



Rubric

The **CSUSM Grad Slam** is an annual campus-wide competition where both undergraduate and graduate students showcase their impactful and innovative research, scholarship, or creative activity in front of a live audience and a panel of judges. Given that this is a competition centered on research communication, students will be evaluated based on their proficiency in articulating their research findings to communicate their research.

Competitors will be scored on four general criteria of **Comprehension, Content, Engagement,** and **Communication**. Each of these criteria is assessed by evaluating whether a series of specific presentation goals, as outlined below, are met.

Judges of the **Grad Slam** provide a score from 1 to 5 (fractional scores like 3.5 are permitted) for each of the four criteria. Each area is scored (with equal weighting) on a 1.0 (poor) to 5.0 (excellent) scale. The highest possible score earned is 20.0. To help calibrate the scores, the meaning of each of the numerical values is shown below.

Area 1: Comprehension

- Were the topic and research significance communicated in language appropriate to a non-specialist audience?
- Did the speaker explain terminology, and provide adequate background information to illustrate points?
- Did the speaker clearly understand their topic and make the audience understand something about it, too?

Area 2: Content

- Did the presentation provide some background about the research question being addressed & its significance?
- Did the presentation clearly describe the key results of the research, including conclusions and outcomes, if applicable?
- Did the presentation follow a clear and logical sequence?
- Did the presenter spend adequate time on each element of their presentation—or did they elaborate too long on one aspect?

Area 3: Engagement

- Did the presenter give the audience a sense of who they are, what they study, why the study it, and how—in relatable terminology?
- Did the presenter engage and connect with the audience?
- Did the orator and presentation make the audience want to know more?

- Was the presenter careful not to trivialize or generalize their research?
- Did the presenter convey enthusiasm for their research?

Area 4: Communication

- Did the presenter capture and maintain their audience’s attention?
- Did the speaker have sufficient stage presence, eye contact, and vocal range?
- Did s/he maintain a steady pace, and have a confident stance?
- Did the PowerPoint slide enhance the presentation – was it clear, legible, and concise?
- Was the research or scholarship conveyed in an understandable way?

Scoring Guide	
Score	
1.0	Poor, does not meet expectations
2.0	Demonstrates competency, but some major weaknesses
3.0	Good, with some flaws
4.0	Very good, only very minor flaws
5.0	Excellent, almost flawless