

PLS 210
Presentation instructions

In the presentation, you will explain how a component of the research process in Political Science that we consider in a particular week has been addressed by the author or authors of a journal article of your choosing. The purpose of this assignment, which is worth 10% of the course grade, is to help you to familiarize yourself with the week’s material, use your knowledge to analyze a scholarly publication, and develop your ability to collaborate productively with others and speak about your work in a public setting.

You will prepare and deliver the presentation together with one or two other students. You will have ten minutes to deliver the presentation, which will be followed by a short Q&A session.

The journal article that you discuss needs to have been published in a peer-reviewed Political Science journal. The article must not be in the course syllabus, but you are welcome to use one on which you draw in your research project.

To deliver a high-quality presentation, you will need to select an appropriate publication, review the research design and/or methods used by its author(s), consider the challenges relevant to the part of the research process under consideration that the author(s) faced and how those challenges were tackled, and assess the advantages and limitations of the approach that the author(s) adopted. Having completed your analysis, you will introduce the article and present your findings during the week’s seminar.

The directions above are necessarily general because of the diversity of topics and articles that different presentations will examine. I am happy to offer more specific advice on your particular presentation, topic, and article in office hours.

Presentation rubric

	Failure	Minimally acceptable	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
Understanding of the topic under consideration	The presentation provides no evidence of the presenters’ understanding of the topic.	The presentation is suggestive of limited understanding of the topic, based on superficial engagement with relevant course material. In some cases a large number of factual errors may be present.	The presentation indicates some understanding of the topic, based on evident effort to engage with relevant course material. In some cases a small number of factual errors may be present.	The presentation demonstrates solid understanding of the topic, based on evident engagement with relevant course material. In some cases a very small number of factual errors may be present.	The presentation demonstrates excellent understanding of the topic, based on evident engagement with relevant course material and, in most cases, consultation of outside scholarly material

Explanation of article selection	Article selection is not explained.	The explanation is not convincing.	The explanation is reasonable but not fully developed.	The explanation is compelling.	The explanation of the article's suitability is unusually sophisticated.
Familiarity with the article	The presentation provides no evidence of the presenters' understanding of the article's content, the research on which it is based, and the ways in which the researcher(s) addressed the relevant part of the research process.	The presentation is suggestive of limited understanding of the article's content, the research on which it is based, and the ways in which the researcher(s) addressed the relevant part of the research process. In some cases a large number of factual errors may be present.	The presentation indicates some understanding of the article's content, the research on which it is based, and the ways in which the researcher(s) addressed the relevant part of the research process. In some cases a small number of factual errors may be present.	The presentation demonstrates solid understanding of the article's content, the research on which it is based, and the ways in which the researcher(s) addressed the relevant part of the research process. In some cases a very small number of factual errors may be present.	The presentation demonstrates evident familiarity with the article's content, the research on which it is based, and the ways in which the researcher(s) addressed the relevant part of the research process.
Analysis of the choices made by the article's author(s) in relation to the relevant part of the research process	The presentation contains no discernable analysis.	The analysis is poorly developed and, in some cases, simplistic.	The presentation provides a mostly coherent, but not fully developed, analysis based on some understanding of the topic and the article.	The presentation provides a coherent, but in some cases not fully developed, analysis based on solid understanding of both the topic and the article.	The presentation provides a cogent analysis that is based on excellent understanding of both the topic and offers valuable insights.
Presentation structure and delivery	Weak or no organization, random expression of ideas, disjointed or incomprehensible delivery.	Difficult to follow and/or poorly delivered presentation.	The presentation follows a clear, if not necessarily well-thought-out, organization and the delivery is somewhat engaging.	The presentation is clearly structured and delivered in a manner that helps the audience to absorb the content.	The presentation is clearly structured and delivered in a manner that helps the audience to gain valuable new insights and/or consider the subject from different perspectives in addition to absorbing the content.