

## SURF SYMPOSIUM STUDENT PRESENTATION JUDGING RUBRIC

The proficiencies in this rubric focus on students' presentation content, visual aid(s) they use, and their oral delivery. The description of each proficiency level reflects the SURF standards. The top-rated presentations based on this rubric will be considered for best presentation awards.

Proficiencies	Expert (4)	Proficient (3)	Almost Proficient (2)	Developing (1)
<b>Define Problem</b>	Demonstrated the ability to construct a clear and insightful problem statement with evidence of all relevant contextual factors.	Demonstrated the ability to construct a problem statement with evidence of most relevant contextual factors, and problem statement was adequately detailed.	Began to demonstrate the ability to construct a problem statement with evidence of most relevant contextual factors, but problem statement was superficial.	Demonstrated a limited ability in identifying a problem statement or related contextual factors.
<b>Articulation of Research Relevance and Importance</b>	Clearly articulated importance by referring to a specific theory or problem.	Articulated importance in a general sense.	Seemed unsure about the importance of their research.	Did not attempt to articulate importance.
<b>Methods and Analysis</b>	Justified and provided a detailed description of how the data was collected and analyzed.	Provided a sufficiently detailed description of how the data was collected and analyzed.	The description of how the data was collected and analyzed was somewhat confusing.	Description of how the data was collected and analyzed was not evident.
<b>Results and Discussion</b>	Interpretations of the results were insightful, informed by the study, and explained how the results support or refute the hypothesis and future directions.	Interpretations of the results were sufficient but lack thoughtfulness and insight. Did not explain how the results support or refute the hypothesis and future directions.	Interpretations of the results were insufficient, lacked thoughtfulness and insight. Did not explain how the results support or refute the hypothesis.	Interpretations of results were missing or lacking thoughtfulness and insight.

<b>Proficiencies</b>	<b>Expert (4)</b>	<b>Proficient (3)</b>	<b>Almost Proficient (2)</b>	<b>Developing (1)</b>
<b>Acknowledgment</b>	Acknowledged all the collaborators and their level of contribution, consistently cited.	Acknowledged all collaborators and their level of contribution.	Cursory acknowledgment of collaborators.	No acknowledgments or citations or both.
<b>Research Storytelling</b>	Effectively used a strategy to replace public assumptions with new ones from their research; used a transformative metaphor to introduce new understanding	Developed a strategy to replace public assumptions with new ones from their research; can identify a relevant metaphor for this strategy	Explained the difference between their assumptions and those of the public; can provide any example of a metaphor for their research.	Did not distinguish the public's assumptions from theirs; did not connect a metaphor to their research narrative.
<b>Visuals</b>	Visuals were professional and memorable. The transformative metaphor anchors the presentation.	Visuals were of good quality and helped tell the story of the research. An effective metaphor used.	Visuals were of uneven quality; some parts were good and others not. A vague metaphor used.	Visuals were confusing, unprofessional, and/or not clearly relevant. No metaphor used.
<b>Accessibility of Language</b>	Student used little or no jargon and defined terms without prodding.	Student used jargon frequently and defined terms without prodding.	Student used jargon without explanation, but when asked could define terms.	Student used jargon throughout and/or could not explain terms when asked.
<b>Enthusiasm</b>	Student explained their research enthusiastically; their interest was palpable and infectious; their speech was appropriately confident throughout the presentation.	Student explained their research or topic with enthusiasm; their speech was engaging and confident for the most part.	Student showed general interest in their research or topic; often used tentative or hedging expressions.	Student showed interest in their research or topic; overused tentative or hedging expressions.
<b>Oral Communication</b>	Oral presentation had clear organization, and each part was effectively and concisely delivered.	Oral presentation had clear organization, was easy to follow, and included relevant information.	Oral presentation had some organization but was somewhat difficult to follow (e.g., too detailed, too general, missing important sections).	Oral presentation was disorganized or unclear.

**References:**
<https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/oral-communication>
<https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/problem-solving>
<https://www.cornellcollege.edu/library/faculty/focusing-on-assignments/tools-for-assessment/original-research-project-rubric.shtml>