

**Spelman College
Research Day**

Art History Rubric

Numerical Legend Box

Excellent 5	Good 4	Fair 3	Unsatisfactory 2	Poor 1
-----------------------	------------------	------------------	----------------------------	------------------

Please evaluate the following categories based on the numerical value for each item. Mark one response for each item.

Presentation Content

1. Introduction: Presentation includes introduction that briefly outlines structure of presentation and introduces a clear, well-focused thesis statement.	5	4	3	2	1
2. Research Skills: Skillful use of art historical research skills and awareness of previous scholarship in relevant areas; masterful attention to detail.	5	4	3	2	1
3. Artists' bio details: Does presenter include bio details on relevant artist(s), and demonstrate expansive knowledge of artist(s) life, career and notable works?					
4. Thesis: Project proposes an original thesis and reveals self-directed, thorough art historical examination. Does the thesis represent an original idea and an informed argument? Does this project address a lack in previous scholarship?	5	4	3	2	1
5. Clear Use of Art History Theories and Methodologies: Project demonstrates clear use/understanding of one or more art historical theories/methodologies (possibilities include Formalism; Iconography and Iconology; Marxist critique; Feminism, gender and sexuality studies; Cultural studies and post-colonial theory; Semiotics, Psychoanalysis, etc.).	5	4	3	2	1

Presentation

6. Voice: Clarity, volume, modulations	5	4	3	2	1
7. Eye Contact/Engagement with audience	5	4	3	2	1
8. Command of audience	5	4	3	2	1
9. Understanding of Subject: (Demonstrated through level of ease and mastery in addressing questions during Q&A Session); Does presenter reveal how images discussed are central to thesis argument?					
10. Organization and Timing: Logical sequence, appropriate time management.	5	4	3	2	1
11. Format of Presentation: Does presenter follow the stated outline/format articulated in the "Introduction"? Is the presentation well-organized and clearly presented? Does the presentation flow in a natural way and function in a manner that strengthens the argument? Are all images on view labeled clearly and sufficiently, with artist's name, title of work, date, medium and size?	5	4	3	2	1

Total Points:

Comments

*Provide comments specifically evaluating the research component of the oral presentation. Focus on how effectively the presenter communicated her research to the audience. **NOTE:** These comments can be assessed in the case of a tie to rank the award winners.*

Spelman College
 Research day
 Dance & Theater
 Rubric

Numerical legend box

5- excellent	4-good	3-fair	2-unsatisfactory	1-poor
--------------	--------	--------	------------------	--------

CLARITY OF PURPOSE How well did the presenter(s) clearly state the central research question and/or area of inquiry? If a performance element was included, did they provide a statement explaining compositional and/or performance aspects of the work?					
TECHNICAL MASTERY How well did the presenter(s)' composition and/or performance demonstrate technical mastery and innovation in the field? Consider body, space, time, energy, tone, delivery, and stage presence.					
Creative integration of source materials How well did the presenter(s) incorporate specific reference to authors, composers, texts, scores, podcasts, and/or films? Correct citations required.					
METHODOLOGY How well did the presenter(s) demonstrate the use of creative processes and/or compositional methods to develop this work?					
ORIGINAL ANALYSIS Was the presentation clearly delivered, well-written, well-rehearsed and well-organized?					
RESEARCH CONTEXT How well did the composition and/or performance draw from and contribute to the artistic field?					
Total points					

Additional comments:

