Research Presentation Judging Rubric - Full Text

I. Core Elements of Project

Faculty Judge

	1. Novice	2. Apprentice	3. Practitioner	4. Expert
A. Question/Goal	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. Process/ Methodology	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.
C. Findings/Results	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
Utah State University

II. Presentation Structure

Faculty Judge

	1. Novice	**2. Apprentice**	**3. Practitioner**	**4. Expert**
A. Flow and order of information	Key takeaway was not stated. Information was incoherent without a beginning, middle, or end, had poor or non-existent transitions.	Key takeaway was stated but was difficult to find and/or understand. Information had an implicit flow with evident beginning, middle, end, and transitions.	Key takeaway was stated but could have been easier to find and/or understand. Information had an explicit flow that was logical and orderly with strong, effective transitions.	Key takeaway was eminently clear. Information organized in a flow with a cohesive narrative across entire presentation. Transitions that enhanced the understanding of the project.
B. Language (spoken and written)	Language was incoherent, inaccesible, unrelated to research question, or had significant usage errors.	Language was confusing, difficult to understand, only partially informed the research question, or contained some usage errors.	Language was clear, generally accessible, informed the research questions, and had few usage errors.	Language was clear and accessible, informed the research questions, and was free of usage errors.
C. Relevance and appropriateness of visual elements	No visual elements were used on visual aid, or the visuals used were inaccessible or were not relevant to project/research.	Some visual elements were used on visual aid, but the visuals used only partially clarified project/research.	Visual elements used on visual aid, and the visuals supported understanding of project/research.	Visual elements used on visual aid served as focal points, and visuals enhanced understanding of project/research.

Research
Utah State University

III. Need for Project

Faculty Judge

	1. Novice	**2. Apprentice**	**3. Practitioner**	**4. Expert**
A. Context	Little or no information provided to give context to the work.	Attempted to provide context for the research/project, but failed to illustrate need for the work.	Provided context that convincingly argued for the need of the work.	Context to project elucidated a striking need for the research/ project.
B. Quality of study or project design	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 way that advanced the field of study.	Not only replicated existing research or creative techniques, but innovated techniques in a way that advanced the field of study.
C. Conclusions, outcomes and future directions	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
Utah State University

IV. Knowledge of Project

Faculty Judge

	1. Novice	2. Apprentice	3. Practitioner	4. Expert
A. Appropriate to field	No attempt was made to put project into context of the field or discipline.	Presenter demonstrated some familiarity with the work of their discipline.	Presenter demonstrated familiarity with the work of their discipline. Presenter cited or linked to additional resources.	Presenter demonstrated considerable knowledge of the work of their discipline. Presenter cited or linked to relevant works.
B. Added to visual aid	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.
C. Ability to answer questions	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 demonstrated ability to provide additional relevant information.

Research
UtahStateUniversity

V. Effective Visual Aids

Visual aid expert

	1. Novice	2. Apprentice	3. Practitioner	4. Expert
A. Text efficiency	Text was inefficient due to nonexistent or confusing titles and headings, small or inconsistent fonts, long and dense paragraphs or lack of captions.	Text was mostly efficient but had a few significant issues with nonexistent or confusing titles and headings, small or inconsistent fonts, long and dense paragraphs, or lack of captions.	Text was efficient with mostly appropriate use of clear titles, descriptive headings, large fonts, bulleted lists, diagrams and captions.	Text was optimally formatted for quick and sporadic reading through the appropriate use of clear titles, descriptive headings, large fonts, bulleted lists, diagrams, and captions.
B. Layout	Visual aid overloaded the reader with too much content, lack of organization, and/or non-descriptive headings.	Visual aid had basic organization but was hindered by too much content, cluttered elements, and/or non-descriptive headings.	Visual aid was mostly organized and was easy to navigate due to carefully curated content, organized and aligned elements, and descriptive headings with main messages.	Visual aid maximized reader attention by eliminating all unnecessary content. Remaining elements were clearly organized with descriptive headings that shared main messages.
C. Images and figures	Images and figures either were not present or did not contribute to effective communication due to a lack of simplicity, explanation, relevance, size, or quality.	Images and figures only partially helped communicate the project due to a lack of simplicity, explanation, relevance, size, or quality.	Images and figures in the visual aid mostly helped communicate the project and generally had appropriate simplicity, explanation, relevance, size, and quality.	Images and figures in the visual aid helped communicate the project through high simplicity, helpful explanation, significant relevance, ample size, and high quality/resolution.

Research

Utah State University

VI. Professionalism and Poise

Speaking Fellow

	1. Novice	2. Apprentice	3. Practitioner	4. Expert
A. Overall presence	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. Verbal delivery	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.
C. Nonverbal delivery	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.

Research
UtahStateUniversity