## Presentation Rubric

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

**PRESENTATION ID _____________**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score /100</th>
<th>A. Presentation Content</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Background was relevant. Connections to previous literature were clear. A goal and logical hypothesis were stated clearly and showed clear relevance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Background was relevant. Connections to previous literature were made. A goal and logical hypothesis were stated but relevance was not very clear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Background was relevant. Connections to previous literature were NOT made. A goal and logical hypothesis were stated but relevance not clarified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No background or previous literature presented. Goal and hypothesis in- appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score /10</th>
<th>Approach to work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Innovative and strong methods and approach. Appropriate use of controls or comparisons or references where relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Strong methods or approach. Appropriate use of controls or comparisons or references where relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Acceptable methods or approach. Slightly inadequate use of controls or comparisons or references where relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Weak methods or approach. No discussion of controls or comparisons or references where relevant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score /10</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Adequate amounts of reasonable quality data were presented to address hypothesis or goal of project. Presentation of data was clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Some reasonable quality data were presented to address hypothesis or goal of project was presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Data were lacking, not fully sufficient to address hypothesis or project goal. Presentation of data was included but unclear.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score /10</th>
<th>Conclusions and Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Strong conclusions were developed and supported with evidence. Major points and take-home messages clearly summarised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Conclusions were developed and supported with evidence. Some take-home message somewhat summarised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Some conclusions were given. Take-home message only partly summarised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Conclusions were not supported with evidence. Major points and take-home message not mentioned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Flow: organisation and transition between intro, approach, results, and conclusions  
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  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  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  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  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  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.