

## FELLOWSHIP GUIDELINES – 2018 ADJUDICATION MATRIX

Presentation Style	1 = Needs Improvement	2 = Fair	3 = Good	4 = Excellent	5 = Exceptional	Score
<b>Vocal quality</b>	Difficulties with speaking clearly. Mumbles and does not project voice. Incorrectly pronounces terminology. Uneven pace	Difficulty with pronouncing some key words. Occasionally inappropriate use of technical jargon Some slang. Adequate pace and volume.	Clear presentation with some words not pronounced correctly. Technical jargon defined clearly, and used appropriately in the context of presentation.	Clear and concise presentation. Considerate use of technical jargon. Calm and confident	Succinct elocution of entire presentation. Excellent use of the requisite scientific terminology. Natural presenter.	
<b>Quality of presentation style</b>  <b>Note: failure to de-identify patient data results in a zero score</b>	Extremely cluttered, confusing slides. Uses the slides inappropriately, and does not have headings which make sense to the audience. Information disjointed or inadequate. No logical flow of information.	Slides have some cohesion, still a little too busy and disorganised. Attempt made to have ideas presented in a logical format.	Slide layout is good. Has a structured form to it. Graphic placement still needs a little work. Information relevant and appropriate to the audience. Organised in a clear sequence.	Slide detail balanced with the writing and graphics, and all space and headings used appropriately. Material engaging, is accurate , varied and relevant. Contains an introduction, main body and conclusion.	Aesthetically pleasing. Has excellent use of the space and uses appropriate headings to guide the audience. Engaging and relevant information for audience. Excellent details presented in a well organised manner.	
<b>Citations</b>	Could not check the validity of the information being presented. No reference list shown.	Occasionally the correct citation format was used. Was able to find the sources of the information used.	Citation format used correctly throughout the presentation. Some graphics and quotations still lacked sources.	Citations used correctly. Presented in the correct format with excellent information.	Credibility and authority of the information could not be argued. All information clearly identified and credited to the appropriate sources.	
<b>Time Management</b>	Completely overtime by a significant amount. Clearly has not rehearsed presentation.	Is overtime and presenter had insufficient time to complete all material and answer questions.	Adheres to time constraints. Is familiar with the equipment and was able to present all material. Just enough time to answer questions	Solid timing of material on each slide. Presenter has clearly rehearsed and was familiar and comfortable with equipment.	Impeccable timing. All slides given effective time. Speaker was able to take questions and interact with audience and maintain focus on content delivery.	
Presentation Content	2 = Needs Improvement	4 = Fair	6 = Good	8 = Excellent	10 = Exceptional	Score
<b>Introduction</b>	The introduction is lacking direction and does not focus and engage the audience. Chairperson not acknowledged	The introduction has some semblance of structure. Has a messy or incomplete direction. Chair not acknowledged.	The introduction is appealing to the audience. Has a defined sequence and flow. Still has an occasional element of direction lacking. Chair acknowledged.	The introduction has clarity and brevity, and directs the audience in a coherent fashion. Chair acknowledged.	Compelling introduction that conveys the overall topic and engages the audience immediately. Standard conventions met.	
<b>Aim / Reason Statement</b>	Hazy description of the aim. or reason. Uncertainty as to what the presentation focus is.	Contains irrelevancies and the aim is not very clear. Does not really define the issues for discussion.	Has focus on the topic. Identifies the basic concepts to be discussed.	Identifies the topic with clarity. Demonstrates the key concept areas for discussion.	Topic is clearly identified and incorporates focus and direction.	
<b>Methodology Or Case study technique described</b>	There is a lack of clarity with the topic, purpose is unclear and conceptually it is not developed.	The presentation is quite descriptive, but does not get to the point of the topic, and there is little comparison and contrasting of literature.	Demonstrates a broad brush view of the topic. Overall concepts and ideas are defined and discussed through the presentation.	Topic developed with clarity. Concepts are systematically defined and all elements are compared and contrasted.	The key concepts are clearly explained, defined, and systematically compared and contrasted throughout the presentation. Can show consistency in aligning literature with practical elements.	

