

ORAL PRESENTATION RUBRIC

SYNOPTIC METEOROLOGY LABORATORY

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA — FALL 2008

CRITERION: DELIVERY STYLE

DISTINGUISHED:

Poised. Articulate with proper volume. Maintains good eye contact with audience. Not rushed. Confident. Selects rich variety of meteorological terms to convey ideas. Uses geographic precision.

PROFICIENT:

Articulate but not polished, appearing uncomfortable at times. Strong voice. Selects terminology appropriate for the context. Maintains eye contact most of the time. Geographic precision somewhat lacking.

BASIC:

Audience has trouble hearing the presenter's voice. Speaker seems uncomfortable and uses meteorological terminology inappropriate for the context on a few occasions. Uses vague words like 'this' or 'up here'. Some eye contact but looks away frequently to read notes.

UNACCEPTABLE:

Speaks with a soft or monotone voice. Appears anxious. Misuses scientific terminology. Meteorology is missing. Vague pronouns and incorrect use of geography dominate the presentation. Poorly prepared.

SCORING: DELIVERY STYLE

CRITERIA	RANGE OF POINTS
DISTINGUISHED	9-10
PROFICIENT	7-8
BASIC	4-6
UNACCEPTABLE	< 4

CRITERION:

FORMAT & COMMUNICATIONS AIDS

DISTINGUISHED:

Presentation is well organized, complete and thorough. Focuses on the ingredients of greatest significance. Graphics reinforce the material in the presentation and maximizes audience understanding.

PROFICIENT:

Presentation wanders, but is complete. Graphics may not have crisp, clean look. Font size and amount of information on slides are appropriate. Some details not well explained. Handles questions well.

BASIC:

Presentation is not well organized and runs long. Graphics rarely support the material. Fonts too small, in general. Too much information is included on slides.

UNACCEPTABLE:

Theme of briefing is not apparent. Graphics distract audience. Font too small to be seen.

SCORING: FORMAT & COMMUNICATIONS AIDS

CRITERIA	RANGE OF POINTS
DISTINGUISHED	18-20
PROFICIENT	14-17
BASIC	7-13
UNACCEPTABLE	< 7

ORAL PRESENTATION RUBRIC

SYNOPTIC METEOROLOGY LABORATORY

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA — FALL 2008

CRITERION: TECHNICAL ACCURACY

DISTINGUISHED:

Uses valid meteorological reasoning throughout. Correctly ties all concepts together and leads audience to an understanding of the ingredients significant to the actual forecast. Comes across as authoritative with his/her application of the meteorological theory.

PROFICIENT:

Meteorological reasoning is strong, but concepts are not integrated. Makes no errors in logic but fails to identify the ingredients significant to the actual forecast. Audience is left wondering because 'cause and effect' features are not linked.

BASIC:

Makes a few technical errors but does not use any 'fluff'. However, inserts 'slang meteorological terms' here and there. Briefer accepts MOS guidance without any explanation. Audience has some doubts the briefer knows what they are talking about.

UNACCEPTABLE:

Provides a tour of the weather maps with no use of any scientific theory. Improper use of technical terms. Briefing is all 'fluff'.

SCORING: TECHNICAL ACCURACY

CRITERIA	RANGE OF POINTS
DISTINGUISHED	45-50
PROFICIENT	35-44
BASIC	20-34
UNACCEPTABLE	< 20

CRITERION: WRITTEN FORECAST DISCUSSION

DISTINGUISHED:

Like the oral presentation, the discussion narrative gets describes the real ingredients that drive a given forecast. Correctly ties all concepts together and convinces the Instructor that the student knows what he/she is writing about.

PROFICIENT:

Narrative wanders but is correct in its scientific reasoning and logic. Instructor believes the student knows what he/she is writing bout.

BASIC:

Narrative makes minimal use of scientific concepts developed in the SoM curricula or garnered from NWS sites. Instructor does not believe the student has a command of synoptic principles.

UNACCEPTABLE:

No scientific reasoning skills are apparent.

SCORING: WRITTEN FORECAST DISCUSSION

CRITERIA	RANGE OF POINTS
DISTINGUISHED	18-20
PROFICIENT	14-17
BASIC	7-13
UNACCEPTABLE	< 7