Rubric – Quick Talk Graduate Communication Competition

Criteria	1 – Poor	2 – Fair	3 – Good	4 – Very Good	5 – Excellent	Score
Audience Adaptation *(Could I understand this as a non-expert?)*	Presentation assumes expert knowledge; terminology, pacing, or explanations are inaccessible to a non-expert audience.	Presentation attempts accessibility but still relies on unexplained jargon or assumptions.	Presentation is generally accessible, though some concepts could be better calibrated for a non-expert audience.	Presentation is well-calibrated to a non-expert audience; complex ideas are explained clearly and thoughtfully.	Presentation is exceptionally well-adapted; complex research is made understandable without oversimplifying; audience feels respected and included.	__
Clarity & Structure *(Was it easy to follow?)*	Presentation is confusing and lacks a clear structure, making it difficult to follow.	Presentation is somewhat unclear, with noticeable gaps in organization or coherence.	Presentation is generally clear but may lack strong organization or smooth transitions.	Presentation is clear and well-structured, with minor room for improvement in transitions or coherence.	Presentation is intuitive, seamless, and easy to follow from start to finish.	__
Research Contribution & Impact *(What is new or important about the research itself?)*	Presentation fails to clearly articulate what is new, significant, or impactful about the research.	Presentation gestures toward contribution or impact but lacks depth or clarity.	Presentation adequately explains the research contribution, with some consideration of its impact.	Presentation clearly conveys the significance and broader impact of the research.	Presentation compellingly communicates why the research is intellectually novel and important.	__
Engagement & Relevance *(Did this presentation make me care?)*	Presentation fails to connect the research to real-world relevance or audience interests.	Presentation has limited appeal; relevance is unclear or weakly established.	Presentation is moderately engaging, with some effort to connect the research to audience concerns.	Presentation is engaging and persuasive, effectively connecting the research to issues that matter to a non-expert audience.	Presentation is highly compelling, making the research feel urgent, relevant, and exciting to a non-expert audience.	__
Delivery & Presence *(Did the speaker's presence help or hurt the message?)*	Speaker's verbal and non-verbal delivery distract from the message (e.g., poor eye contact, monotone voice, distracting mannerisms).	Speaker's delivery is uneven, with inconsistent eye contact, tone, or presence.	Speaker's delivery is solid and clear, with generally effective eye contact, tone, and gestures.	Speaker's delivery is confident and polished, enhancing clarity and engagement.	Speaker's delivery is exceptional: confident, dynamic, and purposeful, strengthening the overall impact of the talk.	__

Total Score: ___ / 25

Are you an engineer? Y/N -> if yes
Accuracy Check:
☐ **No issues — the engineering information is correct in substance and framing.**
☐ **Minor inaccuracy — does not meaningfully alter understanding.**
☐ **Moderate inaccuracy — judges should be aware.**
☐ **Significant inaccuracy — student must be notified; may require disqualification or revision.**