

Project Title:
Student Names:

School:
Teacher Name:

2024 REACH Symposium Oral Presentation Scoring Criteria

	Excellent (5-6 points)	Good (3-4 points)	Marginal / Poor (1-2 points)
Research Question	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project purpose is focused and clearly stated. ○ Background information presented is sufficient, relevant, and cited. ○ The question is fully testable using scientific practices. ○ The research question is original, interesting, and relevant to health issues or scientific discovery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project purpose is stated but lacks focus or is somewhat unclear. ○ Background information is presented but may omit key information, lack detail or relevance, and/or is not cited. ○ The question is somewhat testable using scientific practices. ○ Research question is somewhat interesting and relevant but lacks originality or clear connections to health or scientific discovery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project purpose is not stated or is unfocused or unclear. ○ Background information is minimal or absent and is not cited. ○ The research question is not testable using scientific practices. ○ Research question doesn't address an issue with relevance and interest or is the answer is already known.
Score:	Comments:		
Design & Methodology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The research design is well matched to the research question. ○ A well-designed data collection plan is presented so that others can fully understand what was done or replicate the methods to see if they get the same results. ○ Variables (dependent, independent, control) are accurately defined and measured. ○ Evidence from multiple trials is presented. ○ Tool(s) used to collect data are thoroughly described. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The research design is somewhat matched to the research question ○ A plan to collect data is presented but may lack detail or contain flaws or gaps. ○ Variables are accurately defined and measured but may not be controlled. ○ Additional trials are needed to yield stable, interpretable results. ○ Detail is lacking on methodology to reproduce results. ○ Tool(s) used to collect data are partially described. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The research design is poorly matched to the research question ○ The plan to collect data is not well designed or presented. ○ Variables are inaccurately defined or measured and/or uncontrolled. ○ No evidence of repeated trials. ○ Results are not reproducible. ○ Tool(s) used to collect data are not described or lack key detail in description.
Score:	Comments:		
Data Collection, Analysis & Interpretation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Data is systematically collected. ○ Results are clearly communicated. ○ The application of mathematical, statistical, and graphic methods to analyze data is appropriate. ○ Data are interpreted appropriately; a valid conclusion to the research question is stated and is supported by the data. ○ Potential sources of error are fully described. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Data is systematically collected but may contain significant errors. ○ Results are communicated but may lack sufficient detail. ○ Mathematical and/or statistical analysis and graphic representation of data is mostly appropriate but has gaps or errors. ○ Data interpretation is mostly correct; a conclusion is stated but is somewhat inconsistent with the presented data. ○ Key sources of potential error or uncertainty are not identified or well described. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Data is not collected in a systematic or accurate way. ○ Results contain errors and/or are not clearly communicated. ○ Mathematical and statistical analysis and graphic representation of data is missing or incorrectly performed. ○ The data is interpreted incorrectly, and /or the conclusion is invalid. ○ Potential sources of error or uncertainty are not described.
Score:	Comments:		

	Excellent (5-6 points)	Good (3-4 points)	Marginal / Poor (1-2 points)
Quality of Oral Presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rehearsed and professional delivery. ○ Delivery is clear and concise. ○ Student(s) maintain eye contact and engaging tone. ○ If applicable, all group members contribute equally during the presentation. ○ Presentation adheres to time limit. ○ Thoroughly and accurately responds to questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Delivery is somewhat rehearsed and professional. ○ Delivery is somewhat unclear and/or includes some irrelevant information. ○ Eye contact and tone are somewhat engaging. ○ If applicable, all group members contribute somewhat equally during the presentation. ○ Presentation slightly extends beyond time limit. ○ Student(s) respond to questions somewhat accurately and thoroughly but with some gaps or errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Delivery lacks prior preparation and rehearsal and/or is unprofessional. ○ Delivery is very unclear and/or includes much unnecessary information. ○ Student(s) do not maintain eye contact and/or lack an engaging tone. ○ If applicable, group members do not contribute equally during the presentation. ○ Presentation does not fit within time limit. ○ Student(s) do not respond accurately or thoroughly to questions.
Score:	Comments:		
Quality of Visual Aid: Slideshow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Slideshow displays logical organization of material. ○ Tables/graphics/photos are completely labeled and accurate. ○ Text is easy to read and free from grammatical and spelling errors. ○ Text is limited to necessary information to support research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Slideshow is mostly logically organized but may be somewhat difficult to follow. ○ Tables/graphics/photos are missing a label and/or label(s) contain small errors. ○ Text is mostly easy to read but may contain small spelling or grammatical errors. ○ Text includes some additional information that is unnecessary to support research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Slideshow is unorganized and/or very difficult to follow. ○ Tables/graphics/photos are missing several labels and/or contain significant errors. ○ Text is difficult to read and/or contains many spelling or grammatical errors. ○ Text includes much unnecessary information that distracts from the key elements of the research.
Score:	Comments:		
Overall Score:	Comments:		

**This rubric is modified from the Regeneron ISEF Judging Criteria. <https://sspcdn.blob.core.windows.net/files/Documents/SEP/ISEF/2020/Judging/Judging-Criteria.pdf>*

