical and mathematics skills, must also have skills that allow them to adapt to the new professional context[2], such as the ability to collaborate, solve problems, become integrated in multicultural teams, and communicate, especially orally[3]. The oral presentation of practical or theoretical information is a professional skill that students will have to apply in their future careers. For example, some of the most common professional situations Electrical Engineers have to face involve trying to convince potential clients to hire their services, or persuading them to invest in a project. Mastering oral presentations is crucial to a successful outcome in these scenarios.

Electrical Engineering studies are strongly focused on assessment through written mathematical tests[4], and so introducing activities that involve oral presentations becomes even more important. An essential role of assessment is to strengthen students'

reflective skills in analyzing and developing discipline-specific communication skills realistically and critically enough[5].

Given the variety and subjectivity of possible criteria for their assessment, oral presentations are difficult to assess. Therefore, it is important to develop tools that help to clarify these criteria. In this regard, scoring rubrics allow the quality of the students' contributions and their performance levels to be rated in different contexts, specifying which factors to assess and different expected levels of performance[6,7]. Among other things, rubrics make it possible to: (a) improve students' performance on academic activities by showing them where to focus their attention; (b) make valid judgments related to the task; and (c) improve the consistency between the ratings of different evaluators[7]. A well-designed rubric would reduce inconsistencies in assessments[12].

However, various difficulties have been found in developing rubrics in Higher Education. Thus, authors in Ref. 8 highlight (a) university professors' relative lack of training in teaching skills and methodologies, and in assessing teaching and learning, as well as (b) their uncertainty about the reliability and validity of rubrics for assessing students' academic achievement. To guarantee its validity, the scoring rubric would have to fit the course objectives and contents, and the raters would have to receive training[8]. Providing examples of behaviors at each level of each criterion on the rubric would also help to achieve a higher level of validity. Therefore, it is necessary to find out what rubrics add to the educational process as alternative forms of assessment and find a way to make them consistent and accurate[9,10].

Based on these arguments, the main purpose of this study is to contribute to the understanding of the learning and assessment of oral presentation skills of future electrical engineers by using a scoring rubric as a teaching resource. In order to fulfill

this main goal, the paper describes the development and use of a scoring rubric designed to solve the reported problems of this teaching tool. The usefulness of the scoring rubric proposed is tested through the analysis of its metric properties, such as reliability and validity. In addition, to evaluate the effectiveness of the scoring rubric as a formative assessment tool, teacher and student feedback is taken into account.

Specifically, students' views are relevant for two reasons. On the one hand, rubrics facilitate the learning of a particular competency because the student focuses on the criteria and performance levels. Moreover, they improve the perception of fairness by explaining the criteria used to assess students.

The structure of the article is as follows. First, we explain the development and design of the analytic scoring rubric. Second, we describe the assessment context. Third, we present data regarding inter-rater agreement and intra-rater agreement in the use of the rubric, and we assess the rubric's validity and its usefulness from the students' perspective. Finally, we present the main conclusions.

2. METHOD

In order to enhance the oral presentation competence of university students, an Innovative Education Group in a Spanish public university developed a project called the "10 in 5" contest[11]. Students are invited to submit a business idea in five minutes using ten static images. A template was designed to assess the participants' oral presentation skills. The template consisted of six assessment criteria with 3 performance levels each. In order to evaluate this experience and suggest improvements, the members of the assessment committee and the participants were interviewed. This

evaluation system was found to be inadequate because there was no definition of the performance standard associated with each level. Therefore, the criteria used to assess the oral presentations were reviewed, and associated behaviors were described at each of the three levels, which led to the design of a scoring rubric.

After a literature review[6,12,13,14], this rubric was composed of ten assessment criteria that reflect important dimensions related to oral presentation skills in groups. In this regard, four of the ten assessment criteria focused on the group level: the uniformity of the visual support media, the coordination of the presentation, the quality of the slides used, and the order and clarity of the presentation. Moreover, to assess the individual performance of each speaker, six other criteria were used: the relationship between the speech and the images, the support in the written material, the tone of voice and modulation, the clarity of the speaking/vocalization, the use of space, and the body language.

