Criteria	Exceptional	Good	Fair	Needs Improvement
Content	– Incorporates specific additional information that enhances the presentation – Highlights non-obvious selectivity issues – Includes other "extra" details	– Most important topics are included – Yield & selectivity are included when significant – A few limited additional details	– Includes all steps of synthesis – Includes total steps & overall yield – Few details or extra info	– Significant omissions
Chemistry Knowledge	– Contextualizes information – Highlights exceptional steps *and* explains why they are exceptional – Incorporates thoughtful criticism	– Correct models are applied and presented appropriately – Most important interactions are identified in key steps	– Uses some models, but omits some others – A few unexplained steps	– Incorrect models – Errors in application of concepts
Organization	– Incorporates background information – Clearly describes each "phase" (background, retro, forward) – Provides context for the work	– Integrates consecutive steps of the synthesis to generate a "flow" – Highlights key functional groups as appropriate – Presentation has a clear and well-stated direction	– Complete linear presentation – Minimal "extras"	– "non-linear" presentation (jumping from topic to topic) – Missing steps or descriptions

Visual Aides	– Shows useful perspective drawings (multiple perspectives if helpful) – Uses "perfect" bond lengths & angles – Incorporates color thoughtfully	– Visually represents key features of the synthesis and transformations – Sizing is appropriate – Alignment & distibution of material is balanced	– Minimal perspective drawings – Minor drawing errors – Overlapping structures – Uneven distribution – Models presented, but not clearly	– Illegible structures – Major errors in drawing or layout
Language (Chemical Terminology)	– Virtually all terminology is accurate and correctly applied – Concepts are presented confidently – Pace is appropriate to the material presented – Level of discussion is appropriate for the audience	– Terminology is generally accurate – Incomplete or informal names are used – Occassional errors – Lacking confidence in naming	– General competence in naming – Some moderate errors – Limited basic errors	– General unfamiliarity with terminology
Questions & Answers	– Speaker quickly grasps the essence of the questions – Answers are correct and address the question specifically – Answers are delivered confidently – Discussion is concise and relevant	– Answers are adequate but indirect – Occassional errors – Lacking confidence in presentation	– Basic responses that don't clarify or add additional info – Minor misinterpretation of questions (e.g., addressing wrong issue)	– Errors in answers – Wrong models to address questions – Non sequiters