

Directions: For each judging category, multiply the weight (15, 30, 40, or 15) by the rank (low 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 high) and enter the category score at the bottom of the page. Add the category scores to determine the total score. At the end of the session, confer with your co-judges to determine the winner, and give the results to the Faculty Facilitator. If presented in a foreign language, take into consideration the native and non-native speaker so that the native speaker is not given an unfair advantage.

	Rank	Organization	Methodology	Content	Delivery	
(weight)		15	30	40	15	
	1 (lowest)	Lacked sequence in presentation or missing information. Presented too little/much material for allotted time frame.	Poor methodology. Inappropriate choice of methods. Methods do not match research design.	Problem/purpose hypothesis: difficult to discern relationships of each. Lacks creativity and innovation. Has no significance to field and will not make contribution.	Presenter unsettled, uninterested and unenthused. Inappropriate voice mannerisms, body language, and poor communication skills. Slides/presentation materials poor and did not enhance presentation/demonstration.	
	2	Poor sequence or illogical presentation of information. Some relevant information not presented. Presentation not well-timed.	Fair methodology. Choice of methods not best fit for research design.	Problem/purpose hypothesis: not cohesive. Demonstrates minimal creativity and innovation. Little relevance or significance to the field and will make little contribution.	Presenter unenthused, monotonous and relied extensively on notes. Voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills sometimes inappropriate. Slides/presentation materials below average and slightly enhanced presentation/demonstration.	
	3	Some information presented out of sequence. Had some spacing and timing problems.	Methodology relevant. Research methods appropriate.	Problem/purpose/hypothesis: cohesive. Has some creativity and innovation. Moderately relevant and/or significant to field and will make some contribution.	Displayed interest and enthusiasm. Limited engagement with audience. Occasionally struggled to find words. Generally appropriate voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills. Slides/presentation materials fair and somewhat enhanced presentation/demonstration.	
	4	Information presented nearly complete and relevant and presented in logical sequence. Pace and timing appropriate.	Methodology appropriate to problem/hypothesis. Good choice of research methods.	Problem/purpose/hypothesis: cohesive and able to determine relationships between them. Creative and innovative. Relevant and/or significant and will make a good contribution.	Engaged audience. Displayed interest and enthusiasm. Good voice mannerisms, body language and communication skills. Slides/presentation materials good and enhanced presentation/demonstration.	
	5 (highest)	Information presented was completed and in logical order. Easy to follow. Very well-timed and well-paced.	Methodology very appropriate for topic. Research methods relevant, appropriate, and innovative; introduces new or expands on established ideas.	Problem/purpose/hypothesis: very cohesive and strongly related. Very creative and innovative. Extremely relevant to field and will make an important contribution.	Very engaging. Expressed ideas fluently in own words. Genuinely interested and enthusiastic. Exceptional voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills. Slides/presentation materials were exceptional and greatly enhanced presentation/demonstration.	
Title / Student(s)	Organization Score	Methodology Score	Content Score	Delivery Score	Total Score	