According to the procedure of the "10 in 5" contest, each criterion was rated on a three-level scale (poor, acceptable, excellent). Thus, shorter scales allow the rater to be positioned at opposite ends of the range, and the assessment process is shorter compared to scales with more levels.

Furthermore, in order to clarify the meaning of each level and develop standardized assessment criteria[5], each criterion contained a detailed description of the necessary requirements to reach this level of performance. Furthermore, to illustrate the various levels of attainment, a series of examples were incorporated for each criterion and performance level[7].

In addition to the criteria described above, the 'length of the presentation' was measured objectively with a chronometer. Students had a presentation time limit of five minutes per group, and going over or under this time limit affected the final grade. Thus, the time limit conditioned students' performance.

After the design phase, a pilot experiment was carried out in the 2011/2012 academic year in a course in the ninth semester of Electrical Engineering studies with sixty-four students. In order to acquire the oral competence, students had to develop a marketing plan for an industrial electrical project and present it in front of an audience. In their presentation, they had to persuade a potential client to hire their services. The project had to be done in pairs. The students were told that they had to orally present the previously prepared work following the guidelines established by the professor. Specifically, the students had five minutes to make their presentation, and they could use ten static slides.

When preparing the oral presentation, the students had access to the rubric. Moreover, it was explained to them in the classroom, and any doubts were resolved and clarified. Thus, students were trained in developing oral presentations, while the rubric was provided to present the criteria for assessing that activity. In order to achieve greater student involvement, the oral presentation grade was linked to the final grade in the course. Thus, this phase serves as a tool for training and evaluation. Given that a rating of each presentation by only one professor could lack reliability[15], students' presentations were rated by the lead professor –in charge of the course– and a guest professor unrelated to it. To improve the results of applying the rubric, the author in Ref. 16 recommends using a combination of different strategies to train raters: introduce them to the rating scales and criteria, show them examples of typical errors that can

occur in the assessment, and provide them with a frame of reference to identify different performance levels. Therefore, before its application, the rubric was explained to the raters, doubts were discussed and clarified, and additional examples were proposed to facilitate its comprehension.

After the activity and the assessment of the presentations, we proceeded to analyze the experience through assessments by its participants. Feedback with reactions about the experience was collected in meetings held with teachers and students after the presentations. As a result, the need to review the rubric was detected, in order to make its use easier. The rubric's design was improved. Some criteria were eliminated, and a criterion for the completion time of the presentation was introduced. As a result, four additional criteria were added. One focuses on the group level and refers to homogeneity in the distribution of exposure time among team members. The other three criteria focus on the individual level and refer to the use of language and vocabulary, eye contact and time management. In addition, participants specifically suggested revising some examples that illustrate the performance levels defined in the rubric. The examples related to ‘written support’ and ‘space’ were especially reviewed in order to clarify them.

Then the experiment was repeated using the improved rubric (see Annex I), following the same methodology described above. In this second experience, in the 2012/2013 academic year, 86 students participated in the same subject. The quality of the rubric should be based not only on its statistical validity, but also on its value to users. In previous experiences, the perceptions of teachers and students were collected qualitatively through interviews. This time, in addition to the interviews, quantitative data were collected reflecting the views of students about the scoring rubric through a

questionnaire. The questionnaire for students included two dimensions. One of them aimed to assess the contribution of the rubric to learning the competence and improving the perceived fairness of the assessment. Another item was included to collect overall student satisfaction with the rubric. Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale, with 1 being the lowest score and 5 the highest. Students completed the questionnaire after the oral presentation. The items used are presented below, along with the analysis and results of the second experiment.

3. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The validity of the rubric's contents was first guaranteed by the theoretical review carried out and the critical evaluation by a group of experts in assessing oral presentations. The next step was to rate its level of intra-rater and inter-rater reliability.

For the 2012/2013 academic year, ratings by the lead professor and the guest professor were labelled for each of the fourteen criteria, assigning the following scores to each of them: 1 for poor, 2 for acceptable, and 3 for excellent. To analyze the reliability of this scale –i.e., intra-rater reliability– Cronbach's alpha was calculated, both for the use of the rubric by the lead professor and for its use by the guest professor. Reliabilities of 0.86 and 0.74 were obtained, respectively, showing good internal consistency and a reliable scale design.

