

Title of Project : \_\_\_\_\_ Serial No : \_\_\_\_\_

ORAL PRESENTATION	1	2	3	4
<b>NUMBER OF PRESENTERS</b>	Uneven involvement (ONLY 1 dominant presenter)	Uneven involvement	Uneven involvement – but acceptable contribution levels from all members	All presenters equally involved
<b>DELIVERY / EYE CONTACT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mumbles or appears uninterested,</li> <li>Lacks confidence and expression.</li> <li>Occasionally maintains eye contact, but mostly reads off a script.</li> <li>Does not engage the audience.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Somewhat enthusiastic, confident, and expressive.</li> <li>Maintains eye contact most of the time but frequently reads off notes/slides.</li> <li>Audience remains somewhat engaged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fairly enthusiastic, confident, and expressive.</li> <li>Maintains eye contact with audience, well-prepared, occasional reference to notes.</li> <li>Audience remains engaged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enthusiastic, confident, and expressive.</li> <li>Maintains eye contact with audience, captivating, excellent presentation.</li> <li>Audience remains engaged and are compelled to participate in the subsequent Q&amp;A.</li> </ul>
<b>QUESTION &amp; ANSWER</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates incomplete knowledge of the topic by responding inaccurately and inappropriately to questions and feedback.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates some knowledge of the topic</li> <li>Able to answer a few questions but not convincingly enough to reflect grasp of research.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates good knowledge of the topic</li> <li>Can answer most questions convincingly enough to reflect grasp of research.</li> <li>Answers with fluency and flow</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Answers extend and expand information</li> <li>Quality of answers represent depth &amp; understanding of researched information</li> </ul>
RESEARCH DESIGN	1	2	3	4
<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reflects researcher's poor command of the literature review process containing only descriptions of previous research in the field of study.</li> <li>The review of literature was insignificant or consisted of non-research based articles. Propositions were irrelevant, inaccurate, or inappropriate.</li> <li>Lacking in analysis and synthesis of ideas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reflects researcher's satisfactory command of the literature review process containing some expansion and elaboration (though still inadequate) of previous research in the field of study.</li> <li>A key construct or variable was not connected to the research literature. Selected literature was from unreliable sources. Literary supports were vague or ambiguous.</li> <li>Lacking in adequate analysis and synthesis of ideas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reflects researcher's sound command of the literature review process containing ample evaluation and elaboration of previous research in the field of study</li> <li>Key constructs and variables are connected to relevant, reliable theoretical and research literature.</li> <li>Provides concluding remarks that show evidence of analysis and synthesis of ideas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reflects researcher's exceptional command of the literature review process containing justified critique of previous research</li> <li>Research narrative integrates critical and logical details from the peer-reviewed theoretical and landmark research literature.</li> <li>Attention is given to different perspectives, conditionalities, threats to validity, and opinion vs evidence.</li> </ul>
<b>MEETING RESEARCH OBJECTIVES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research objectives are clear.</li> <li>Some objectives are met.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research objectives are clear.</li> <li>70 % of the objectives are met.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research objectives are clear.</li> <li>80% of the objectives are met.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research objectives are clear.</li> <li>90% of the objectives are met.</li> </ul>
<b>METHODOLOGY FOR THE RESEARCH</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Procedures for the treatment of and the gathering of data were omitted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Procedures (permissions, treatments, and data gathering) were confusing, incomplete, or lacked relevance to purpose, research questions, or sampling strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Procedures for implementing the study (permissions, treatments, and data gathering) were identified and described in a chronological AND/OR logical fashion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Procedures were thorough, manageable, coherent, and powerful for generating valid and reliable data.</li> <li>The research procedure was chronological and repeatable, with clear distinctions between researcher and participant actions.</li> <li>Clear and reasonable strategies were presented for seeking permissions and for the ethical treatment of human subjects.</li> </ul>
DATA ANALYSIS	1	2	3	4

<b>DATA INTERPRETATION (X2)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some attempt at interpretation evident</li> <li>• No new insights given</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpreted some of the data correctly</li> <li>• Significant errors, omissions or over interpreted data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpreted most of the data correctly</li> <li>• Some conclusions may be suspect or over interpreted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data completely and appropriately interpreted.</li> <li>• Insightful conclusions.</li> <li>• No over-interpretation.</li> </ul>
<b>DATA ACCURACY AND RELEVANCE (X2)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little or no accuracy and /or relevance to the research topic (Methodology employed is inadequate).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate accuracy and relevance (Findings are valid – but methodologies are mainly based on improvisation, lacking in a theoretical scaffolding).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good accuracy and relevance (Findings based on sensible, workable and repeatable methodologies).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outstanding quality in accuracy and relevance (Findings based on existing landmark methodologies by researchers in the field).</li> </ul>
<b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION (X2)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No insight</li> <li>• Lacks depth in discussion</li> <li>• Analyses only some of the basic points.</li> <li>• Limited potential in the design of the entire project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mainly states the obvious - limited insight</li> <li>• Some depth in discussion</li> <li>• Analyses only the most basic points –</li> <li>• Fails to maximize the potential inherent in the project design.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate/Interesting insights</li> <li>• Good depth in discussion</li> <li>• Some important points are missing in the discussion</li> <li>• Synthesizes information from the results to support the hypothesis / thesis statement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent insights</li> <li>• Excellent depth</li> <li>• Results and discussion well focused, relevant, repeatable.</li> <li>• Excellent evidence of analysis and synthesis.</li> </ul>
<b>DATA EVIDENCE (X2) (ACCURACY, CLARITY)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biased, unsubstantiated opinions</li> <li>• No graphs/tables/primary sources/statistical tables/transcripts of interviews/surveys/ to show proof of data analysis (vague and opaque)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marginally substantiated, with shades of bias</li> <li>• Few graphs/tables/primary sources/statistical tables/transcripts of interviews/surveys/ to show proof of data analysis (lacking in clarity and transparency – with clear omissions of data).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate substantiation, fair perspective</li> <li>• Almost all the graphs/tables/primary sources/statistical tables/transcripts of interviews/surveys/are used to show proof of data analysis (somewhat clear and transparent with 1 or 2 oversights).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Well substantiated and mature perspective</li> <li>• Graphs/tables/primary sources/statistical tables/transcripts of interviews/surveys/ are well presented as proof of data analysis (very clear and transparent presentation)</li> </ul>
<b>DATA REPRESENTATION (X2) (PRESENTATION)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graphs/tables/primary sources/transcripts/interviews/surveys/video clips/ photographs are misleading, unclear, and messy</li> <li>• Data represented have many errors</li> <li>• Wrong representation chosen</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graphs/tables/primary sources/transcripts/interviews/surveys/video clips/photographs/video clips are neat but appears simple and unattractive.</li> <li>• Data represented have few errors</li> <li>• Some data are wrongly represented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graphs/tables/primary sources/transcripts/interviews/surveys/video clips/photographs are clear, neat and attractively represented</li> <li>• Data represented have no errors</li> <li>• Most data are correctly represented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graphs/tables/primary sources/transcripts/interviews/ surveys /video clips/ photographs are exceptionally well designed, attractive, neat and clearly represented</li> <li>• Data represented have no errors</li> <li>• All data are correctly represented</li> </ul>

Only groups scoring at least 55 will be considered for Grand Finals Selection round.

Judge's name : \_\_\_\_\_ Signature : \_\_\_\_\_

Marks : \_\_\_\_\_/64

Group recommended for Grand Finals selection round? \*Yes/No (please circle)

If "Yes", please state reason(s). Also include areas for improvements.