Three-Minute Thesis Competition

| Name: | Score: | | | |
|--|---------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| Date: | | | | |
| | Strong (3) | Good (2) | Weak (1) | Not at all (0) |
| Comprehensibility | | | | |
| The presentation helped the audience understand the | | | | |
| research | | | | |
| The presenter clearly outlined the nature and aims of | | | | |
| research | | | | |
| The significance of the research is clear to me | | | | |
| The presentation followed a logical sequence | | | | |
| Engagement | | | | |
| The presentation made the audience want to know | <u></u> | | | |
| more | | | | |
| The presenter did not trivialize or over-simplify the | | | | |
| research | | | | |
| The presenter conveyed enthusiasm for the work | | | | |
| The presenter captured and maintained the | | | | |
| audience's attention | | | | |
| I would like to know more about the speaker's research | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Communication | | | | |
| The thesis topic and its significance were | | | | |
| communicated in language appropriate to a non- | | | | |
| specialist audience | | | | |
| The speaker used good eye contact and vocal range; | | | | |
| maintained a steady pace, and a confident stance | | | | |
| The speaker avoided scientific jargon, explained | | | | |
| terminology that needed to be used, and provided | | | | |
| adequate background information to illustrate points | | | | |
| The presenter spent the right amount of time on each | | | | |
| element of the presentation, and did not | | | | |
| overelaborate or rush | | | | |
| The PowerPoint slide enhanced the presentation – it | | | | |
| was clear, legible, and concise | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Scores tally | | 1 | | |