The inter-rater reliability analysis was performed using two procedures. In the first – the holistic rating– the level of association between the global scores awarded by the two raters was calculated using Pearson's correlation coefficient. These global scores were obtained based on the individual scores on the different criteria analyzed in the rubric. No weights were applied to the different criteria, and so they were all assigned

the same relative weight. In the second procedure –the analytic rating– the degree of agreement between the two professors in applying the rubric was estimated using Cohen's kappa statistic. This statistic was applied criterion by criterion.

By aggregating the scores on each criterion, a holistic rating for each student was obtained, which could range between 14 and 42 points. Figure 1 shows the graphic representation of this holistic rating, changing this unusual scale into one ranging from 0 to 10.

Fig. 1: *Holistic rating*

Figure 1 shows a slight tendency for the lead professor to assign higher scores than the guest professor, as its distribution presents more scores in the higher part of the scale. In fact, the guest professor's distribution presents one mode and seems to be Normal, while that of the lead professor presents two modes and a higher dispersion. To more closely examine the relationship between the global scores of the two raters, a correlation analysis was performed, obtaining a correlation coefficient of 0.68 ($p<0.001$), which is statistically significant. If we compare this result with the literature on the reliability of rubrics applied to any type of learning activity (i.e. not only oral presentations), this result lies within the range established for this type of analysis –between 55% and 75%–[7]. However, it should be mentioned that the reliability levels of rubrics designed to assess oral competencies are usually low[7,17]. Therefore, the results seem to show that the rubric is reliable.

To analyze the degree of homogeneity between the different raters and, therefore, the usefulness of the rubric to assess the same student, the variable 'inter-rater differences' was created. It reflects the difference between the score given by the lead professor and the one given by the guest professor for each criterion. This variable receives a value of 0 when both professors give the same score, 1 when the rating of one of the professors lies on the midpoint of the scale (acceptable) and the other at one of its extremes (poor or excellent), and 2 when the opinions of the two professors are completely opposite (poor versus excellent). The degree of agreement between the evaluating professors applying the rubric can be analyzed in two different ways, one stricter and another laxer[18]. In the strict one, inter-rater agreement is thought to exist when both professors give exactly the same score (level) on the different assessment criteria. By contrast, in the lax one, agreement is thought to exist when the ratings differ by a maximum of one point.

Figure 2 summarizes the inter-rater differences related to the group criteria: coordination, order, quality, uniformity, and time distribution. Following the strict criterion, a level of agreement is observed that ranges between 58% (coordination) and 83% (time distribution).

Fig. 2: *Inter-rater differences on the group criteria*

However, if the lax criterion is used, the percentage of agreement increases to 100% on every group criterion, except in the case of time distribution, where it reaches 90%.

Figure 3 shows the differences between the two raters' scores for the individual criteria. In this case, the degree of coincidence between the two scores is slightly lower, as it ranges between 40% and 80% for all variables. However, using the lax criterion, the level of coincidence increases for all criteria, at least up to 92%, and reaching 100% in most cases. Although the two raters gave exactly opposite opinions on some criteria – space, voice tone, and time management–, this happened only rarely.

Fig. 3: *Inter-rater differences on the individual criteria*

The use of the kappa statistic allows a more precise view of the level of agreement between the assessments made by the lead professor and the guest professor in 2012/2013 academic year (Table 1). This statistic was calculated, first, considering that inter-rater agreement exists only when their scores coincide –strict criterion–, and then considering that, in the case of showing a 1-point difference, the level of agreement is not 100%, but rather 75% –lax criterion–. Using the strict criterion the kappa statistic is significant for all the items, except for body language, space, speech and slides, and voice tone. Using the lax criterion the kappa statistic is significant for all the items, except for space, and speech and slides. Moreover, the average kappa increases from 0.33 with the strict criterion to 0.49 with the lax one. Thus, given that a kappa value above 0.40 is acceptable[19], there is a sufficient level of inter-rater consensus when applying the rubric.

