

# Research Presentation Judging Rubric - Full Text

## I. Core Elements of Project

Faculty Judge

	1. Novice	2. Apprentice	3. Practitioner	4. Expert
<b>A. Question/Goal</b>	Goal or question was unstated or unclear (ambiguous, incoherent).	Goal/question was present, but implicitly stated and lacked appropriate scope by being overly narrow or broad.	Question or goal was explicitly stated, but still lacked appropriate scope.	Question or goal was clearly stated and of an effective scope.
<b>B. Process/ Methodology</b>	Process or methodology was absent or unclear.	Process or methodology was present but was an unsuitable means for evaluating the project question or meeting the project goal.	Process or methodology was present and was a proper means to evaluate the project question or meet the project goal.	Process or methodology was clearly outlined and demonstrated elegance or inventiveness to evaluate the project question or meet the project goal.
<b>C. Findings/Results</b>	Findings or results were unstated or hard to identify.	Findings or results were stated but lacked clarity, context or objectivity.	Findings or results addressed project question or goal with clarity, context and objectivity.	Findings or results addressed project question or goal with clarity, context and objectivity and provided exceptional insight.

# Research Presentation Judging Rubric - Full Text (continued)

## II. Presentation Structure

Faculty Judge

	1. Novice	2. Apprentice	3. Practitioner	4. Expert
A. Flow and order of information	Information was incoherent without a beginning middle or end, had poor or non-existent transitions or lacked headings or title to provide signposts or structure to project.	Information had attempted or implicit flow with evident beginning, middle and end, but poor transitions tying project elements together. Included headings and title, but were used in an illogical order or were disconnected from the project's content.	Information had an explicit flow that was logical and orderly with clear beginning middle and end that were tied together with strong, effective transitions. Headings and title outlined project elements.	Information organized in a flow that captures a cohesive narrative across entire presentation. Beginning, middle and end were tied together with transitions that enhanced the understanding of the project with headings and title that not only outlined project elements, but increased understanding.
B. Text	Text was incoherent, unrelated to research question, contained significant grammatical errors, or was of an unreadable size.	Text was confusing, only partially informed the research question, contained some grammatical errors, or was hard to read.	Text was clear, informed the research questions, had one or two grammatical errors and was easy to read.	Text was clear and accessible, informed the research questions, was free of grammatical errors.
C. Relevance and appropriateness of visual elements	No visual elements were used on visual aid or the visuals used were not relevant to project/research.	Some visual elements were used on visual aid, but the visuals used only partially clarified project/research.	Appropriate number of visual elements used on visual aid and the visuals supported understanding of project/research.	Appropriate number of visual elements used on visual aid and visuals enhanced understanding of project/research.

# Research Presentation Judging Rubric - Full Text (continued)

## III. Need For Project

Faculty Judge

	1. Novice	2. Apprentice	3. Practitioner	4. Expert
<b>A. Background/Context</b>	Little or no background provided to give context to the work; significant gaps in supporting literature.	Attempted to provide background and context for the research/project, but failed to illustrate need for the work.	Provided context and background that convincingly argued for the need of the work.	Background and context to project elucidated a striking need for the research/project in presenter's field.
<b>B. Quality of study or project design</b>	Project or study didn't follow reputable methodology or existing research or creative techniques or was unreplicable.	Project or study attempted to follow reputable methodology or existing research or creative techniques but was unreplicable.	Successfully replicated existing research or creative techniques, but failed to use techniques in a new way that advanced the field of study.	Not only replicated existing research or creative techniques, but innovated techniques in a new way that advanced the field of study.
<b>C. Conclusions, outcomes and future directions</b>	No clear conclusions or outcomes were reached as a result of the project/research.	Conclusions or outcomes reached as a result of the project/research were already known in presenter's field or researcher didn't have a sense of the next steps for advancing current research.	Conclusions or outcomes reached as a result of the project/research added to presenter's field; presenter had a sense of the next steps for advancing current research.	Conclusions or outcomes reached as a result of the project/research significantly added to presenter's field; presenter not only had sense of next steps for current research, but demonstrated vision for future research.

