



Presentation Rubric

Judges, please score each category with a whole digit between 1-10; per the scale guidance provided.

PRESENTATION ID _____	Score ____ /100 ____ /10
Introduction	____ /10
10 Background was relevant. Connections to previous literature were clear. A goal and logical hypothesis were stated clearly and showed clear relevance.	
8 Background was relevant. Connections to previous literature were clear. A goal and logical hypothesis were stated and seemed relevant.	
6 Background was relevant. Connections to previous literature were NOT made. A goal and logical hypothesis were stated clearly but relevance was not very clear.	
4 Background was relevant. Connections to previous literature were NOT made. A goal and logical hypothesis were stated clearly but relevance not clarified.	
1 No background or previous literature presented. Goal and hypothesis in-appropriate.	
Approach to Work	____ /10
10 Innovative and strong methods and approach. Appropriate use of controls or comparisons or references where relevant.	
8 Strong methods and approach. Appropriate use of controls or comparisons or references where relevant.	
6 Acceptable methods or approach. Somewhat adequate use of controls or comparisons or references where relevant.	
4 Acceptable methods or approach. Slightly inadequate use of controls or comparisons or references where relevant	
1 Weak methods or approach. No discussion of controls or comparisons or references where relevant.	
Results	____ /10
10 Substantial amounts of high-quality data were presented to address hypothesis or goal of project. Presentation of data was clear, thorough, and logical. Potential problems and alternative approaches identified.	
8 High-quality data were presented to address hypothesis or goal of project. Presentation of data was clear. Potential problems and alternative approaches identified.	
6 Adequate amounts of reasonable quality data were presented to address hypothesis or goal of project. Presentation of data was clear.	
4 Some reasonable quality data were presented to address hypothesis or goal of project was presented.	
1 Data were lacking, not fully sufficient to address hypothesis or project goal. Presentation of data was included but unclear.	
Conclusions and Discussion	____ /10
10 Strong conclusions were developed and supported with evidence. Major points and take-home messages clearly summarized.	
8 Conclusions were developed and supported with evidence. Major points and take-home message somewhat summarized.	
6 Reasonable conclusions were given and supported with evidence. Some take-home message somewhat summarized.	
4 Some conclusions were given. Few take-home messages summarized.	
1 Conclusions were not supported with evidence. Major points and take-home message not mentioned.	



Flow (Organization and transition between introduction, approach, results and conclusions) _____ /10

- 10 Presentation was engaging, well organized, strong transition, easy to follow.
- 8 Presentation was well organized and easy to follow.
- 6 Presentation was somewhat organized, some transition made, able to follow.
- 4 Presentation was somewhat organized, weak transition made, somewhat able to follow.
- 1 Presentation was not well organized, weak transition, hard to follow.

Scientific Objectivity _____ /10

- 10 Statements were supported by data, not opinions, and objectivity maintained.
- 8 Statements were somewhat supported by data and objectivity maintained.
- 6 Statements were supported by data but some opinions slipped in.
- 4 Statements were weakly supported by data but opinions slipped in.
- 1 Presented opinions and objectivity was not maintained.

Mastery (Depth of understanding and knowledge of field) _____ /10

- 10 Presenter exhibited strong in-depth mastery of the field.
- 8 Presenter exhibited strong knowledge of the field.
- 6 Presenter exhibited some knowledge of the field.
- 4 Presenter exhibited weak knowledge of the field.
- 1 Presenter exhibited superficial knowledge of the area.

Clarity of Language (Refers to language choices, not pronunciation) _____ /10

- 10 Presentation was very easy to understand by a diverse audience, not overly verbose or jargony, and defined all terms clearly.
- 8 Presentation was easy to understand by a diverse audience, not overly verbose or jargony, and defined all terms clearly.
- 6 Presentation was somewhat easy to understand by a diverse audience, some use of jargon and undefined terms.
- 4 Presentation was hard to understand by a diverse audience, included lots of jargon and undefined terms.
- 1 Presentation was very hard to understand.

Format (Layout and visual aids [graphs and diagrams]) _____ /10

- 10 Format was innovative, very clear and effective in conveying message.
- 8 Format was very clear and effective in conveying message.
- 6 Format was clear but was not effective in conveying message.
- 4 Format was only somewhat clear.
- 1 Format was hard to follow (e.g., too much detail).

Oral Delivery _____ /10

- 10 Oral delivery was highly engaging, professional, clear, and concise.
- 8 Oral delivery was somewhat engaging, professional, and clear.
- 6 Oral delivery was not very engaging, yet professional and clear.
- 4 Oral delivery was not very clear. It was too fast or slow or used unclear sentences.
- 1 Oral delivery was not clear at all nor was it engaging or encouraging focus.