Rio Grande Research SLAM Judging Criteria

| | Excellent | | Good | Good Poor | | SCORE: |
|---|-----------|---|------|-----------|---|--------|
| Intellectual Significance: Did the speaker explain why her/his project matters? Was the motivation for the work clear? | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| Intellectual Contribution: Was the significance of the postdoc's unique contribution clearly specified? | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| Clarity: Did the speaker provide adequate background knowledge to make the talk and the importance of the project understandable? Was the talk organized and presented logically? | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| Delivery: E.g., pace, enthusiasm, confidence, body language, eye contact, and vocal range. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| Visuals: Did the slide enhance the presentation and help to emphasize the primary points of the talk? Was the slide well designed, clear, legible, and concise? | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| Engagement: To what extent did the talk appeal to your intellectual curiosity? This is the "WOW factor" of the presentation. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |