

### Student Research Conference Presentation Judging Rubric

<b>Elements</b>	<b>Novice (1 point)</b>	<b>Apprentice (2 points)</b>	<b>Practitioner (3 points)</b>	<b>Expert (4 points)</b>
Background / Context	Little or no background provided to give context.	Referenced relevant literature from the field but provided background and limited context that lacked connection to research.	Referenced relevant literature from the field and provided detailed background and context that connected with and supported the research.	Referenced relevant literature from the field and provided detailed background and context that displayed evidence of synthesized thinking about the research.
Question / Goal	Question or goal was not stated or was unclear (ambiguous, incoherent).	Question or goal was clearly stated but lacked detail and appropriate scope.	Question or goal was clearly stated in detail and of an appropriate scope.	Question or goal was clearly stated and was built upon the foundation and in the context established by the background.
Methodology / Process	Methodology or process was not described.	Methodology or process was described but inappropriate for research question or goal.	Methodology or process was clear and appropriate for research question or goal.	Methodology or process was clear and demonstrated inventiveness to evaluate the research question or meet goal.
Results / Findings	Results or findings were not included.	Results or findings were not presented clearly and descriptions of analysis and/or interpretation were absent.	Results or findings AND analysis and interpretation of the findings were clearly described but not fully developed.	Results or findings AND analysis and interpretation of the findings were clearly described and fully developed.
Conclusions	Conclusions were not presented.	Conclusions were presented but applications, limitations, and/or extensions were not fully developed.	Conclusions were presented in the context of the existing body of knowledge and included appropriate applications, limitations, and extensions.	Conclusions significantly added to presenter's field and presenter demonstrated clear vision for future research.
Professionalism	Presenter was unfamiliar with content and relied heavily on notes/visual aids; speech was unclear and used excessive filler words; body language was distracting; unprofessional appearance; unable to answer questions.	Presenter was mostly familiar with content; speech was somewhat unclear and used filler words; body language was slightly distracting; unprofessional appearance; attempted to answer questions.	Presenter was familiar with content; speech was clear but used filler words; body language was appropriate; professional appearance; able to answer questions.	Presenter was comfortable with content; speech was clear and controlled without use of filler words; body language was natural and complemented presentation delivery; professional appearance; able to effectively answer questions.
Visual Aid	Visual aid was not included or lacked readability or viewability; was disorganized or lacked context; visuals were not effective or were distracting or detracted from understanding of the presentation.	Visual aid was mostly readable or viewable but lacked organization or context; demonstrated poor design or placement of elements and images.	Visual aid was readable or viewable; had basic organization or context; design or placement of elements and images was effective.	Visual aid was clearly readable or viewable; was well-organized or placed in proper context; demonstrated effective design or placement of elements; enhanced understanding of the presentation.