Intel[®] Teach Program

Visual Ranking Tool

 Name:
 Mrs. McGill/Government

 Team Members:
 Period

 Date:

National Energy Policy: Developing a Coherent Plan Presentation Scoring Guide

4	3	2	1	
Research x 2 = Comments:				
 Research sources include a wide variety of handouts, Internet, and printed texts, and present varying perspectives. All research resources are reliable, relevant, accurate, well-documented (sources are cited), and known for their expertise. 	 Several types of resources (handouts, Internet, texts) from varying perspectives are used. All of the research resources appear to be reliable, relevant, and accurate, but they do not all cite their sources. 	 Several types of resources (handouts, Internet, texts) may be used, but they only reflect one perspective. The reliability of some of the sources is suspect because they are not from known expert sites. Some of the sources are out of date. 	 Only one type of source is used (such as sources only from the Internet), and they only reflect one perspective. Some of the sources are from obviously biased and unreliable sources or are so out of date that they are misleading. Sources are not referenced. 	
Content x 10 = Comments:				
 Evidence provided shows the choices in your energy plan are reliable, sufficient to meet demands, supportive of economic growth, and environmentally sensitive. Presentation provides clear and compelling information on your plan's impact, justification, energy data, and comparisons to past and current plans. Final conclusions are very clear, well organized, and convincing. Evaluation of the energy problem is insightful and thorough. 	 Evidence provided is fairly clear on how choices in your energy plan are reliable, sufficient to meet demands, supportive of economic growth, and environmentally sensitive, but some areas are not fully supported. Presentation provides information on your plan's impact, justification, energy data, and comparisons to past and current plans. Final conclusions are clear, fairly organized, and make a reasonable argument. Evaluation of the energy problem covers the main issues. 	 Evidence provided is missing some elements on how choices in your energy plan are reliable, sufficient to meet demands, supportive of economic growth, and environmentally sensitive. Presentation provides incomplete information on your plan's impact, justification, energy data, and comparisons to past and current plans. Final conclusions are presented, but are not organized in a logical manner. Evaluation of the energy problem misses some of the main issues. 	 Evidence does not show how choices in your energy plan are reliable, sufficient to meet demands, supportive of economic growth, or are environmentally sensitive. Presentation provides very little or no information on your plan's impact, justification, energy data, and comparisons to past and current energy plans. Final conclusions are incoherent or not presented. Completely misses the main energy issues. 	

4	3	2	1	
Delivery x 2 = Comments:				
 Presentation is well rehearsed with smooth delivery. Team members have clear roles in the presentation and all are "experts" on the entire subject. Delivery is supported by effective visual media, including slides, props, or handouts. 	 Presentation is fairly well rehearsed with good delivery. Team members have clear roles in the presentation and all are "experts" in their assigned area of the topic. Delivery is supported by slides, props, or handouts. 	 Presentation is not well rehearsed and is disjointed. Team members are unclear about their roles in the presentation and only appear to know the content that is written on the slides. Some of presentation is delivered by reading the slides, rather than using the slides as "notes." 	 It is obvious that the presentation has not been rehearsed. Team members are unclear about their roles in the presentation and do not know the content that is written on the slides. All of the presentation is delivered by reading the slides, rather than using the slides as "notes." 	
Mechanics x 2 = Comments:				
 Presentation is free of any grammatical or spelling errors. 	 Presentation is free of most grammatical or spelling errors, but they do not affect the understanding of the presentation. 	 Presentation has some grammatical or spelling errors, some of which affect the understanding of the presentation. 	 Presentation has many grammatical or spelling errors, which seriously affect the understanding of the presentation. 	
Layout/Design x 1 = Comments:				
 Design of the presentation is creative, clean, and attractive, supporting the overall purpose/message of the presentation. Graphics, charts, sounds, and/or animations reinforce the key points of the presentation. 	 Design of the presentation is attractive, basically supporting the overall purpose/message of the presentation. Graphics, charts, sounds, and/or animations do not conflict with the key points of the presentation. 	 Design of the presentation is somewhat distracting, and is confusing as to how it supports the overall purpose/message of the presentation. Graphics, charts, sounds, and/or animations sometimes conflict or distract from the key points of the presentation. 	 Design of the presentation is distracting and difficult to view, and does not support the overall purpose/message of the presentation. Graphics, charts, sounds, and/or animations have nothing to do with the content of the presentation. 	
Individual Contribution x 8 = Comments:				
 Evidence of teamwork is obvious and your contributions greatly enhance the project. You are an expert in the subject matter. You are able to see the issues from multiple perspectives. You discuss possible solutions rationally and clearly in order to weigh their benefits and drawbacks to make an informed decision. 	 Evidence of teamwork exists and your contributions enhance the project. You are an expert in your subject matter, but you could be more informed on other team members' content. You are able to see the issues from more than one perspective. You discuss a narrow range of solutions rationally in order to weigh their benefits and drawbacks, but some options are not considered. 	 Evidence of teamwork is spotty and it is unclear how your contributions enhance the project. You do not know your subject matter well and have limited knowledge of other team members' content. You are able to see the issues from only one perspective. You discuss solutions with some bias, so you cannot clearly weigh those options' benefits and drawbacks. Some important options are not considered. 	 There is no evidence of teamwork and you do not provide any meaningful contribution to the project. You do not know your subject matter well and have no knowledge of other team members' content. You do not understand the issues and/or have serious misconceptions. You discuss solutions with significant bias, so you cannot weigh those options' benefits and drawbacks. Important options are not considered. 	
Total Points: out of 100	Comments:			

Copyright © 2010 Intel Corporation. All rights reserved. Adapted with permission. Intel, the Intel logo and the Intel Education Initiative are trademarks of Intel Corporation or its subsidiaries in the U.S. and other countries. *Other names and brands may be claimed as the property of others.