

Seminar Scoring Guidelines

Evaluation Criterion	Score (5 – 1)				
	5	4	3	2	1
Scientific significance	Clearly stated and integrated into the presentation	Clearly stated, but explicit connection to the work described was lacking	Significance was established primarily by relation to peripheral issues. The audience was left to infer how the work informed those issues	An attempt to establish scientific significance was made, but there was little rational connection to the work presented.	There was no attempt to establish the scientific significance of the work
Introduction	Information necessary to understand the context for the research, rationale for the study, the types of experiments pursued, and the interpretation of the results was provided	Most of the necessary information was provided, but minor aspects of the talk were unclear due to a lack of background information.	Either the context for the project, the rationale for the study, the types of experiments, or interpretation of the results was made difficult due to a lack of background information.	The introduction failed to address multiple major needs of the audience (context, rationale, experimental approach, data interpretation).	The introduction failed to prepare the audience for the talk.
Knowledge of subject	Presentation free of factual errors, etc. Questions were directly addressed to the level expected of a senior undergraduate student.	Presentation was free of factual errors, etc. Questions were addressed, but more by avoidance than direct answers.	A couple of minor factual errors noted. Questions were addressed, but more by avoidance than by direct answers.	Multiple minor factual errors, or one major error noted. Some questions addressed, but presenter caught “flat footed” on others.	Major flaws in knowledge noted. Inability to address straightforward questions from the audience. Credibility is highly questionable.
Clarity of presentation	Clear presentation. No superfluous data/information. Experiments performed made sense as did any data and their interpretation. Confident you could summarize the talk to someone else.	Clear presentation with some distraction from unnecessary information. With few exceptions, the experimental approach and the data obtained made sense. But for a couple of minor aspects, could confidently summarize the talk for another student.	Presentation was clouded by inclusion of unnecessary information. A major component of the experimental approach or data did not make sense. Could confidently summarize most, but not all, of the major components of the talk.	Had to sift through the presentation to identify the salient points. Major experimental components were unclear. Confidence in a summary would be restricted to the broad thrust of the talk.	Superfluous information was the rule rather than the exception. It was not clear how most of the experimental approach/data advanced the project. Could only give a vague description of the talk to another student.
Quality of visual aids	Images were clear, graphic parameters (font type and size, image size, etc.) were consistent, readable and well- proportioned, only necessary text was used. No distracting extras (sound effects, etc.). The information included was useful to the presentation.	Only minor issues evident. Minor inconsistencies in graphic parameters. One or two instances of wordy or text-dense passages. No distracting extras. Information included was useful to the presentation.	Text, images, graphs, etc. were clear but substantial inconsistency was evident throughout the talk. Text was not overwhelming but could be simplified substantially (e.g., full sentences → bullet points). Superfluous information included.	Had to strain to see some images/text. Information necessary to interpret graphs, tables missing. Inconsistency in graphic parameters observed throughout the talk. Several slides of superfluous information included. Text dense slides included (e.g., points given in multiple sentence passages).	In terms of consistency in graphic parameters, use of text, clarity and visibility of images, etc., the visual aids were, in fact, a distraction.
Quality of presentation	Logical and coherent organization/flow characterized the talk. Conclusions were well supported by the data presented. Good public speaking habits used throughout.	Generally well-organized talk. Logical conclusions presented based on the data. Some improvement in public speaking habits needed.	Portions of the talk lacked logical organization/flow. Some conclusions were fully not supported by the data. Major improvement in one habit of effective public speaking is necessary	A broad organizational structure was used for the talk, but its components were not well connected. Abrupt shifts in topic/line of thought were noted. Multiple conclusions weakly supported (if at all) by the data. Major improvement in more than one habit of good public speaking is needed.	Organizationally, the talk was incomprehensible. Generally, conclusions were unsupported by the data. Several aspects of good public speaking need major improvement.
Summary score	Based on a talk of this caliber, an applicant would be a “must hire”	Based on a talk of this caliber, an applicant would be in the top tier of candidates to hire.	A talk of this caliber wouldn’t automatically disqualify the applicant, but in a strong pool of candidates, it is unlikely to win the position.	Based on a talk of this caliber, an applicant would not be competitive, but may, contingent on substantial improvement, be encouraged to apply for another position in the future.	Based on a talk of this caliber, an applicant would not be competitive for any research position in your company.