## FELLOWSHIP GUIDELINES – 2018 ADJUDICATION MATRIX

<b>Results - Experimental</b>	Minimal results demonstrated from the research, no clarity to the results	Results are limited and unclear	Acceptable amount of results with acceptable connection to the methodology	Good level of results presented, well linked to the methodology stated	Excellent results demonstrated with accurate alignment with stated methodology	
<b>OR Results Literature Review</b>	Minimal research into the literature. Content of presentation is wholly unsupported.	Research undertaken is superficial and limited. Sourced literature is obscure, outdated and not reliable.	Good scope of literature read. Has an awareness of the critical issues. The literature is sound, and shows evidence of analysis, reflection and critical thinking. Needs more depth and insight.	Evidence of wide, relevant and critical reading. Can express concepts from the literature and support the key ideas within the presentation. Good depth and insight of the literature.	Demonstrates evidence of wide critical reading. Is able to draw and synthesise information from own and others research. Outstanding summary of the published materials.	
<b>OR Case study application of technique</b>	Minimal description of the case being described	Basic information provided, unclear description of case	Good description of case, follows logical presentation of information	Good description of case, limited use of literature referencing	Excellent description of case with relevant linkages to literature references	
<b>Discussion</b>	There is a lack of clarity with the topic, and conceptually it is not developed. No reference to existing literature	The presentation is quite descriptive, but does not get to the point of the topic, and there is little comparison and contrasting of literature.	Demonstrates a broad brush view of the topic. Overall concepts and ideas are defined and discussed through the presentation with good reference to existing literature	Topic developed with clarity. Concepts are systematically defined and all elements are compared and contrasted.	The key concepts are clearly explained, defined, and systematically compared and contrasted throughout the presentation. Can show consistency in aligning literature with practical elements.	
<b>Command of Topic</b>	Poor. Struggles often to find words. Reads most of presentation.	Possesses an adequate command of material. Occasionally struggles to find words and place in document.	Material is expressed with occasional hesitation, but not a heavy reliance on notes.	Has a sound command of material. Presenter was prepared and knew their material.	Excellent. Does not read from notes or slides. Expresses ideas and concepts fluently in own words.	
<b>Conclusion</b>	No conclusion	Vague conclusion, unclear outcome	Conclusion given, but still leaves questions unanswered and did not support aim.	Conclusion supported the main ideas within the presentation. Offers brief glimpses of potential future direction / research.	Conclusion left no doubt in audience that the data unequivocally supported the aim of the research. Was able to discuss the immediate implications / applications to the workplace, and also future direction.	
<b>Audience Response</b>	<b>1 = Needs Improvement</b>	<b>2 = Fair</b>	<b>3 = Good</b>	<b>4 = Excellent</b>	<b>5 = Exceptional</b>	<b>Scores</b>
<b>Response to audience questions</b> If No questions = 3	Became flustered when asked clarification questions. Could not give an effective or clear response.	Was not able to give a clear and concise answer to the question asked.	Occasional inconsistencies with the response. Overall gave definitive answers to questions raised.	Answers showed thoroughness of knowledge on the subject.	Consistently offers a thorough knowledge of the content and able to express appropriate detail when necessary.	
<b>Audience engagement</b>	Very little engagement of the audience. The delivery if material is purely through reading from notes. Audience disengaged. Demonstrates distracting mannerisms which distract from the presentation	An attempt is made by the presenter to connect with the audience via eye contact. Relies on visual aids to engage the audience. Talks to screen Incongruent body language vs verbal message	Good engagement with audience. Has mastered connection with the audience using eye contact. Uses a good range of visuals to engage the audience. Occasionally but inconsistently used hands and body movements.	Presenter engages with audience well. Connects on all levels and uses all mechanisms to get the message across. Engaging body language. Fluid movement and gestures, congruent with message delivered.	Audience completely mesmerised by the quality of the experience. Presenter has full control over all aspects of learning and has a physical stage "presence". Speaker appears comfortable and natural.	
<b>Final score (max is 100)</b>						

**FELLOWSHIP GUIDELINES – 2018 ADJUDICATION MATRIX**