

ADJUDICATION MATRIX

	1 = Needs Improvement	2 = Fair	3 = Good	4 = Excellent	5 = Exceptional	Your scores
Mechanics						
1. Introduction	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.	
2. Pronunciation / Elocution <i>(consider presenters who have ESL and assess accordingly)</i>	Difficulties with speaking clearly. Mumbles and does not project voice. Incorrectly pronounces terminology.	Difficulty with pronouncing some key words	Clear presentation with some words not pronounced correctly.	Clear and concise presentation.	Succinct elocution of entire presentation	
3. Abstract	Ill defined parameters around structure and content.	Difficult to clearly comprehend understand what the presentation is about	Show cases the importance and relevance of the key concepts under discussion in a clear manner.	Presents a clear and succinct descriptive overview of the topic. Demonstrates a depth of knowledge of the key concepts, supported by the literature.	Contains excellent scientific merit and originality. Has clarity in the message. Highlights the topic and its implications from a variety of perspectives.	
4. Clearly specified Aim	Hazy description of the aim. 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.	
5. Development of topic	There is a lack of clarity with the topic, 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.	
6. Literature Review	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.	
7. Technical Vocabulary / scientific language (e.g., appropriate use of technical jargon)	Completely inappropriate use of technical jargon. Excessive slang. Profanity.	Occasionally inappropriate use of technical jargon Some slang.	Technical jargon defined clearly, and used appropriately in the context of presentation.	Considerate use of technical jargon.	Excellent use of the requisite scientific terminology.	
Platform skills						
8. Rapport (e.g., audience attention or involvement, and an appropriate greeting or introduction)	No attempt to establish rapport with audience. No introduction or greeting. Audience completely disinterested or not involved.	Gains some rapport with the audience. Has some difficulty in retaining the rapport through the presentation.	Some rapport established thru the use of humour, greeting, or other techniques. Some audience involvement.	Demonstrates an excellent technique of eliciting rapport and maintaining it with the audience.	Completely engaged audience's attention. Greeting or other techniques was effective.	
9. Voice Qualities Clarity, Pace, Fluency <i>(consider presenters who have ESL and assess accordingly)</i>	Poor. Halting, uneven pace. Cannot hear all the words due to mumbling, speaking too softly, too quickly, or in monotone.	Adequate pace and volume. Speaks fairly clearly, but lacks sufficient variations in vocal intonation for emphasis.	Has a good use of voice. Overall a very clear presentation. In some sections of the content, the pace of delivery and volume inappropriate.	Has an excellent use of voice. Is clear, calm and confident. The tonality and inflections are delivered appropriately.	Fluid, natural delivery. Speaks clearly, is well-paced and demonstrates good vocal variety, articulation, and volume.	

10.Ability to engage and involve audience, include eye contact and body language; poise	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.	
Visuals						
11.Layout of material & Organisation (eg the relevance of the material and structure of the presentation)	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.	
12.Use of diagrams / Clarity of images (all images etc to be acknowledged and de-named. FAILURE TO DO SO ON ANY SLIDE WILL RESULT IN AN INSTANT ZERO MARK FOR THIS SECTION)	No graphics or images included or irrelevant diagrams used.	Included graphics and images somewhat relevant to the topic. However the images do not enhance the content. Tends to distract from the presentation.	Included appropriate images and graphics pertinent to the presented material. Good quality images are used, however need to check the resolution.	Suitable images and graphics selected and integrated well into the presentation.	Excellent visual aids which were embedded into the presentation.	
13.Text	Lengthy blocks of text. Font size too small. Font type difficult to read.	Readability still difficult. Lengthy text. Fonts too dark / light. Busy bold writing with inappropriate text and inconsistent indented text.	Format of text on slide still a little inconsistent. Text is easier to read, however typeset, combined with long strings of text does not enhance readability.	Overall all writing is easy to read. Content is enhanced by appropriate use of shade and contrast.	KISS principle adhered to. All writing clear, concise and legible. Text reads well and all slides follow a consistent format.	
14.Choice of slide background and colour / Background	Was not able to read the writing as the background was too dark. Poor choice for the transfer of information	Conflicting backgrounds with limited colour contrast. Writing still a little difficult to read.	Incorporated the appropriate design template required by the practice. Slide background	Background slide colour good. Has balance and all text is legible. Audience can be intuitively guided through	Excellent choice of background to compliment and encapsulate the finer points of the presentation.	
15.Command of material (e.g., the amount of reading)	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.	
16.Understanding (e.g., the accuracy of statements and the coverage of the topic)	Poor. Major topics or concepts were inaccurately described or explained, or completely omitted.	A few topics or concepts were inaccurately described, or omitted.	Has a good grasp of the concepts, and could describe them sufficiently.	Possesses and can demonstrate an excellent understanding of the key concepts.	Excellent understanding and coverage. No topics or concepts were inaccurately described or omitted.	
17.Depth of research / Topic Analysis	Generally poor, limited in scope and does not demonstrate the depth required.	Superficial and limited information presented. Topic was limited in its scope and analysis.	Adequate and generally sound. A good analysis of the topic.	Demonstrates excellent depth of key concepts within the research. Concepts and issues are carefully and critically reviewed.	Insightful, has incredible depth, demonstrates complexity and critical awareness of subject.	
18.Body	Little to no facts. Ideas presented lacked substance and supporting evidence. No logical flow of ideas.	Facts presented in some semblance of logical flow. Still a little vague, and lacks a strong sense of purpose.	Logical sequence of information presented. Information requires more substance, but does support the aim.	Information provided uses sound evidence and supports the aim of the presentation. Audience is interested in the topic.	Facts presented were undisputable. Information presented utilised academic and professional evidence and discussed succinctly. Invoked a high level of audience interest.	

19.Conclusion	No conclusion	Vague conclusion	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.	
20.Citations	Could not check the validity of the information being presented.	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.	
21.Preparation	Evidence shows that this presentation has been hastily prepared. Presenter is flustered with content and equipment.	Adequate preparation. Some of the materials are under prepared and results in a weak delivery.	Sound preparation, however presenter is a little unsure of some material. Delivery is a little shaky in some areas.	Well rounded preparation. Presenter is comfortable with the subject material and delivered a sound presentation.	Presentation meticulously prepared. Presenter is well rehearsed, fluent with subject matter and delivered with flair.	
22.Time Management	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.	
23.Other (e.g., dress, visual aids)	Unacceptable. Numerous problems degraded the quality of the presentation.	At least one major problem degraded the quality of the presentation. (ie slide missing or not working)	Acceptable. A few minor problems were noticed.	Fairly comprehensive and well constructed presentation. Presenter was poised and well rehearsed.	Well polished flawless presentation incorporating all criteria.	
Questions and Answers						
24.Clear understanding of question	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.	
Final score (max is 120)						

ADJUDICATORS COMMENTS: