

## UC Grad Slam 2015: Scorecard

Contestant's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Topic: \_\_\_\_\_

Judge's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

### Rank in Round

(no ties except at 4<sup>th</sup> place—circle *one*)

1<sup>st</sup>                      2<sup>nd</sup>                      3<sup>rd</sup>                      4<sup>th</sup>

	<u>Excellent</u>		<u>Good</u>		<u>Poor</u>	<b><u>SCORE:</u></b>
<i>Clarity:</i> Did the speaker provide adequate background knowledge to make the talk and the importance of the project understandable?	5	4	3	2	1	/5
<i>Organization:</i> Did the presentation follow a clear and logical sequence?	5	4	3	2	1	/5
<i>Delivery:</i> E.g., pace, enthusiasm, confidence, body language, eye contact, and vocal range.	5	4	3	2	1	/5
<i>Visuals:</i> If used, did the slides and/or props enhance the presentation and help to emphasize the primary points of the talk? Were the slides well designed, clear, legible, and concise? (*If no visuals were used, see note below.)	5	4	3	2	1	/5
<i>Appropriateness:</i> Was the topic and its significance communicated in language appropriate to an intelligent, but non-specialist audience? (For example, did the speaker avoid or explain discipline-specific jargon?)	5	4	3	2	1	/5
<i>Intellectual Significance:</i> Did the speaker explain why her/his project matters (for example, its significance to the academic discipline)?	5	4	3	2	1	/5
<i>Engagement:</i> To what extent did the talk speak to your intellectual curiosity? Did it make you want to learn more about the topic?	5	4	3	2	1	/5
<b>Comments for the presenter:</b>						<b><u>TOTAL SCORE:</u></b>

\*If the presenter is not using visuals, a score of 5 points indicates that you understood the presentation and it kept your attention perfectly, so no visuals were required; a score of 1 point indicates that visuals were needed in order for you to understand the presentation.