SCORING CRITERIA - 2025 Postdoc Research Symposium

##/##/## - JUDGE NAME

SCORING CALIBRATION

Please use the criteria below and your experience to guide your scores for each of the nine presentation elements below. Half-point scores are allowable.

1 - Does not meet expectations.
2 - Demonstrates competency, but did not address most of the criteria or had significant weaknesses.
3 - Good, but did not address some of the criteria or had some notable flaws.
4 - Very good. Addressed all of the criteria, but had some minor flaws in delivery.
5 - Excellent. Exceeded expectations, no flaws or nearly flawless delivery.

GOALS	ELEMENTS	CRITERIA (Judges score 1 - 5 on each. 5=highest)	[Presenter 1] [Presentation Title]	[Presenter 2] [Presentation Title]	[Presenter 3] [Presentation Title]
Comprehension & Content	**Motivation**	Does the presentation make *clear why a general audience should care* about this topic, problem, or question?			
	Intellectual Significance	Did the presenter explain why their project is *significant to their academic discipline*? Can we easily understand why an exploration, solution, or answer matters to current and future research and/or professional pursuits?			
	Clarity of Research	Did the presenter *clearly identify the focus of their research?* That may include the specific question(s) or objective(s) they aim to address as part of their postdoc (or previous) research?			
	Organization	Did the presentation follow a *clear and logical sequence*? This can take many forms, but could include elements of a beginning, important information, strategy/design, and outcomes or impact of work.			
Engagement & Communication	**Delivery**	The oration was *delivered clearly and effectively*. For example, presenters' volume and clarity of speech, body posture, eye contact, and use of gestures when appropriate.			
	Appropriateness	Was the topic and its significance communicated in language that was *relevant and appropriate for a broad audience*? For example, did the speaker avoid or explain discipline-specific jargon, without "dumbing down" the content?			
	Effective Conveyance	To what degree was the *presenter particularly effective in conveying their scholarship or research*—making it interesting and engaging to the audience in this format? Was the presenter's task of connecting their work to the audience's lives and interests notably challenging (not the research itself per se), and/or did it require them to use an innovative approach?			
	Accessibility & Visual Clarity	Were all *elements accessible to a broad audience and enhance the presentation*? Were all graphics, props, and text easy-to-view and interpret? If used, were any sound elements clearly audible or any video clearly visible?			
	Engagement	To what extent did the talk *inspire your curiosity*? Did it make you want to learn more about or take action on the topic?			
	SCORE TOTAL				
	GENERAL COMMENTS FOR POSTDOC PRESENTER *Please provide constructive and supportive comments for the presenter that can enable them to improve their future presentations. Specific examples of ways they can improve using the criteria above are encouraged.*				