



Judge's Name:

Participant:

University:

Participant #:

Criteria	Excellent		Good		Poor		Score
	5	4	3	2	1		
<p>Comprehension</p> <p>Were the topic, key results, research significance, and outcomes communicated in language appropriate to a non-specialist audience?</p> <p>Did the speaker avoid scientific jargon, explain terminology, and provide adequate background information to illustrate points?</p> <p>Did the speaker clearly understand their topic and make the audience understand something about it, too?</p>	5	4	3	2	1		
	Notes:						
<p>Content</p> <p>Did the presentation provide some background about the research question being addressed and its significance?</p> <p>Did the presentation clearly describe the key results of the research, including conclusions and outcomes?</p> <p>Did the presentation follow a clear and logical sequence?</p> <p>Did the presenter spend adequate time on each element of their presentation – or did they elaborate for too long on one aspect or was the presentation rushed?</p>	5	4	3	2	1		
	Notes:						
<p>Engagement</p> <p>Did the presenter give the audience of sense of who they are, what they study, why they study it, and how --- in relatable terminology?</p> <p>Did the presenter engage and connect with the audience?</p> <p>Did the orator and presentation make the audience want to know more?</p> <p>Was the presenter careful not to trivialize or generalize their research?</p> <p>Did the presenter convey enthusiasm for their research?</p>	5	4	3	2	1		
	Notes:						
<p>Communication</p> <p>Did the presenter capture and maintain their audience’s attention?</p> <p>Did the speaker have sufficient stage presence, eye contact, and vocal range?</p> <p>Did s/he maintain a steady pace, and have a confident stance?</p> <p>Did the PowerPoint slide enhance the presentation – was it clear, legible, and concise?</p> <p>Was the research or scholarship conveyed in an understandable way?</p>	5	4	3	2	1		
	Notes:						
	Total:						