1. Case Details

(1) The case was clearly presented, giving pertinent details such as who, what, where, and when. All major players were clearly identified.  

(½) Many facts were presented about the case, but some details appeared to be missing or confusing.

(0) There were clear omissions that made it impossible to follow.

2. Objective Summary of the Evidence and Techniques

(1) The evidence and analytical techniques were clearly presented.

(½) Some parts of the evidence/analysis were confusing.

(0) Little to no evidence and/or analysis was presented.

3. Critical Analysis of the Analytical Techniques

(1) The presenters gave a thorough critique of the quality of the analysis.

(½) The presenters attempted to analyze the analysis but fell short.

(0) There was really no critique of the analytical techniques.

4. Quality of Slides

(1) The slides were visually appealing and well organized.

(½) The slides were adequate but could have been better.

(0) There were lots of typos, and the slides were poor.

5. Presentation

(1) The presenter spoke well (loud, clear, and engaging) and contributed equally to the presentation.

(½) The presenter was OK, but not as good as his or her partner and/or other presenters so far.

(0) The presenter needs to practice their public speaking.