

# Student Research Symposium: Lightning Talks Scorecard

---

**PRESENTER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**PRESENTATION NUMBER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**TOTAL SCORE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**TITLE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Abstract:** \_\_\_\_\_

	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Section Total</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	Is the abstract concise and accurate? Does it reasonably resemble the work presented?					
<b>Dissemination</b>	Student(s) has a minimal grasp of information and ineffectively synthesized the project's main goals/results. Poor sequence of information and/or did not stay within the allotted time frame.				Student(s) demonstrates full knowledge of information and effectively synthesizes the project's main goals/results. Provides understandable explanations and elaboration where necessary.	
<b>Methodology</b>	Poor methodology. Inappropriate choice of methods. Methods do not match research design or choice of methods not best fit for research design.				Methodology is appropriate for the topic. Research methods relevant, appropriate, and innovative; introduces new or expands on established ideas in a sophisticated way; teaches the reviewer something new.	
<b>Content</b>	Objective(s) and/or Problem Proposed Solution difficult to discern. Lacks creativity and innovation. Little relevance or significance to the field of study and will make little contribution.				Objective(s) and/or Problem Proposed Solution very cohesive and strongly related. Very creative and innovative. Extremely relevant to the field of study and will make an important contribution.	
<b>Oral Competency</b>	Student(s) seemed disinterested and unenthusiastic. Poor grasp of the project. Poor communication skills.				Student(s) very engaged and enthusiastic. Expresses ideas fluently. Excellent communication skills.	