

**Peer Evaluation** Your assistance is required in evaluating the presentations of your peers. Please the circle the number that best describes your perception of each group’s presentation. Keep the following grading rubrics in mind.

- **Presentation format:** Were the slides readable? Could you follow the narrative of their presentation?
- **Engagement:** Do the speakers seem to be interested in the material they are presenting? Are they explaining their topic in such a way it engages you?
- **Professionalism:** Do the speakers use intonation to signal what words or concepts are most important? Did they appear to have practiced ahead of time? Was it clear they had divided the presentation between them? Did the speakers stay on time?
- **Presence:** Do the speakers command the room? Do they draw your attention or do they just look like they want this to be over as soon as possible? Are the speakers loud enough? Can you hear them even in the back of the room? Are the speakers engaged with the audience? Do they seem connected or do they seem to be going through the motions?
- **Content:** Do the speakers appear to have full command of the material? Were there obvious gaps in their knowledge of the subject matter? Were they able to answer questions coherently?

Criteria	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent	Comments
Presentation format	1	2	3	4	5	
Presentation style	1	2	3	4	5	
Professionalism	1	2	3	4	5	
Presence	1	2	3	4	5	
Content	1	2	3	4	5	

Table 1: Group J - Molly, Minji, Olivia, Rachel

Criteria	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent	Comments
Presentation format	1	2	3	4	5	
Presentation style	1	2	3	4	5	
Professionalism	1	2	3	4	5	
Presence	1	2	3	4	5	
Content	1	2	3	4	5	

Table 2: Group B - Alyson, Christine, Jane

Criteria	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent	Comments
Presentation format	1	2	3	4	5	
Presentation style	1	2	3	4	5	
Professionalism	1	2	3	4	5	
Presence	1	2	3	4	5	
Content	1	2	3	4	5	

Table 3: Group I - Jessica, Eva, Anastasia

Criteria	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent	Comments
Presentation format	1	2	3	4	5	
Presentation style	1	2	3	4	5	
Professionalism	1	2	3	4	5	
Presence	1	2	3	4	5	
Content	1	2	3	4	5	

Table 4: Group H - Miranda, Trang, Liza

Criteria	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent	Comments
Presentation format	1	2	3	4	5	
Presentation style	1	2	3	4	5	
Professionalism	1	2	3	4	5	
Presence	1	2	3	4	5	
Content	1	2	3	4	5	

Table 5: Group A - Maddie, Danielle, Katie, Ji Young

Criteria	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent	Comments
Presentation format	1	2	3	4	5	
Presentation style	1	2	3	4	5	
Professionalism	1	2	3	4	5	
Presence	1	2	3	4	5	
Content	1	2	3	4	5	

Table 6: Group E - Nati, Abby, Sarah

Criteria	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent	Comments
Presentation format	1	2	3	4	5	
Presentation style	1	2	3	4	5	
Professionalism	1	2	3	4	5	
Presence	1	2	3	4	5	
Content	1	2	3	4	5	

Table 7: Group C - Subashini, Izzy, Erina

Criteria	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent	Comments
Presentation format	1	2	3	4	5	
Presentation style	1	2	3	4	5	
Professionalism	1	2	3	4	5	
Presence	1	2	3	4	5	
Content	1	2	3	4	5	

Table 8: Group G - Emily, Emmay, Wanqi

Criteria	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent	Comments
Presentation format	1	2	3	4	5	
Presentation style	1	2	3	4	5	
Professionalism	1	2	3	4	5	
Presence	1	2	3	4	5	
Content	1	2	3	4	5	

Table 9: Group F - Vera, Yipeng, Mengqi

Criteria	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent	Comments
Presentation format	1	2	3	4	5	
Presentation style	1	2	3	4	5	
Professionalism	1	2	3	4	5	
Presence	1	2	3	4	5	
Content	1	2	3	4	5	

Table 10: Group D - Angie, Monica, Zoe