


# WORKGROUP EVALUATION



# GROUP ACTIVITY



**GRADES GROUP**

Peer Review

**max 3 points**

# 5 GROUPS

## FOR EACH GROUP

- **min 3 persons**
- **max 4 persons**
- **1 article each group**

## Presentation date

- **all 18.12.2025**
- **max 10-15 slides**
- **10 minutes max for presentation**
- **2 minutes Q&A**
- **5 minutes evaluations time**



# ROLES IN THE GROUPS



## 1. **MANAGER** of the group:

- distribution of work to each group participant
- control and manage the activities timing

## 2. **LECTURE:**

- preparation of the final presentation version
- oral exposition

## 3. **MANAGER EVALUATION:**

- collecting the evaluation of proper group on the other groups works
- exposition of the proper group evaluation on the other group performances
- indicate 1 aspect positive e 1 suggestion to improve the other group presentation
- fill the evaluation schedule

## 4. **MANAGER REFERENCES:**

- collaborate with the lecturer to improve the presentation quality
- prepare the references report to include in the presentation
- in case the group is of 3 members this work is assigned to the group manager

**Number of the evaluated Group:**

1. ☐ 2. ☐ 3. ☐ 4. ☐ 5. ☐ 6. ☐

**PRESENTATION EVALUATION SCHEDULE**

**SCIENTIFIC QUALITY OF THE WORK:**

LEVEL

Not sufficient	Sufficient	Quite good	Good	Very good	Excellent
0	1	2	3	4	5

1. Consistency between presentation and content
2. Clarity of the scientific topics covered
3. Validity of the scientific topics covered (with links to sources)

**CREATIVITY AND FORMAL DISPLAY OF CONTENT**

LEVEL

Not sufficient	Sufficient	Quite good	Good	Very good	Excellent
0	1	2	3	4	5

1. Formal correctness of the contents, balance between pictures and texts
2. Originality of the presentation format

**CLARITY OF THE PRODUCT PRESENTED**

LEVEL

Not sufficient	Sufficient	Quite good	Good	Very good	Excellent
0	1	2	3	4	5

1. Clear and accurate presentation of content
2. Respect for the established presentation times (10 minutes)
3. Scientifically appropriate and informative language

**SYMPATHY AND EMPATHY OF PRESENTATION**

LEVEL

Not sufficient	Sufficient	Quite good	Good	Very good	Excellent
0	1	2	3	4	5

1. Did I find the product presented appealing?
2. Did I find the product engaging?
3. Did I appreciate the group's presentation style? (did they stand out from the others in their presentation style?)

**VISUAL/EXHIBITIONAL/MEDIA SPECIAL EFFECTS**

LEVEL

Not sufficient	Sufficient	Quite good	Good	Very good	Excellent
0	1	2	3	4	5

1. Innovative special effects
2. Non-redundant and/or excessive special effects
3. Special effects appropriate to the product presented

The overall rating is derived from the average of the individual ratings.

OVERALL RATING: ..... date.....

## ➤ 23 december

- communication to the students of the final rating assigned to each group

Please note that the results of the assessments will influence the oral exam grade by a maximum of 3 points for each member of the working group.

Risultato valutazione	Punti
0-1.9	1 punto
2-3.9	2 punti
4-5	3 punti

**The final ratings will be obtained by the peer and teacher rates**