Name:	

A	В	С	D
 □ Clearly orients the audience to the process by providing necessary background □ Clearly lays out the process with key examples □ Gives a digestible overview of analysis □ Clearly justifies the analysis □ Clearly explains how the analysis works with key examples □ Slides are succinct and readable (e.g., not cluttered) □ Presentation is engaging □ Presentation is timely (done in 8 minutes or less) □ Visuals are clear and help audience follow what is being said □ Audience questions are engaged with and answered □ Demonstrates meaningful engagement with other presentation through questions and/or completed audience forms 	 □ Orients the audience to the process by providing necessary background □ Lays out the process with key examples □ Gives an overview of analysis □ Justifies the analysis □ Explains how the analysis works with key examples □ Slides are mostly succinct and readable (e.g., not too cluttered) □ Visuals are mostly clear and help some of the audience follow what is being said □ Audience questions are engaged with and but not well answered □ Demonstrates engagement with other presentation through questions and/or completed audience forms 	☐ Orients the audience to the process by providing some background ☐ Lays out the process with some examples ☐ Justifies only part of the analysis ☐ Explains how the analysis works with some examples ☐ Slides are readable ☐ Visuals are unclear but there is an attempt to help the audience understand the process and analysis	 No background □ Description of process is confusing or incorrect □ Analys □ No justification of the analysis □ Synthesizes none of the background necessary to understand the process (e.g., language, sound inventory, basic syntactic assumptions) □ Audience questions are totally ignored (I have no idea how this would even happen) □ No engagement with other presentations