Assessing Student Presentations of New Material in Advanced Calculus

Scott Beaver - Western Oregon University

MAA MathFest August 4, 2007

▲□▶▲圖▶▲≣▶▲≣▶ = のへで

Scott Beaver - Western Oregon University

Assessing Student Presentations of New Material in Advanced Calculus

I ask each student in Advanced Calculus to present new material for one class period each term

- Presenter gains a deeper understanding of their topic
- Classmates ask more questions and are often more engaged than in typical lecture
- A break in the routine

The students are teaching a class, so I expect

- Good preparation handling of questions
- Appropriate pace feel the audience
- Present in their own style don't just read notes
- Flawless logic it is Advanced Calculus after all

- Good temporal flow
- Good blackboard technique
- Split time reasonably between board and students eye contact
- No misspelling, poor grammar or punctuation, etc.
- Clear graphics (if used)

| Student Presentation Scoring Guide and Rubric | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|--------|--------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Score Evaluation Criteria | 4 | 3 | 2 | l | 0 | Weight | Possible points | | | | | |
| Introduction - Effectiveness of your brief initial discussion of the content, scope, and flow of your presentation | Your introduction makes perfectly clear the salient points and scope of your talk | A bit too brief (or too long), or missing an important item | Contains some relevant information but not nearly enough | Poorly worded or confusing introduction | No introduction | 2 | 8 | | | | | |
| Logical Clarity - Your effectiveness in presenting your ideas without (uncorrected) logical flaws | No logical errors | One or two logical errors | Three logical errors | Four logical errors | Five or more logical errors | 3 | 12 | | | | | |
| Subject Knowledge - Your ability to handle questions | You answer 90% or more of the questions fully and with appropriate elaboration | Your answer to 70%- 90% of the questions was sufficient | Your answer to 40%- 69% of the questions was sufficient | Your answer to 10%- 39% of the questions was sufficient | Your answer to less than 10% of the questions was sufficient | 4 | 16 | | | | | |
| Temporal Orgranization - To what degree your talk proceeded without jumping around between ideas, or filling in a detail which should have been provided earlier | All ideas presented in a logical, clear sequence | One unanticipated jump between ideas or filled-in missing detail | Two or three such errors | Four or five such errors | Six or more such errors | 3 | 12 | | | | | |
| Spatial Orgranization - Your blackboard technique and neatness; note that slides minimize your chances of scoring poorly here | Excellent use of space, obvious boundaries between ideas, clear and legible handwriting | One or two instances of cramming, poor handwriting, or unclear boundaries | Three or four such instances | Five such instances | More than five such instances | 3 | 12 | | | | | |

| Student Presentation Scoring Guide and Rubric | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--------|--------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Score Evaluation Criteria | 4 | 3 | 2 | I | 0 | Weight | Possible points | | | | | |
| Relative Pace - The appropriateness of the pace of your talk for yor audience | Ideal pace for the class, you pause when appropriate | Infrequent inappropriate pace, but you still check your audience often for apparent grasp | Several instances of inappropriate pace, but you still check your audience several times | Pace typically but not always inappropriate | Consistently too fast or too slow | 2 | 8 | | | | | |
| Delivery / Eye Contact - How well you interacted with your audience | You speak to the audience, you almost never check your notes, and you spoke clearly | Good eye contact, but you return to your notes occasionally, or occasionally speak too quietly | Fair eye contact with your audience, but you frequently return to your notes or speak too quietly | You are usually reading from your notes or speaking too quietly | No eye contact to speak of, or you're presentation was very difficult to hear | 3 | 12 | | | | | |
| Mechanics - Spelling, grammar, punctuation, etc. | No such errors | One or two such errors | Three or four such errors | Four or five such errors | More than five such errors | 1 | 4 | | | | | |
| Creativity / Paraphrasing - The degree to which your talk was presented in your own style | Obviously you owned the presentation | Well-paraphrased with a few unnecessary exceptions | Some creativity, but you seem quite bound to the source material | Little creativity or paraphrasing | Presentation recited from the source material | 2 | 8 | | | | | |
| Graphics - The relevance and clarity of your graphics (if you used, or should have used, any) | Graphics are clear, presented at appropriate times, and each reinforces or explains an idea in your talk | Good graphics, but some room for improvement in clarity, neatness, or relevance | Significant room for improvement | Poorly presented or some missing graphics | Confusing graphics, or no graphics when there should have been | 2 | 8 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 25 | 100 | | | | | |

Final note: They must get 75 points or higher

They repeat the assignment to accomplish this, if necessary

Scott Beaver - Western Oregon University

Assessing Student Presentations of New Material in Advanced Calculus

Contact Information

Scott Beaver - Western Oregon University

beavers@wou.edu

www.wou.edu/~beavers

▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶ □ ● ● ●

Scott Beaver - Western Oregon University

Assessing Student Presentations of New Material in Advanced Calculus