CMSC 304 – Paper Presentation Feedback

Evaluator's name: _____ Presenter's name: _____

Rating scale: 1-poor, 2-weak, 3-fair, 4-good, 5-excellent

Content							
	Clearly described the problem being studied	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Articulated the relevant ethical questions	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Stated a clear position on the questions	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Justified the position using evidence	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Identified appropriate policies/decisions to consider	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant principles and values	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Identified stakeholders and potential consequences	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant laws	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was clear	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was interesting	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of content	1	2	3	4	5	

Presentation Style							
	Organized talk well	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Spoke clearly and with sufficient volume	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Maintained good flow (minimal hesitation/fumbling)	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Visual aids were readable and useful	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Was well prepared	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Projected confidence	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of presentation style	1	2	3	4	5	

This space for comments and suggestions.

CMSC 304 – Paper Presentation Feedback

Evaluator's name: _____ Presenter's name: _____

Rating scale: 1-poor, 2-weak, 3-fair, 4-good, 5-excellent

Content							
	Clearly described the problem being studied	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Articulated the relevant ethical questions	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Stated a clear position on the questions	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Justified the position using evidence	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Identified appropriate policies/decisions to consider	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant principles and values	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Identified stakeholders and potential consequences	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant laws	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was clear	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was interesting	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of content	1	2	3	4	5	

Presentation Style							
	Organized talk well	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Spoke clearly and with sufficient volume	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Maintained good flow (minimal hesitation/fumbling)	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Visual aids were readable and useful	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Was well prepared	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Projected confidence	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of presentation style	1	2	3	4	5	

This space for comments and suggestions.

CMSC 304 – Paper Presentation Feedback

Evaluator's name: _____ Presenter's name: _____

Rating scale: 1-poor, 2-weak, 3-fair, 4-good, 5-excellent

Content							
	Clearly described the problem being studied	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Articulated the relevant ethical questions	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Stated a clear position on the questions	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Justified the position using evidence	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Identified appropriate policies/decisions to consider	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant principles and values	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Identified stakeholders and potential consequences	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant laws	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was clear	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was interesting	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of content	1	2	3	4	5	

Presentation Style							
	Organized talk well	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Spoke clearly and with sufficient volume	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Maintained good flow (minimal hesitation/fumbling)	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Visual aids were readable and useful	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Was well prepared	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Projected confidence	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of presentation style	1	2	3	4	5	

This space for comments and suggestions.

CMSC 304 – Paper Presentation Feedback

Evaluator's name: _____ Presenter's name: _____

Rating scale: 1-poor, 2-weak, 3-fair, 4-good, 5-excellent

Content							
	Clearly described the problem being studied	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Articulated the relevant ethical questions	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Stated a clear position on the questions	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Justified the position using evidence	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Identified appropriate policies/decisions to consider	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant principles and values	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Identified stakeholders and potential consequences	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant laws	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was clear	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was interesting	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of content	1	2	3	4	5	

Presentation Style							
	Organized talk well	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Spoke clearly and with sufficient volume	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Maintained good flow (minimal hesitation/fumbling)	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Visual aids were readable and useful	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Was well prepared	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Projected confidence	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of presentation style	1	2	3	4	5	

This space for comments and suggestions.

CMSC 304 – Paper Presentation Feedback

Evaluator's name: _____ Presenter's name: _____

Rating scale: 1-poor, 2-weak, 3-fair, 4-good, 5-excellent

Content							
	Clearly described the problem being studied	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Articulated the relevant ethical questions	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Stated a clear position on the questions	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Justified the position using evidence	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Identified appropriate policies/decisions to consider	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant principles and values	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Identified stakeholders and potential consequences	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant laws	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was clear	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was interesting	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of content	1	2	3	4	5	

Presentation Style							
	Organized talk well	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Spoke clearly and with sufficient volume	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Maintained good flow (minimal hesitation/fumbling)	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Visual aids were readable and useful	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Was well prepared	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Projected confidence	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of presentation style	1	2	3	4	5	

This space for comments and suggestions.

CMSC 304 – Paper Presentation Feedback

Evaluator's name: _____ Presenter's name: _____

Rating scale: 1-poor, 2-weak, 3-fair, 4-good, 5-excellent

Content							
	Clearly described the problem being studied	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Articulated the relevant ethical questions	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Stated a clear position on the questions	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Justified the position using evidence	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Identified appropriate policies/decisions to consider	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant principles and values	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Identified stakeholders and potential consequences	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant laws	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was clear	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was interesting	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of content	1	2	3	4	5	

Presentation Style							
	Organized talk well	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Spoke clearly and with sufficient volume	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Maintained good flow (minimal hesitation/fumbling)	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Visual aids were readable and useful	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Was well prepared	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Projected confidence	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of presentation style	1	2	3	4	5	

This space for comments and suggestions.