Table 1: *Level of agreement using the Kappa statistic*

Students' opinions about the rubric's usefulness were assessed. To this end, the means and standard deviations of the questionnaire items were calculated (Table 2).

Table 2: *Analysis of the results for the rubric's usefulness from the students' perspective*

Students are considered to be generally satisfied with the rubric used for the oral presentation, as they give an average score close to 4. Regarding its usefulness for learning the competence, the students' assessment was above 4 on most items. Therefore, the rubric seems to contribute positively to competence in the domain, not only in the present, but also in developing their careers. However, students do not consider the rubric to be helpful specifically in reducing anxiety. With regard to the usefulness of the rubric for the fairness of the evaluation process, the results are positive, with scores around 4. Students think the rubric helped them to clarify the criteria the professors use to assess the activity, and that it contributed to fairer assessment.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Finally, oral presentation skills are among the key competencies for the future professional development of Electrical Engineering students. Students' acquisition of the appropriate level of these competencies is a challenge for university professors, who are interested in looking for systems that facilitate their learning and assessment.

There is growing interest in the rubric as a tool that can foster the development of competencies and improve processes for rating them by creating clear and objective

measurement criteria. The rubric orients students about the desired performance levels, while it reduces possible rater bias when assessing the same event. Therefore, it contributes to improving the perceived fairness of the assessment. This study has shown the evolution process of a rubric based on diverse experiences that have made it possible to improve its usefulness in learning and assessing the oral presentation competence in Electrical Engineering students.

This study contributes to teaching a key competence for Electrical Engineers by providing a reliable and valid rubric. Previous studies on rubrics in the area of the oral presentation competence have yielded relatively modest results for its reliability and validity, due to the large number of factors that can be assessed and their different interpretations. The rubric designed in this study presents more acceptable reliability parameters, both inter-rater and intra-rater, considering the measurement standards for this competence.

In addition, the content validity has been assured, and a continuous improvement process has been carried out, enriched by the contribution of students and professors. Therefore, we offer a rubric that is technically adequate, which means it can be used as a tool to assess oral presentation skills in Electrical Engineering studies.

One of the factors that contributed to the rubric's acceptance as a valid and reliable instrument was the prior training of the raters through different actions, as suggested, among others, by Ref. 20. However, and as recognized in the literature, training is important, but it does not completely eliminate differences between raters, especially considering the many nuances in the assessment of the skill being assessed. For example, the fact that the guest professor gave lower scores than the professor of the subject is probably due to a greater degree of affectivity with his/her own students. The

use of a rubric, and the training received in applying it, does not impede that, consciously or unconsciously, "implicit corrections" might be applied depending on the knowledge one has about the students.

Furthermore, the study provides an analysis of the students' reaction to the use of the rubric. This analysis was performed focusing on two dimensions that have been highlighted in the literature: its usefulness for learning and the degree to which it improves the perceived fairness. For these two dimensions, the participants' reactions show very positive values. The students are happy with the rubric, as it offers clear guidelines for making quality presentations in public, and they think it will help them in the future. It promotes the students' learning by providing them with a clear orientation to improve their performance on current academic assignments and in future professional situations. However, the usefulness of the rubric for reducing anxiety before an oral presentation obtained a relatively low score. This is probably due to the fact that speaking in public is one of the social experiences that produce the most fear among the general population, and students in particular[21], and that even the use of a rubric does not help to reduce this fear completely. Probably for this reason, the score on overall satisfaction is slightly lower than the individual scores obtained by the items related to the usefulness for learning and the fairness of the assessment.

Regarding whether the use of rubrics helps to improve the perceived fairness of the assessment, this aspect also received support. In this study, the students think assessments based on rubrics are fairer. Therefore, these results indicate that this scoring rubric enables professors to assess oral presentations more fairly.

The study presented makes useful contributions to professors who want to develop a rubric to assess the oral presentation competence. However, it also has a series of

limitations that would make it necessary to take precautions in future studies. The main limitation is that the sample is small, basically in the number of students assessed. However, it should be pointed out that the percentage of student participants is practically 100% of the students enrolled in the major in this academic year.

