

UBC Hist 490R: The Environmental History of British Columbia.

David Brownstein

Presentations.

Various due dates, **March 20, 22, 27 and 29**; the presentation is worth 15% of your final grade.

Time is a precious commodity. Please aim for a presentation of **20 minutes**, this will allow for a brief period of conversation and questions (and at some point, a break). This is your opportunity to present an extended exploration of your ideas before committing everything to writing. Ask us for our advice on how to best tackle any problems that you are experiencing.

Depending on your topic, things to include:

Please start right off with a clear argument and then tell us a story that supports your point. At some stage along the way you will want to include the following elements, in the order dictated by your topic:

- give a brief explanation of the literature that you have consulted
- relate what it told you, if you found any gaps, how you went about synthesizing what you collected
- was there a consensus in the literature, any debate?
- your archival sources and possible oral history interviews
- if need be, anticipate audience questions
- if you were to do more research on this in the future, where might you go next?
- come prepared with questions for us to jumpstart conversation.

It is important that you attend all of the presentations, even when you are not 'on' that day. Your peers will be counting on you to provide constructive criticism of their work. In addition to my feedback, each presenter will get constructive criticism from two anonymous peer reviewers. By filling out these forms, you will gain insight into what makes a good presentation, and perhaps what to avoid. Please see over for an example of the form.

History 490R: Student Presentation Comment Sheet.

Student Presenter:

Name of Evaluator:

Presentation style.

Was the material delivered in a clear, concise and professional manner?

Comment on the presenter's use of visuals.

Content:

Was there a clear and identifiable argument or recommendations?

Was the argument supported adequately, or conclusions logical?

Was the presenter successful in fostering discussion?

Was the presentation original or inventive?

Other comments or advice for the presenter? (Over).

Marking Rubric.

	Sophisticated 80 - 100	Quite good 70 - 79	Sufficient 60 - 69	Inadequate < 60
Content				
Began with a clear argument?	Began with a very strong argument	Began with an argument, but it was unclear or still needs a lot of work	Began with an argument but only in the weakest possible form	Did not begin with an argument
Did the argument have sufficient support, or interpretations followed from the evidence?	Supporting material was relevant, logical, and compelling	Supporting material offered but it could have been better deployed, or bordered on unconvincing	Weak supporting material, or poorly structured	Evidence for argument inadequate, or argument does not follow from evidence
Analysis	Strong display of sharp analysis	Analytical approach present, if in progress	Analytical elements but did not play a large part in the whole	Analysis either weak or absent.
Was the presentation original or inventive?	Compelling ideas, highly original	Strong ideas, elements of novel approach	Creative elements present but could stand much sharpening	Striking lack of originality. Material parroted from other sources
Attribution of ideas	Always obvious if ideas were own or those of others	Generally clear whose ideas at any given time	Confusion as to ownership of ideas	Total lack of transparency re source of ideas

Timing	Spot on at 20 minutes	Slightly over or under 20 minutes	Too long or too short	Much too long or much too short
Was the presenter successful at fostering discussion?	A very smooth facilitator. Conversation guided with grace	A comfortable facilitator, even if bumpy in parts	Rough or awkward facilitation, but got the job done	Required intervention from instructor to keep things on track
Presentation Style				
Delivered in a clear, concise and professional manner?	Clear voice, good speed, consistent eye contact	Good, even if a few issues reduced the impact of the message	Positive elements present, recommend that researcher work on engaging with their audience	Attitude or comportment unprofessional in nature. Inappropriate elements
Slides and visuals?	Clear, strong, attractive, provided support rather than acting as a distraction	Good, save for a few minor issues	Some elements hard to read, or unclear. Perhaps too text-heavy or not enough images	Unclear, confusing, sloppy