

Evaluation rubric of oral presentations in master's degree programmes (master level) of Oulu School of Business

Learning objective 5B: Our graduates are able to express their ideas effectively, both to academic and business audience, in oral form.

Evaluator (thesis supervisor): _____

Date: _____

Student evaluated: _____

Headline of the thesis: _____

Rubric criteria	Evaluation			Grade
	Excellent (5)	Good (3)	Sufficient (1)	
Content of presentation (taking the target group into account; argumentation; analyticity)	Knows how to focus of the presentation to the audience; justifies arguments believably; presents links between things as well as a well-grounded solution.	Brings out key issues, but contains irrelevancies; arguments are generally well-grounded but somewhat lacking.	The student does not recognise relevant issues and does not provide grounds for arguments.	
Structure of the presentation (coherence; use of time)	The presentation proceeds in a coherent and balanced manner; the use of time is divided in an appropriate manner in sections and the presenter sticks to the timetable effortlessly.	The presentation is generally coherent and generally sticks to the timetable.	The presentation is confused and plotless; it is significantly shorter or longer than the time reserved for it.	
Performing (contact with the audience; taking the target group into account)	Excellent contact and cooperation with the audience; for example, language use and non-verbal communication are suited to the occasion.	Good contact with the audience but small deficiencies can be detected; language use and non-verbal communication are generally suited to the occasion.	The student does not take contact with the audience; non-verbal communication and language use betray indifference towards the audience; inappropriate to the occasion.	
Illustration (making the issue presented concrete; understandability)	The student skilfully illustrates the matter, for example, with verbal, non-verbal and illustrative tools.	The matter presented is well-illustrated but some parts of it may remain unclear to the audience.	Illustration is insufficient. The matter presented was not made concrete to the audience.	
Final grade				

This evaluation rubric has been drawn up by the development working group for teaching of marketing (markkinoinnin oppiaineen opetuksen kehittämistyöryhmä – MOKTR) in spring 2015. The rubric has been designed for evaluating the learning objective 5B results of Oulu Business School's master's thesis proposals. MOKTR wishes to thank the members from the Marketing programme Ilkka Ojansivu, Chair, Jaana Tähtinen, Outi Nuojua, and Timo Pohjosenperä; business life representative Mikko Ronkainen; student members Mika Tiainen, Miia Paavola, and Mikael Rahkamo; guest experts Sinikka Moilanen, Satu Nätti, and Pauliina Ulkuniemi.

Comments by the evaluator:

This evaluation rubric has been drawn up by the development working group for teaching of marketing (markkinoinnin oppiaineen opetuksen kehittämistyöryhmä – MOKTR) in spring 2015. The rubric has been designed for evaluating the learning objective 5B results of Oulu Business School's master's thesis proposals. MOKTR wishes to thank the members from the Marketing programme Ilkka Ojansivu, Chair, Jaana Tähtinen, Outi Nuojua, and Timo Pohjosenperä; business life representative Mikko Ronkainen; student members Mika Tiainen, Miia Paavola, and Mikael Rahkamo; guest experts Sinikka Moilanen, Satu Nätti, and Pauliina Ulkuniemi.