

Georgetown Postdoc Symposium: Presentation Judging Form

Presenter Name: _____ Judges Name: _____

Please evaluate the following 8 categories using a score of 1-5 (1=poor, 5=outstanding). Carefully review the scoring criteria, and **circle** a number for each category that best reflects your assessment.

Comments will be anonymously shared with presenters.

Background/Introduction

Clear and provided a relevant overview of the research or scholarly landscape	5
Clear/relevant to the project but too much detail	4
Clear but incomplete or not completely relevant	3
Not clear or relevant to project	2
No Background/Introduction	1

Hypothesis/Objective

Very clear and appropriately linked to the Background/Introduction	5
Mostly clear and appropriately linked to the Background/Introduction	4
Clear but not appropriately linked to the Background/Introduction	3
Not clear or relevant to the project	2
No Hypothesis/Objective	1

Methodology

Clear rationale and comprehensive details to fully understand what was done	5
Sufficient details to understand what was done	4
Lacked relevant information to fully understand what was done	3
Methods were not clear or relevant	2
No Methods	1

Results/Evidence

Included high quality and clear data/details that addressed the hypothesis/objective	5
Included sufficient data/details that addressed the hypothesis/objective and were understandable	4
Included sufficient data/details that addressed the hypothesis/objective but were difficult to comprehend	3
Provided but lacking details or key data	2
No Results were provided	1

Conclusion and/or Future Work

Strongly supported by results/evidence and very relevant to hypothesis/objective; Potentially very realistic next steps	5
Supported by results/evidence and relevant to hypothesis/objective	4
Some connection to results/evidence and to hypothesis/objective	3
Little to no connection to results/evidence	2
No Conclusions and/or Future Work mentioned	1

Tailoring of Presentation to General Audience

Presentation could be easily understood across disciplines (STEM, Social Sciences, Humanities, etc.); Jargon was used rarely or was clearly defined.	5
Presentation could be mostly understood across disciplines; Jargon was mostly defined.	4
Presentation could be somewhat understood across disciplines; Jargon was sometimes defined.	3
Presentation could be understood within a discipline (STEM, Humanities, Social Sciences, etc.); Jargon was rarely defined and used often.	2
Presentation required very specific background knowledge; Jargon was frequently used and not clearly defined.	1

Overall Presentation and Handling of Questions

Demonstrates very strong knowledge of the project; Answers difficult questions clearly and succinctly; Presentation is logical and very clear.	5
Demonstrates good knowledge of the project; Answers most questions; Presentation is clear for the most part, but has a few inconsistencies.	4
Demonstrates some knowledge of the project; Has some difficulty answering challenging questions; Presentation is somewhat unclear and has inconsistencies.	3
Demonstrates poor knowledge of project; Has difficulty answering questions; Presentation is generally unclear.	2
Does not demonstrate any knowledge of the project; Doesn't understand questions; Presentation is very confusing.	1

Quality of the Presentation Slides or Poster

All components present and layout has a strong flow; text is easy to read; photographs/tables/graphs are well-designed, appropriate, and labeled correctly.	5
All components present and layout is relatively easy to follow; text is easy to read with minor spelling errors; photographs/tables/graphs are appropriate and labeled correctly.	4
All components are present but layout is confusing; text is mostly clear with minor spelling errors; photographs/tables/graphs are somewhat related to text.	3
All components are present but layout is confusing & messy; text is hard to read with spelling errors; photographs/tables/graphs are not relevant or properly labeled.	2
Components are missing; layout is confusing & messy; photographs/tables/graphs are poorly done.	1

Comments: