

JUDGE'S NAME:
 PARTICIPANT:
 PARTICIPANT #:
 UNIVERSITY:



CRITERIA	Excellent		Good		Poor		SCORE
	5	4	3	2	1		
COMPREHENSION <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were the topic, key results, research significance, and outcomes communicated in language appropriate to a non-specialist audience? Did the presenter avoid scientific jargon, explain terminology, and provide adequate background information to illustrate points? Did the presenter clearly understand their topic and make the audience understand something about it, too? 	5	4	3	2	1		
	Notes						
CONTENT <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the presentation provide some background about the research question being addressed and its significance? Did the presentation clearly describe the key results of the research, including conclusions and outcomes? Did the presentation follow a clear and logical sequence? 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? 	5	4	3	2	1		
	Notes						
ENGAGEMENT <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the presenter give the audience a sense of who they are, what they study, why they study it, and how --- in relatable terminology? Did the presenter engage and connect with the audience? Did the orator and presentation make the audience want to know more? Was the presenter careful not to trivialize or generalize their research? Did the presenter convey enthusiasm for their research? 	5	4	3	2	1		
	Notes						
COMMUNICATION <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the presenter capture and maintain audience attention? Did the presenter have sufficient stage presence, eye contact, and vocal range? Did the presenter maintain a steady pace, and have a confident stance? Did the PowerPoint slide enhance the presentation – was it clear, legible, and concise? Was the research or scholarship conveyed in an understandable way? 	5	4	3	2	1		
	Notes						
TOTAL							