

## RESEARCH INTENT &amp; PRESENTATION ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

<b>Name of candidate</b>	
<b>IC/Passport number:</b>	
<b>Research title:</b>	
<b>Date of presentation:</b>	

**Instructions for Assessor**

Each Assessor should complete reading the Research Intent submitted by the applicant before the presentation session. Scores of both the Assessors will be averaged out and followed by a pass/fail determination.

For the rubric score, complete by marking an (x) in the appropriate box (i.e Excellent = 4, Very Good = 3, etc.) for each rubric line.

1. Assign a numeric score, listed at the top of the column, depending on the committee member's choice
2. Add the scores from each Assessor's rubric form, then average them. e.g. Assessor A scored a 4, and Assessor B scored a 3, so their total is 7 and the average is 3.5
3. Any score in the range of 0.0 to 1.99 is deemed to have **failed**

**Research Intent & Presentation Rubric**

Criteria rubric	Excellent (4)	Very Good (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
<b>1. Organization</b>	Very logical, coherent, complete	Generally logical, mostly coherent, generally complete	A bit scattered but acceptable, somewhat coherent, occasionally scrambled, some noticeable omissions but still understandable	Rather hard to follow, significant omissions and/or substitutions
<b>Score</b>				
<b>2. Understanding of the research scope</b>	Clearly understood both research findings and underlying theory, could aptly contextualize or interpret findings in light of theory, when appropriate may have suggested how theory might be extended based on research results	Adequate understanding of research findings, generally understood underlying theory, perhaps a bit reluctant to attempt to extend theory or explain contradictory findings	Weak but acceptable understanding of theory, could present research findings but not always clear on implications, occasionally confused details or important findings	Lacked adequate understanding of theory, research findings not always understood, confused or uncertain about the implications of findings, contradictions or confusion evident in how material handled

**Research Intent & Presentation Rubric**

<b>Criteria rubric</b>	<b>Excellent (4)</b>	<b>Very Good (3)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory (1)</b>
<b>Score</b>				
<b>3. Research Statement</b>	Well-grounded, properly contextualized, clearly and convincingly presented	Theoretical motivation visible, context provided, reasonable presentation	Theoretical motivation could be stronger, presentation okay but could be better, research question(s) could be stronger	Theoretical grounding weak, missing, or confused, not clear what the research question is, presentation and argumentation hard to follow
<b>Score</b>				
<b>4. Literature Review</b>	Broad-ranging, well-organized, provides a strong foundation for the research being presented	Very adequate, used effectively to introduce the research question at hand	Major sources included but some visible gaps, utilization of sources could be stronger but is acceptable, organization is okay	Significant gaps in the literature review, not effectively used in support of research question, organizing principles unclear

**Research Intent & Presentation Rubric**

Criteria rubric	Excellent (4)	Very Good (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
<b>Score</b>				
<b>5. Methodology</b>	Clearly explained, very appropriate, properly applied	Explained, mostly appropriate, generally proper application, overall - only a few shaky areas	Explained but not always clearly, generally appropriate though they are some weaknesses, application could be improved	Inadequate explanation, some choices suspect or inappropriate, methodology not always applied as described
<b>Score</b>				
<b>6. Presentation</b>	Clear, precise, convincing, articulate, good audience connection	Mostly clear, good grasp of content, only occasional stumbles, minor uncertainty on some facts or details	Occasional confusion or lack of clarity, occasional gaps in theory or important details, somewhat nervous or jittery	A lot of confusion, not in control of facts and key details, very nervous and stiff, frequently at a loss for words

**Research Intent & Presentation Rubric**

<b>Criteria rubric</b>	<b>Excellent (4)</b>	<b>Very Good (3)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory (1)</b>
<b>Score</b>				
<b>7. Ability to grasp the "Question and Answer"</b>	Quickly grasped questions, clear and apt responses, good control of both theory and findings	Occasionally misunderstood a question, responses usually good though occasionally vague, generally apt grasp of question and how to answer	Some misunderstanding of questions, responses may be vague or inaccurate, did not always give a full response, may answer a different question	Frequently misunderstood a question, incorrect or inadequate responses, lack of confidence in response, argumentative
<b>Score</b>				

**Research Intent & Presentation Rubric**

Criteria rubric	Excellent (4)	Very Good (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
<p><b>8. Understanding of the research scope</b></p>	<p>Clearly understood both research findings and underlying theory, could aptly contextualize or interpret findings in light of theory, when appropriate may have suggested how theory might be extended based on research results</p>	<p>Adequate understanding of research findings, generally understood underlying theory, perhaps a bit reluctant to attempt to extend theory or explain contradictory findings</p>	<p>Weak but acceptable understanding of theory, could present research findings but not always clear on implications, occasionally confused details or important findings</p>	<p>Lacked adequate understanding of theory, research findings not always understood, confused or uncertain about the implications of findings, contradictions or confusion evident in how material handled</p>
<p align="right"><b>Score</b></p>				

**Research Intent & Presentation Rubric**

Criteria rubric	Excellent (4)	Very Good (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
<b>9. Response to questions</b>	Quickly grasped questions, clear and apt responses, good control of both theory and findings	Occasionally misunderstood a question, responses usually good though occasionally vague, generally apt grasp of question and how to answer	Some misunderstanding of questions, responses may be vague or inaccurate, did not always give a full response, may answer a different question	Frequently misunderstood a question, incorrect or inadequate responses, lack of confidence in response, argumentative
<b>Score</b>				