Spelman College
Research Day

General Rubric

SCORE	Statement of Research Problem/Rationale	Literature Review/ Background/Theory	Methods	Analysis/ Results	Conclusions/ Discussion	Overall Presentation & Handling Questions
Excellent (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The following items are clearly defined and appropriate for the study <ul style="list-style-type: none"> questions and/or hypothesis rationale/justification project objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Literature review is thorough and relevant Gaps in the literature are identified Background information is clearly and precisely articulated References are cited appropriately 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methods are clearly defined and appropriate for the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis is appropriate and clearly explained Figures/tables are clear and used appropriately to summarize data Findings are accurate and clearly articulated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion addressed study's problem/question Conclusions are supported by results Results are placed into broader framework Importance of findings is addressed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study is innovative and has potential to contribute to the field Overall aesthetics of the presentation are appropriate Organization of information is logical and facilitates understanding Presenter answered questions well For Posters: Length of summary (by presenter) is appropriate
Developing/ Competent (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The following items are defined, but the relevance of some items to the study is not clearly articulated <ul style="list-style-type: none"> questions and/or hypothesis rationale/justification project objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Literature review is thorough, gaps in the literature are identified, and background information is clearly articulated. However, this information is not well connected to the project Most references are cited appropriately 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methods have been identified and appropriate for the project, but not completely described 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis is appropriate and clearly explained Figures/tables are clear and used appropriately to summarize data Findings are inaccurate or are not clearly articulated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion addressed study's problem/question Conclusions are supported by results Results are not placed into broader framework OR importance of findings are not clearly addressed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study is innovative and has potential to contribute to the field Overall aesthetics of the presentation or the organization of information could be improved Presenter answered questions well For Posters: Length of summary (by presenter) is appropriate
Less Developed (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One of the following items is missing and the relevance of several items to the study is not clearly articulated <ul style="list-style-type: none"> questions and/or hypothesis rationale/justification project objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some relevant literature is presented, but not connected to the project Gap in the literature are not clear Background information is not articulated well References are not cited appropriately 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methods have been identified, but not described and not appropriate for the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figures/tables are clear and used appropriately to summarize data Analysis is inappropriate or are not clearly explained Findings are not accurate or not clearly articulated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion addressed study's problem/question Conclusions are supported by results Results are not placed into broader framework AND importance of findings are not clearly addressed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study is innovative and has potential to contribute to the field Overall aesthetics of the presentation or the organization of information could be improved Presenter struggled to answer some questions For Posters: Length of summary (by presenter) is appropriate
Poor (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two or more of the following items are missing and the relevance to the study is not clearly articulated <ul style="list-style-type: none"> questions and/or hypothesis rationale/justification project objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Literature review is not thorough or connected to the project Gaps in the literature are not identified Background information is not articulated well Few references are cited or cited incorrectly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methods have not been identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figures/tables used inappropriately Findings are inaccurate Analysis are inappropriate and are not explained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion did not address study's problem/question Conclusions are not supported by results Results are not placed into broader framework Importance of findings is not addressed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study is not innovative Overall aesthetics of the presentation and the organization of information could be improved Presenter struggled to answer questions For Posters: Length of summary (by presenter) was not appropriate

Comments: Provide comments specifically evaluating the research component of the oral presentation. Focus on how effectively the presenter communicated her research to the audience. **NOTE:** These comments can be assessed in the case of a tie to rank the award winners.

Spelman College Research Day

Music Rubric

Numerical Legend Box

5- Excellent	4-Good	3-Fair	2-Unsatisfactory	1-Poor
---------------------	---------------	---------------	-------------------------	---------------

<i>ORAL PRESENTATION</i> Student projects voice clearly and authoritatively; displays great effort at rehearsal; does not 'read' off the board					
<i>FORMAT OF PRESENTATION</i> Presentation is strongly organized and commands audience's attention throughout the entirety of presentation.					
<i>EVIDENCE OF RESEARCH</i> Vast evidence of data collection to support research (survey, questionnaire, observation, etc.)					
<i>CRITICAL EVALUATION</i> Presentation reflects a distinct, critical evaluation and analysis of the presentation topic.					
<i>MUSICAL ANALYSIS</i> Presentation includes detailed descriptions of multiple works and uses appropriate technical language in a strongly organized, manner.					
<i>UNDERSTANDING OF SUBJECT</i> Presenter is able to fully discuss how this musical research is applicable to other aspects of social, historical, and cultural developments; presenter is able to offer implications for further research					
<i>TOTAL POINTS</i>					

Additional Comments:
