Presentation Rubric

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

PRESENTATION ID _____

	Score	___ /100

A. Presentation Content

Introduction   ___ /10

10	Background was relevant. Connections to previous literature were clear. A goal and logical hypothesis were stated clearly and showed clear relevance.
7	Background was relevant. Connections to previous literature were made. A goal and logical hypothesis were stated but relevance was not very clear.
4	Background was relevant. Connections to previous literature were NOT made. A goal and logical hypothesis were stated 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.
7	Strong methods or approach. Appropriate 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	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.
7	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 summarised.
7	Conclusions were developed and supported with evidence. Some take-home message somewhat summarised.
4	Some conclusions were given. Take-home message only partly summarised.
1	Conclusions were not supported with evidence. Major points and take-home message not mentioned.

Flow: organisation and transition between intro, approach, results, and conclusions ___ /10

10   Presentation was engaging, well organised, strong transition, easy to follow.

7   Presentation was well organised, some transition made, able to follow.

4   Presentation was somewhat organised, weak transition made, somewhat able to follow.

1   Presentation was not well organised, weak transition, hard to follow.

Scientific Objectivity ___ /10

10   Statements were supported by data, not opinions, and objectivity maintained.

7   Statements were supported by data, but some opinions slipped in.

4   Statements were somewhat 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.

7   Presenter exhibited good knowledge of the field.

4   Presenter exhibited weak knowledge of the field.

1   Presenter exhibited superficial knowledge of the area.

B. Presentation Style

Clarity of Language ___ /10

10   Presentation was very easy to understand by a diverse audience, not overly verbose or jargony, and defined all terms clearly.

7   Presentation was somewhat easy to understand by a diverse audience, some use of jargon and some 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.

7   Format was very clear but lacking some effectiveness 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.

7   Oral delivery was somewhat engaging, 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.