Judging and Evaluation of Presentations

The Research Symposium Committee engages a formal process for evaluating student presentations. Judges selected for the Symposium at Tennessee State University include academic and corporate professionals, external to the University.

All student presentations, graduate and undergraduate, are part of the competition. The committee uses evaluation forms developed with criteria that best reviews originality, creativity, knowledge, and overall image of the student's presentation, whether oral or poster.

Oral presentations are judged for originality and creativity, organization of content, oral presentation, knowledge of material, clarity of artwork (charts, graphs, slides), and overall presentation. Students are given 15 minutes for their presentation including questions from the judges. A number of judges will evaluate the oral presentation based on the student presenter's explanation of the research, the content, dialogue with the presenter, and delivery of the presentation during the student's 15-minute time allotment.

Posters presentations are judged for organization and creativity, organization of content, technical procedures employed (when applicable), oral delivery, knowledge of material, clarity of artwork (charts, graphs, images), appearance of poster, and overall presentation. For poster presentations, three (3) judges evaluate each poster presentation based on the student's explanation of the research, their ability to answer questions about the research, and the content and appearance of the poster. Students come to the Symposium prepared to explain their poster to a judge who is not familiar with their field and to one who may be an expert in the field.

Evaluation forms for judging are available below. These forms are made available for students to know the categories for which their presentation will be evaluated. This information can be useful for practicing ahead of the Symposium.

Tennessee State University 37th Annual University-Wide Research Symposium, 2015

Oral Presentation – Evaluation Form

Session		Presentation No	
Category		Possible	Awarded
		<u>Points</u>	<u>Points</u>
I.	Originality and Creativity Theoretical or clinical significance of research Creativity and originality of logic Timeliness and uniqueness of ideas	20	
II.	Organization (Logical presentation of ideas) Objectives/goals are clearly stated. Methods are appropriate for achieving goals. Results are clearly presented. Thoughts and ideas flow in a logical manner. Results accomplish the purposes of the project	20 t.	
III.	Presentation (Oral presentation and delivery) Exhibits good body posture Maintains good eye contact with audience Good diction; good articulation	20	
IV.	Knowledge of Material (Familiarity with subject matter) Exhibits knowledge of subject matter Answers questions with confidence	t 20	
V.	Neatness (Neatness of charts and graphs) Neat slides and/or transparencies, free of marks and smudges Visual materials are easy to read.	10	
V.	Overall Presentation	10	
	TOTAL POINT	ΓS	

Tennessee State University

37^{th} Annual University-Wide Research Symposium, 2015

Poster Presentation – Evaluation Form

Session		Poster No	
Category		Possible <u>Points</u>	Awarded Points
I.	Originality and Creativity Theoretical or clinical significance of research Creativity and originality of logic Timeliness and uniqueness of ideas	20	
II.	Organization Objectives/goals are clearly stated. Methods are clearly outlined. Results are clearly presented. Thoughts and ideas flow in a logical manner.	20	
III.	Procedures Data based on adequate sample size Methods appropriate for achieving goals Uses correct and appropriate statistical methods Provides valid and reliable data	20	
IV.	Neatness Materials are easy to read. Materials are free of marks and smudges.	20	
V.	Overall Presentation Materials are organized with smooth transitions (i.e., Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion). Style and language are appropriate to discipline. Charts, graphs, and/or illustrations are appropriate to subject investigated. Conclusion(s) is/are consistent with evidence.	20	
	TOTAL POINTS		