Business Student Research Showcase
Rubric for Presentations (Award Assessment)

Judge's Name: _____

Author's Name: _____

	1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	Points
Abstract					
Format and Submission	Guidelines are not followed	Only partially follows guidelines	Follows guidelines provided, but missing some items	Follows guidelines provided	
Research Contribution	Minimal or nonexistent	Unclear, not relevant, author is not aware	Unclear and not relevant	Clear and relevant	
Methods	Methods are not mentioned.	Methods are not obvious	Author describes what they did: data sources and methods of data collection are provided..	..and convinces the reader that the methods employed were appropriate to the research/project.	
Results	Results are not presented.	Results are not presented clearly.	Author describes what they learned, and provides outcomes for the main results or an explanation of why no results were achieved..	..and relates the results to the research/project question.	
Writing	Not clear, writing does not flow, main idea is not conveyed	Main idea is clear, but writing has problems and errors	Clear, concise, informative, a few errors	Clear, concise, informative, virtually no errors	
Presentation					
Subject Knowledge - Ability to answer questions	Presenter does not have grasp of information; cannot answer questions about the subject	Presenter is uncomfortable with information and/or is able to answer only rudimentary questions	Presenter is at ease with expected answers to all questions, but fails to elaborate	Presenter demonstrates full knowledge by answering all questions with explanations and elaboration.	
Content quality	Presentation lacks main thesis or thesis is very weak. Addressed some components; but needed details lacking. Topics at concrete conceptual level. Analysis limited or inaccurate. Reasons, examples or details lacking, or unsupported by facts.	Listener unsure of topic direction until late in presentation Limited ability to provide appropriate topic breadth/depth Few inaccuracies of information Left out a critical component that should have been addressed, or only explained a few facts	Introduction did not immediately reveal topic's purpose Topics expanded most of the time; Information was accurately explained Components backed by factual information ; conclusions correct in part or in whole	Presentation's thesis / topic purpose immediately evident Depth appropriate to topic Original/ interesting interpretation of little known information Rationale for choice of data interpretations was given; conclusion scientifically critical or intriguing	
Language	Speaker's voice is consistently too weak or too strong. Speakers' talking pace is too slow or too fast.	Speaker's voice is frequently too weak or too strong. Speaker sometimes uses inflections inappropriately. Speaker's talking pace is often too slow or too fast.	Speaker's voice is generally steady, strong and clear. Speaker sometimes uses inflections to emphasize key points and create interest. Speaker's talking pace is appropriate.	Speaker's voice is steady, strong and clear. Speaker often uses inflections to emphasize key points and create interest. Speaker's talking pace is appropriate	

Slides	Did not complement the presentation, confused the audience, had many mistakes	Used as a prop for the presented to read, text heavy	Did not complement the presentation well, design is clear but not professional, some errors	Guided the audience, complemented the presentation, design is clear and professional, virtually no errors	
Delivery style	Posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness detract from the presentation; speaker appears uncomfortable	Posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness make the presentation understandable; speaker appears timid	Posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness make the presentation interesting; speaker appears comfortable	Posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness make the presentation compelling; speaker appears confident	
References	Review of literature lacking or incomplete at best. Plagiarism likely.	Content was offensive by its simplicity. References are flawed in number, type and relevance. Sources are not adequately cited.	Bibliography made available; references sufficient but not recent. Sources easily found, not as credible.	Reference material: cutting-edge and/or seminal articles; bibliography made available; text sources credible	
Graduate Students					
Methodology Knowledge	Presenter does not have in-depth knowledge of the research methodology and cannot elaborate	Presenter has in-depth knowledge of the research methodology but can somewhat elaborate on it	Presenter has in-depth knowledge of the research methodology and but cannot explain it	Presenter has in-depth knowledge of the research methodology and can clearly explain it	
Professionalism	Does not meet minimum requirements for business dress. Inappropriate word choice for audience. Inappropriately informal.	Meets minimum standards for business dress and appearance. Generally, the presenter treats audience professionally, acceptable word choice (no slang).	Dressed appropriately. May seem to lack confidence at times. Reasonably credible.	Dressed appropriately. Appearance engenders respect and credibility. Treats audience professionally. Speaker appears confident and has good command of the topic.	

Total (in %):