**JUDGING SCORECARD**

**Presenter's Name:** 

**Judge's Name:** 

**Date:** 

When scoring, the use of half points is permitted.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>POOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORE**

---

**CLARITY:** Did the speaker provide adequate background knowledge to make the talk and the subject understandable?

**ORGANIZATION:** Did the presentation follow a clear and logical sequence?

**DELIVERY:** e.g., pace, enthusiasm, confidence, body language, eye contact, and vocal range.

**APPROPRIATENESS:** Was the topic communicated in language appropriate to an intelligent, but non-specialist audience? (For example, did the speaker avoid or explain discipline-specific jargon and acronyms?)

**INTELLECTUAL SIGNIFICANCE:** Did the speaker explain why the research matters to the field of study? If the student presents on collaborative work, was the significance of the student's unique contribution clearly specified?

**ENGAGEMENT:** To what extent did the talk speak to your intellectual curiosity? Did it make you appreciate the topic and want to learn more about it?

**COMMENTS** for the presenter (positive and constructive feedback, areas of opportunity):