The usefulness of rubrics in Electrical Engineering studies should not be limited to the assessment of competencies. As this study shows, students recognize that the use of rubrics adds value to their training (formative assessment) and their future professional development. Therefore, the introduction of rubrics provides a significant learning opportunity that should be fomented in these types of university studies.

5. REFERENCES

1. T.R. Halfhill and T.M. Nielsen. 'Quantifying the softer side of management education: an example using teamwork competencies', *J. Mgment. Educ*., 31(1) (2007), 64-80.
2. S. Haase, H.L. Chen, S. Sheppard, A. Kolmos, and N. Mejlgaard, 'What does it take to become a good engineer? Identifying cross-national engineering student profiles according to perceived importance of skills', *Int. J. Enging. Educ.,* 29(3) (2013), 698-713.
3. L. De Grez and M. Valcke, 'Student response system and how to make engineering students learn oral presentation skills', *Int. J. Enging. Education*, 29 (4) (2013), 940-947.
4. B.B. Jensen, 'Oral assessment in engineering education', *Int. J. Elect. Enging. Educ*., 47(4), (2010), 375-379.
5. M. L. Hyvärinen, P. Tanskanen, N. Katajavuori, and P. Isotalus. 'Evaluating the use of criteria for assessing profession-specific communication skills in pharmacy'. *Stud. High. Educ.*, 37(3), (2012), 291-308.
6. H.G. Andrade, 'Teaching with rubrics: the good, the bad and the ugly', *College Teaching*, 53(1), (2005), 27-31.
7. A. Jonsson and G. Svingby, 'The use of scoring rubrics: reliability, validity and educational consequences', *Educ. Research R.*, 2(2), (2007), 130-144.
8. M.Y. Reddy and H.G. Andrade, 'A review of rubric use in higher education', *Assess. Evalu. High. Educ.,* 35(4) (2010), 435-448.
9. H.G. Andrade and Y. Du, 'Student perspectives on rubric-referenced assessment', *Pract. Assess. Research Evalu.,* 10(3), (2005), 1-11.

10. M.Y. Reddy, 'Design and development of rubrics to improve assessment outcomes: a pilot study in a Master's level business program in India', *Quality Assurance Educ.*, 19(1) (2011), 84-104.
11. A. Bolívar-Cruz, N. Dávila-Cárdenes, M. Fernández-Monroy, I. Galván-Sánchez, S.M. González-Betancor, A.J. López-Puig, H. Suárez-Falcón, D. Verano-Tacoronte, and P. Dorta-González, 'Evaluación y fomento de la competencia de comunicación oral de los estudiantes universitarios', *Revista Iberoamericana de Evaluación Educativa*, 6(1), (2013), 17-28.
12. C.A. Mertler, Designing scoring rubrics for your classroom. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 7(25), (2001), 1-10.
13. K. Montgomery, *Authentic assessment: A guide for elementary teachers*. (Longman, New York, 2001).
14. A.J. Nitko, *Educational assessment of students*. (3rd ed, Merrill/Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2001).
15. D. Magin and P. Helmore, 'Peer and teacher assessments of oral presentation skills: how reliable are they?', *Std. High. Educ.,* 26(3), (2001), 287-298.
16. D.E. Smith, 'Training programs for performance appraisal: a review', *Acad. Mngment. Review,* 11(1), (1986), 22-40.
17. L. Williams and J. Rink, 'Teacher competency using observational scoring rubrics', *J. Teach. Physic. Educ.*, 22(5) (2003), 552-572.
18. H.E.A. Tinsley and D.J. Weiss, 'Interrater reliability and agreement' in H.E.A. Tinsley and S.D. Brown (Eds.), *Handbook of applied multivariate statistics and mathematical modeling*, (Academic Press, San Diego, CA, 2000), pp.95-124.
19. T. Stoddart, R. Abrams, E. Gasper, and D. Canaday, 'Concept maps as assessment in science inquiry learning-A report of methodology', *Int. J. Sci. Educ.*, 22(12), (2000), 1221-1246.
20. J.A. Marín-García, C. Miralles, and M.P. Marín, 'Oral presentation and asessement skills in engineering education', *Int. J. Enging. Educ.*, 24(5), (2008), 926- 935.
21. K. K. Dwyer and M. M. Davidson. Is public speaking really more feared than death? *Communication Research Reports*, 29(2), (2012), 99-107.

