Presenter Name:		Reviewer name:		
		Ratings (1-5 scale)		
	Explanation of a 1	**Your rating**	**Explanation of a 5**	**Notes and justification for your rating.**
Slides follow the Assertion Evidence format	Almost no slides followed the AE format. Many slides contained bulleted lists or other extra text.		Almost every slide followed the AE format, a figure with annotations, and one complete sentence as a title, with citations in the bottom of the slide.	
The student demonstrates a full grasp of the topic.	The presenter demonstrates a lack of understanding or confusion on key ideas from their presentation. Many statements are incorrect or unsupported.		The presenter demonstrates a full grasp of the topic, presenting complete and accurate information.	
The main question of the article is clearly articulated.	The main question of the article is never clearly stated, or only aluded to. Different people in the audience seem to have different ideas of the main question.		The main question is clearly indicated on a slide, why this question is relevant is explained, and the speaker discusses how the question ties into the broader body of biological research.	
The presentation explains how the methods answer the main question of the article.	The methods are barely touched on, no key indication of predictions or relevance to the main question is made.		Exactly how the methods are related to the main question is clear, example predictions are shown (in slides, or through other means).	
An appropriate level of detail for methods is given (not too much extra detail). The audience understands enough detail to understand assumptions, controls, and other key parts of the experimental design.	The methods were lacking or focused too much on irrelevant details (e.g. what temperature cells were grown at). It was not clear which parts of the methods relate to the main question and which are superfluous to testing the ideas of the paper.		Each part of the methods is clearly tied into the main question as a hypothesis or prediction. Extra methodological details were exaplined as needed without getting side-tracked, and the presenter could answer questions about details of the key parts of the methods.	
The order that information is presented helps the audience understand the topic.	Organization was lacking, the order ideas were presented made the presentation hard to follow, made it difficult to understand why some parts of the experiment happened, or what some results mean.		The organization and order of ideas in the presentation helped the audience understand the full scope of the research.	
The presenter makes eye contact with the audience, projects their voice, and engages with the audience in other ways.	The presenter makes little eye contact, reads directly from slides, and almost never interacted with the slides directly. The speaker never engaged the audience directly.		The presenter spoke clearly, asked the audience questions or otherwise got them involved, and frequently interacted with the slides with gestures, pointing, or annotations appearing on the slides.	
Sources are propperly cited and clearly presented throughout the presentation.	Almost no sources are present throughout the presentation. Only the source article is cited, no other papers are used.		Each figure, piece of data, or result includes a clear citation. At least one other paper is cited helping to support the ideas, methods, questions, results, or interpretation of the data.	
The speaker answers questions confidently, including explaining the limits of their knowledge	Speaker did not answer questions, or gave confusing answers that didn't clarify things for the audience.		Speaker answered questions while admiting when they did not know the answer. If they didn't know the answer they discussed some possibilities for what the answer might be, why the question is important, or how they methods may be adjusted to answer the question.	