

Weekly Presentation Guideline

Presentation

The presenters will make a 20 minutes presentation on the paper of the week. The presenter should submit a summary of no more than 2 pages of their materials, and that before the week's class. The file should be in the PDF format, include your group number, and your names. As the instructor, I will not micro-manage groups. It is in the best interest of each group to determine which members of the group can give the best presentation to the class so that they can maximize their grades. Labour division is recommended, however, every group member should master the whole of the material assigned for exams. Groups are free to fire free-riders. An individual can be fired as soon as a majority of the group agrees on the course of action. The instructor will not get involved. That is, those fellows who do not show up for meetings and who want to get a free grade. The instructor will deduct 2 marks out of a possible 10 marks for each absence to a presentation. This is to discourage students who have already presented from not attending presentation by other groups. Bartlett and Ghoshal [2003]

Grading Rubric

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Points
Examples	Presents a with clear examples—i.e., lets the audience know exactly what they are trying to communicate.	Some examples are present, but the audience must make sense of it themselves.	Presenters attempt, but fail, to bring relevant examples (e.g., starts with a rhetorical question/statement or anecdote that is never put into context).	No attempt is made to bring a proper example.	/16
Clarity	Provides compelling and accurate explanation that convinces the audience. The importance/relevance of the paper is clearly stated. There are no gaps in reasoning—i.e., the audience does not need to assume anything or do additional research to understand the paper.	Provides necessary explanation to convince the audience of most aspects of the paper but not all. The importance/relevance of some explanation presented may not be totally clear. the audience must make a few mental leaps or do some additional research to fully understand the paper.	Not enough explanation is provided to support the paper. Overly descriptive.	Either no explanation is provided, or there are numerous factual mistakes, omissions or oversimplifications.	/16

Grading Rubric

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Points
Overall Impression	Presenters directly addresses main question or issue, and adds new insight to the subject not provided in a basic wiki page.	Presenters competently addresses main question or issue, but does not add much new insight into the subject. That said, it is clear that the presenters are able to communicate her knowledge to others.	Presenters attempt to address main question or issue, but fails. The presenters have communicated some information, but does not fully understand its meaning or context and cannot clearly convey it to others.	Presenters do NOT address main question or issue, and it is obvious that presenters have not retained any information from his research.	/8
Professionalism	Professional in appearance	Satisfactory in appearance	Effort required to improve appearance	Unprofessional	/8
Organization	Introduction lays out main argument and gives an outline of what the audience can expect in the presentation. The conclusion brings everything together, acknowledges potential shortcomings of the argument, and gives the audience a sense of what further work might be done to advance the subject.	The introduction lays out the main argument but gives the audience little idea of what to expect in the argument. The conclusion nicely summarizes the main argument and evidence, but does not move beyond what has already been presented.	The introduction gives the audience an idea of what to expect in the paper, but does not effectively lay out the main argument. The conclusion does little more than restate the problematic introduction.	Presentation has no clear organizational pattern.	/8

Total: 56 points

References

Christopher A Bartlett and Sumantra Ghoshal. What is a global manager? *Harvard business review*, 81(8):101–8, 2003.