Reviewer 1:

Scoring scale:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Does not meet expectations | Demonstrates competency but some major weaknesses | Demonstrates competency but some significant weaknesses | Good, but some flaws | Very good, only very minor flaws | Excellent, almost flawless | Outstanding, no flaws |

Please include a score between 1 and 7 in the 2 sections below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| COMPREHENSION AND CONTENT | Score |
| Presentation provided clear background and significance to the research question (Need or opportunity) |  |
| Presentation provided clear positionality of the presenter to the research and research approach (Approach) |  |
| Presentation clearly described the research strategy/design and the results/findings of the research (Benefits - Competition) |  |
| Presentation clearly described the conclusions, outcomes and impact of the research (Landing) |  |
| How can the presenter improve the “ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION” aspect of their work? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION | Score |
| The oration was delivered clearly, and the language was appropriate for a non-specialist audience |  |
| The PowerPoint slide was well-defined and enhanced the presentation |  |
| The presenter conveyed enthusiasm for their research and captured and maintained the audience’s attention |  |
| How can the presenter improve the “ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION” aspect of their work? |  |

Reviewer 2:

Scoring scale:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Does not meet expectations | Demonstrates competency but some major weaknesses | Demonstrates competency but some significant weaknesses | Good, but some flaws | Very good, only very minor flaws | Excellent, almost flawless | Outstanding, no flaws |

Please include a score between 1 and 7 in the 2 sections below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| COMPREHENSION AND CONTENT | Score |
| Presentation provided clear background and significance to the research question (Need or opportunity) |  |
| Presentation provided clear positionality of the presenter to the research and research approach (Approach) |  |
| Presentation clearly described the research strategy/design and the results/findings of the research (Benefits - Competition) |  |
| Presentation clearly described the conclusions, outcomes and impact of the research (Landing) |  |
| How can the presenter improve the “ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION” aspect of their work? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION | Score |
| The oration was delivered clearly, and the language was appropriate for a non-specialist audience |  |
| The PowerPoint slide was well-defined and enhanced the presentation |  |
| The presenter conveyed enthusiasm for their research and captured and maintained the audience’s attention |  |
| How can the presenter improve the “ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION” aspect of their work? |  |