ANNEX I: *Scoring rubric for oral presentation skills 2012/2013*

GROUP RATING		
COORDINATION OF THE PRESENTATION		
Level	**Definition**	**Examples**
Deficient	The speakers do not seem to be coordinated.	It is not clear who is supposed to accomplish each part of the presentation. They interrupt each other and repeat some parts of the presentation.
Acceptable	The coordination seems to be just a division of the work in halves.	The speakers start their part, without using connectives among their speeches.
Excellent	It can be clearly seen a coordination among speakers.	Both speakers use connectives among their speeches using expressions such us: 'As my partner said before…', 'As it was explained at the introduction…', 'Following the initial scheme…'….
ORDER AND CLARITY IN THE PRESENTATION		
Level	**Definition**	**Examples**
Deficient	The ideas are poorly organized.	The main idea is missing or not understood. The presentation does not open with an outline of the contents. Contents are repeated in different sections. Contents are not grouped in a logical order. The purpose of the talk is not introduced or presented. Uncommon terms are used and not explained.
Acceptable	The presentation follows a coherent order, although some support items are missing.	Explains the main ideas, but does not present an outline of contents and/or main conclusions.
Excellent	There is a logical and organized sequence between each of the parts. Concludes with the main ideas.	The audience did not get lost during the presentation, and they knew what was being discussed at all times.
QUALITY OF THE SLIDES USED		
Level	**Definition**	**Examples**
Deficient	There are various errors in the slides related to sharpness, typography, spelling and design.	The images are not sharp, and they are badly focused, poorly aligned or not identifiable. The color chosen makes it difficult to read the text.
Acceptable	Small formatting errors, with no spelling mistakes.	There is some room for error in the paragraph justification, alignment of images or different typographies between slides.
Excellent	There are no formatting errors, and the design is especially attractive.	Figures, images and text can be clearly seen. The choice of colors and formats is visually attractive. Headings and text have different sizes.
UNIFORMITY OF VISUAL SUPPORT MEDIA		
Level	**Definition**	**Examples**
Deficient	There are noticeable differences in the design of the different slides used.	Different types of letters, size, styles, backgrounds….between speakers.
Acceptable	The majority of the slides follow the same design.	Only figures and tables change.
Excellent	The format used throughout the presentation is homogenous.	There is no variation between the slides.

TIME DISTRIBUTION AMONG SPEAKERS		
Level	**Definition**	**Examples**
Deficient	The speakers do not share the exposure time equally.	In a 10-minute presentation, the difference in the use of time between the two speakers is more than 2 minutes.
Acceptable	Similar time distribution during the presentation.	In a 10-minute presentation, the difference in the use of time between the two speakers is less than 2 minutes.
Excellent	Identical time distribution during the presentation.	In a 10-minute presentation, each speaker uses 5 minutes.

