**Score Card**

Each competitor should be assessed on the judging criteria listed below. Please note that each criterion is equally weighted and that the contest emphasizes communicating clearly to a general (i.e. non-specialist) audience.

**Presenter:**

**Presentation:
Judge:**

Scoring scale: **.5 = Poor** - **10 = Excellent**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Judging Criteria** | Total Score  |
| **Comprehension & Content*** Did the presenter clearly establish the nature and purpose of the research?
* Did the organization make sense? Was the content easy to follow?
* Did the presentation clearly describe the key outcomes, results, and conclusions of the research?
* Did the presenter clearly indicate why this research is important/significant?
* Did the speaker explain/define important terminology, avoid jargon, and provide adequate background information to illustrate key points?
* Did the presentation include an effective introduction and conclusion?
 |  |
| **Clarity** **& Engagement:*** Was the presentation *engaging*? Did it make you want to know more?
* Would this talk help a *general/non-specialist* audience be able to understand the research?
* Did the *slide* enhance, rather than detract from, the talk – was it clear, legible, and concise?
* Was the presenter enthusiastic, conversational, personable, and professional?
* Did the presenter’s pacing and style capture and *maintain your attention*?
* Did the presenter effectively and appropriately utilize *non-verbal* communication skills (i.e. eye contact, vocal variety, body movement, etc.)?
 |  |
| **Total presentation score** (out of 20) |  |

**Judges Notes:**