# Research Presentation Judging Rubric - Full Text (continued)

## IV. Knowledge of Project

Faculty Judge

	1. Novice	2. Apprentice	3. Practitioner	4. Expert
<b>A. Referenced literature from field</b>	No literature from presenter's field was cited or the literature cited had no or little relevance to presenter's project/research. No attempt was made to put existing literature into context.	Some literature from presenter's field was used, but was incomplete, irrelevant or insufficient to support project/research. Presenter demonstrated some familiarity with the work of their discipline.	Literature from presenter's field was relevant and adequately supported project/research. Presenter demonstrated familiarity with the work of their discipline.	Literature from presenter's field was relevant and extensively supported project/research. Presenter demonstrated considerable knowledge of the work of their discipline.
<b>B. Added to visual aid</b>	Presenter was unfamiliar with or unable to articulate the content on visual aid.	Presenter was dependent on content on visual aid to communicate project/research.	Presenter was clearly familiar with content on visual aid to communicate project/research, but only presented on information included on visual aid.	Presenter carefully chose the most important content for visual aid to communicate their project/research and added to information included on visual aid.
<b>C. Ability to answer questions</b>	Presenter was unable to answer questions about project/research or provided inaccurate answers to questions.	Presenter was able to partially answer questions about project/research.	Presenter thoroughly and accurately answered questions about the project/research.	Presenter not only answered questions about the project/research thoroughly and accurately, but expanded with relevant information beyond the question.

# Research Presentation Judging Rubric - Full Text (continued)

## V. Effective Visual Aids

Project Management and Communication

	1. Novice	2. Apprentice	3. Practitioner	4. Expert
<b>A. Readability</b>	Visual aid generally lacked readability due to nonexistent or confusing titles and headings, odd or inconsistent fonts, non-contrasting colors, long and dense paragraphs or lack of captions.	Visual aid was mostly readable but has a few significant issues with nonexistent or confusing titles and headings, odd or inconsistent fonts, non-contrasting colors, long and dense paragraphs or lack of captions.	Visual aid was clear and readable with mostly appropriate use of titles, headings, fonts, colors, bulleted lists, diagrams and captions.	Text was optimally formatted for quick and sporadic reading through the appropriate use of titles, headings, fonts, colors, bulleted lists, diagrams and captions.
<b>B. Layout</b>	Visual aid was non-intuitive and disorganized due to poor placement, cluttered elements, unclear headings or insufficient white space.	Visual aid had basic organization, but was hindered by a few elements of poor placement, cluttered elements, unclear headings or insufficient white space.	Visual aid was mostly organized and was easy to navigate due to prominent use of modular placement, clear headings and sufficient white space; aesthetic elements were generally pleasing.	Visual aid was organized into intuitive sections that are delineated by modular placement, clear headings and sufficient white space; aesthetic elements were clear and pleasing.
<b>C. Images and figures</b>	Images and figures either were not present or did not contribute to effective communication due to small size, poor quality or resolution, irrelevance or complexity.	Images and figures only partially helped communicate the project due to small size, poor quality or resolution, irrelevance or complexity.	Images and figures in the visual aid mostly helped communicate the project and were generally appropriately sized, of high quality, relevant and simple.	Images and figures in the visual aid helped communicate the project through ample size, high quality and resolution, relevance to the project and simplicity.

# Research Presentation Judging Rubric - Full Text (continued)

## VI. Professionalism and Poise

Speaking Fellow

	1. Novice	2. Apprentice	3. Practitioner	4. Expert
<b>A. Overall presence</b>	Presenter was unfamiliar with content and relied heavily on visual aid and/or notes. They lacked confidence or appeared uncomfortable and were disconnected from the audience.	Presenter was somewhat unfamiliar with content and was mostly dependent on visual aid and/or notes. They demonstrated some confidence and comfortability, but were disconnected from the audience.	Presenter appeared rehearsed, but had some reliance on visual aid and/or notes. They appeared mostly confident and comfortable and connected with audience.	Presenter was well-rehearsed and able to speak extemporaneously. They appeared confident and comfortable and connected with audience.
<b>B. Verbal delivery</b>	Presenter's speech was difficult to hear or hard to understand; greater attention needed to vocal rate, volume, variety and/or elocution. Significant or distracting use of filler words.	Presenter's speech was mostly clear and audible; demonstrated room for improvement in vocal rate, volume, variety and/or elocution. Noticeable use of filler words.	Presenter exhibited excellent speech; vocal rate, volume, variety and elocution were strong, with minimal usage of filler words.	Presenter spoke with exceptional eloquence; vocal rate, volume, variety and elocution were nearly perfect with few or no filler words.
<b>C. Nonverbal delivery</b>	Presenter's movement and expression caused significant distraction from delivery of content; body language demonstrated room for improvement in eye contact, posture, gesture and/or facial expression. Appearance lacked credibility.	Presenter's movement and expression caused some distraction from delivery of content; body language demonstrated room for improvement in eye contact, posture, gesture and/or facial expression. Appearance lacked credibility.	Presenter's movement and expression emphasized key points of content; presenter maintained good eye contact and posture, mostly used natural gestures and facial expressions and had a credible appearance.	Presenter's movement and expression enhanced delivery of content; presenter maintained excellent eye contact and strong posture, used natural gestures and facial expressions and had a credible appearance.