INDIVIDUAL RATING		
BODY LANGUAGE		
Level	**Definition**	**Examples**
Deficient	Body posture and facial expression are not in consonance with the presentation, and distract the audience from the message.	Hands in pockets.. Chews gum during the presentation.
Acceptable	Body posture and facial expression are most of the time in consonance with the presentation.	Sometimes uses an inappropriate gesture, but it does not last very much and does not hinder following the presentation.
Excellent	Body posture and facial expression are always in consonance with the presentation.	Uses his/her hands to point out specific aspects of the slides and to emphasize his/her speech. His/her gesticulation facilitates following the presentation.
USE OF THE SPACE		
Level	**Definition**	**Examples**
Deficient	Remains static during the presentation or obstructs the presentation more than 20% of the time.	During most of the presentation leans on the desk or the wall or just sits. In a presentation of 10 minutes, hinders the presentation over 2 minutes.
Acceptable	Moves through the presentation area rushedly and obstructs the presentation between 5% and 20% of the time.	Is continuously walking around the presentation area quickly, but does not hinder very much the presentation (in a presentation of 10 minutes, hinders the presentation less than 2 minutes).
Excellent	Moves through the presentation area slowly and obstructs the presentation less than 5%.	Has a smooth movement. Tries to avoid hindering the presentation (in a presentation of 10 minutes, hinders the presentation less than 30 seconds)
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SPEECH AND THE IMAGES		
Level	**Definition**	**Examples**
Deficient	The slides content (text and images) are not related to the speech.	The text and images do not have any relation to the content of the speech. The speaker does not refer to the slides, and could dispense with them.
Acceptable	The slides content is just mainly the speech itself.	The slides are basically the speech, but projected in large letters. The audience could just read the slides and do not need to listen at the speaker.
Excellent	The slides content supports the speech, but it is not just its reproduction.	The slides make the speech more interesting, and they enrich it. The speaker gives details, anecdotes and support that were not on the slides.

CLARITY IN SPEAKING/VOCALIZATION		
Level	**Definition**	**Examples**
Deficient	Does not vocalize enough.	The speaker does not vocalize nor pronounce adequately, so that he/she cannot be understood most of the time.
Acceptable	Tries to speak with enough clarity to be understood by the audience, and achieves it most of the time.	Small comprehension problems due to vocalization.
Excellent	Vocalizes well and naturally.	His/her vocalization is correct and the whole speech can be understood.
VOICE TONE AND MODULATION		
Level	**Definition**	**Examples**
Deficient	Monotonous tone, without voice inflections.	Speaks in such a quiet voice that the audience loses important parts of the speech. Does not highlight specific aspects of the presentation through his/her tone of voice.
Acceptable	Appropriate tone, but does not emphasize what is important.	Can be heard fine, but does not always reinforce the message with his/her tone or volume.
Excellent	Uses tone of voice and volume to reinforce the message.	Makes dramatic pauses after asking a question or making a comment, in order to draw attention. Changes his/her tone of voice to catch the audience attention.
SUPPORT IN WRITTEN MATERIAL		
Level	**Definition**	**Examples**
Deficient	Always reads the written material (slides, script or similar).	Reads the whole speech.
Acceptable	Reads the material at certain points, as support for the talk.	Reads a definition, or a specific figure, to provide precision.
Excellent	Never reads the material.	Knows the speech, but does not say it by heart.
EYE CONTACT		
Level	**Definition**	**Examples**
Deficient	Does not look at the audience, and does not even try.	Looks at the ceiling or out the window; stares at the floor; presents a blank stare….
Acceptable	Distributes the sight through the audience, but concentrating into a small part of it.	Looks at very few listeners, forgetting all others.
Excellent	Distributes evenly the sight through the audience.	Seems to look at everyone in its speech at least once.
LANGUAGE AND VOCABULARY		
Level	**Definition**	**Examples**
Deficient	Uses a reduced and bad language.	Uses jargon, swear words, filler words, repeats continuously the same word or ends the presentation with expressions like ‘the end’, ‘nothing else’, ‘that is all’,… Makes lots of grammatical mistakes.
Acceptable	Uses a 100% correct language and with a wide range of vocabulary during more than half of the presentation.	Does not use swear words, jargon or filler words.
Excellent	Uses a proper and formal vocabulary, with a wide range of it in 100% of the presentation.	In addition to the previous one, uses the specific terminology of the course.

TIME MANAGEMENT		
Level	**Definition**	**Examples**
Deficient	Does not tailor to the time allotted, either upwards or downwards, or speeds up or slows down to achieve adjustment.	Speaks more than a minute over or under the specified time. Skips slides to adjust the speech to the time left.
Acceptable	Tailors to the time allotted with a bias between 30 seconds and a minute. Does not speed up or slow down to achieve adjustment.	Speaks between half a minute and a minute over or under the specified time. Does not skip any slide to adjust the speech to the time left.
Excellent	Tailors to the time allotted without altering its pace to achieve adjustment.	Tailors to the time allotted, with a margin of at most 30 seconds over or under the specified time.