



Platform Presenters Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Judge: \_\_\_\_\_

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Poor 1	Lower than Expected 2	Met Expectations for Scholar's 3	Higher than Expected 4	Outstanding 5
-----------	-----------------------------	--	------------------------------	------------------

<b>Mechanics</b>					
Volume / Pace / Articulation	1	2	3	4	5
Slide Quality	1	2	3	4	5
Appropriateness / Precision	1	2	3	4	5
Ability to use audiovisual equipment.	1	2	3	4	5
Were slides organized effectively to support the message?	1	2	3	4	5
_____ / 25					<b>TOTAL</b>

<b>Content</b>					
Did the presentation include an introduction, hypothesis, purpose and a conclusion?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the conclusion address the hypothesis?	1	2	3	4	5
Was the overall concept and importance of the research understandable by a general scientific audience?	1	2	3	4	5
Was the work presented completed primarily by the trainee him/herself?	1	2	3	4	5
Did he/she specify which part(s) of the project were completed prior to his/her contribution?	1	2	3	4	5
Was the presentation clear?	1	2	3	4	5
Did the content support the hypothesis?	1	2	3	4	5
What was the overall impression given by the presentation?	1	2	3	4	5
Was there a clear direction towards future research?	1	2	3	4	5
Was all content explained?	1	2	3	4	5
_____ / 50					<b>TOTAL</b>

<b>Questions</b>					
Ability to interpret effectively	1	2	3	4	5
Ability to answer questions carefully and effectively	1	2	3	4	5
Did the presenter's response address the question asked?	1	2	3	4	5
Was the point clearly articulated?	1	2	3	4	5
Conciseness	1	2	3	4	5
_____ / 25					<b>TOTAL</b>

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Final Score:**

**/100**