

Participant:

Judge:

Quick-Share Presentation

November 19, 2024

Criteria	1-2 (Poor)	3-4 (Fair)	5-6 (Good)	7-9 (Excellent)	10 (Outstanding)	Score
<b>Relevance to Collaboratorium</b>	Barely related; major misalignment for this Collaboratorium	Loosely connected; unclear fit within the Collaboratorium	Generally related to the Collaboratorium but with some misalignment	Clearly aligns with research in this Collaboratorium	Perfectly aligned; fully represents this interdisciplinary Collaboratorium	
<b>Background &amp; Significance</b>	Little or no background; significance of project focus is unclear	Vague background context; significance of project is barely explained	Clear background but lacks key points leading to significance of this project	Thorough background; significance of project is clear with minor gaps	Comprehensive background; clearly ties project to its broader significance	
<b>Research/Project Design/Strategy</b>	No clear design or methodology is inappropriate	Vague design; weak rationale for method or approach	Clear design; appropriate methodology	Well-explained design; sound methodology	Detailed and coherent design; methodology fully justified and innovative	
<b>Conclusions &amp; Impact</b>	Missing or unsupported conclusions; impact unclear	Vague conclusions; minimal discussion of impact	Generally clear conclusions; impact moderately discussed	Well-supported conclusions; notable impact explained	Strong, clear conclusions with significant impact clearly articulated	
<b>Single Slide Communication</b>	Slide is confusing; design detracts from the content; OR slide doesn't provide support	Layout difficult to read or interpret; OR slide does little to support presentation	Layout is functional but some content lacks clarity	Clean design; easily readable; supports presentation well	Visually appealing and clear; adds value to overall presentation	
<b>Clarity for Non-specialists</b>	Incomprehensible to non-specialists	Difficult to follow; uses unexplained or too much jargon	Generally understandable but with some jargon is unclear	Clear for most non-specialists; minor clarifications needed	Exceptionally clear; non-specialists can understand the significance of the project	
<b>Non-verbal Communication</b>	No eye contact; distracting gestures and body language	Inconsistent eye contact; gestures misaligned with verbal delivery	Some engagement but lacks confident composure	Good eye contact and gestures; seems confident and prepared	Confident, engaging body language that enhances the communication	
<b>Verbal Communication</b>	Inaudible or unclear; poor tone control	Monotonous tone or inconsistent volume control	Generally clear with occasional issues with tone or projection	Clear, confident tone and projection	Dynamic, clear tone and projection and pacing creates enthusiasm in audience	
<b>Presentation Pacing</b>	Noticably rushing through the presentation; taking more than allotted time	Inconsistent pace of the presentation; summary delivered after end of time	Anxious delivery constantly checking time; goes over a few seconds than the allotted time	Presentation is well-timed to cover all visuals in a meaningful and timely manner.	Well-timed presentation with a natural and engaging delivery; Excellent coverage of visuals	

Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_