Thank you for agreeing to serve as a Qualifying Round judge for our all-virtual 2022 Grad Slam competition!

We hope you will find this to be a fun and enriching experience. This guide contains information on the judging process as well as instructions on how to view your assigned videos and enter in your scores using our digital scorecard.

If you have any questions about this process, please feel free to reach out to Shawn Warner at shawnwarner@ucsb.edu.

ABOUT THE COMPETITION

UCSB Grad Slam is an award-winning campus-wide competition for the best 3-minute talk by a graduate student. Students present the central points of their project in a clear, direct, and interesting manner for a non-specialist but educated audience.

Grad Slam judges are selected from among UCSB faculty, staff, and community members to represent a diversity of perspectives and disciplines. In this year’s competition, Qualifying Round talks will be pre-recorded and judged asynchronously, while Final Round talks will be judged live and in person.

Visit the Grad Slam website to learn more about the competition timeline.
About the Judging Process

Each judge in our Qualifying Round is assigned to a group with three other judges who will all be watching and scoring the same group of videos.

The criteria that you will be judging on can be found on the personalized digital scorecard that will be sent to you directly on Friday, February 4.

You can view a sample of the scorecard here.

Your main task is to judge the students’ presentation skills and how well they communicate about their research to a general audience. We ask that you do not judge presenters on the quality of their recording (e.g. sound, video, background) but rather focus on the topic of their talk.

Each presenter is allowed 3 minutes and 3 slides for their talk. Please note that all penalties for going over time, having too many slides, or using disallowed animations will be assessed by the Graduate Division separately, so you do not need to worry about accounting for these things on your scorecard.

There are 7 areas for evaluation on the scorecard, each adding up to 5 points for a highest possible total score of 35 points.

For each criteria, you will award between 1 and 5 points as follows:

- 5 points for a truly excellent job
- 4 points for very good
- 3 points for good
- 2 points for fair but needs improvement
- 1 point for poor

You can use half-points for your scoring (for example, 3.5) but please try to be consistent with how you award points.
Below is an explanation of each of the 7 judging criteria. A brief summary of these is included on your scorecard as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUDGING CRITERIA</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLARITY</td>
<td>Does the speaker provide adequate background knowledge to make the talk and the importance of the project understandable? Students will be presenting on complex research and projects, but they should provide the context for their project and any key terms or concepts for you to understand their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>Did the presentation follow a clear and logical sequence? An effective presentation should tell a story that flows logically from point to point. If a student jumps from point-to-point or topic-to-topic with no connecting material, that is a problem and you should score them accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELIVERY</td>
<td>You should evaluate the following aspects of the speaker’s delivery: pace, enthusiasm, confidence, body language, eye contact, and vocal range. How does the presenter interact with the audience? Is the presentation style confident and enthusiastic? Does the presenter’s excitement for their material come across? Does the presenter deliver the talk without relying on notes? Grad Slam presenters should speak to and engage with the audience without a script OR notes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### JUDGING CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISUALS</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| If the student uses slides and/or props, do they enhance the presentation and help to emphasize the primary points of the talk? Were the slides well designed, clear, legible, and concise? Presenters should not have visuals simply to have visuals. The visual elements of the presentation should contribute to the effectiveness of the talk in some way. Students are not required to use slides and are free to give their presentation without the use of visual aids.  
You can use the full range of points between 1 and 5 to score this category. A score of 5 points in this category indicates that you understood the presentation and it kept your attention perfectly. You can also give a score of 1 point to indicate that you needed visuals to understand the presentation. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATENESS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| We want the presenters to make their research accessible to people outside their discipline.  
Was the topic and its significance communicated in language appropriate to an intelligent but non-specialist audience?  
Does the presenter avoid discipline-specific jargon or effectively explain terminology known only to specialists in a given field?  
You should be able to follow along with a presentation and appreciate its significance. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUDGING CRITERIA</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| INTELLECTUAL SIGNIFICANCE    | This category is very important and possibly the most difficult one to judge. Did the presenter explain why their project matters in their particular discipline and/or field? It’s important to understand that Grad Slam is NOT a research competition – IT IS a public speaking competition. You are not judging which presenter’s significance is better or more noteworthy. You are judging how well the presenter articulated the significance of their project. Moreover, the intellectual significance of a student’s research should be determined by what is appropriate for their discipline, and not only based on any benefits or direct applications to society.  

**A note on collaborative projects:** Some of our students will be presenting on collaborative research that happens in labs, conducted by a team of people. You should judge them on how well they describe their own unique contribution to that work. |
| ENGAGEMENT                    | This category concerns broader contexts and the bigger picture. Did the talk speak to your intellectual curiosity? Did it make you want to learn more about the topic? Did the presentation excite you? Do you think you’ll remember it long after the round is over? Do you want to tell someone about the amazing talk you just heard? If your mind wandered, or if you lost the thread during the presentation, that means a lower score for the presenter. |
Each of our Qualifying Round groups have been organized to minimize conflicts of interest and disciplinary overlap. You should receive an email containing a comprehensive list of all of our Qualifying Round students in order to help us identify any potential conflicts of interest ahead of time.

However, if you notice that you have been assigned to watch the video of a student with whom you have a direct research relationship, please let us know as soon as possible.

Your videos will be sent to you via a YouTube link on Friday, February 4, and you should watch and score all of the videos no later than Wednesday, February 9. Depending on the number of submissions we receive, you may be asked to view as few as 5 or as many as 20 videos during the asynchronous judging process.

We ask that you watch each video only once in order to replicate our in-person competition setting as closely as possible, where you would only have the luxury of hearing a student’s talk one time through. If you find you must watch the videos more than once, try to be consistent and watch each video the same number of times as the others.

We ask that you conduct the judging process by yourself, without discussing the presentations or sharing the videos with others. If possible, watch the videos on a laptop or regular computer screen rather than on a smaller handheld device.
In addition to the YouTube link containing your assigned videos, you will also be sent a Google Spreadsheet that contains your personalized scorecard.

The names of each presenter will already be pre-filled into your scorecard, and these will correspond to the students’ names on the videos in your YouTube playlist. After you view each video, make a selection for each criteria from the drop-down lists.

**NEW THIS YEAR:** The space near the bottom of your scorecard should be used to enter your written feedback. This feedback, along with your scores, will be compiled with the other judges in your group and shared anonymously with the individual students. *Presenters often find judges’ feedback to be the most useful aspect of the competition, so we hope that you will take the time to enter concise and constructive feedback for them.*

Once you have watched and scored all of the presentations, we encourage you to review all of your scores as a whole. **Feel free to recalibrate your scoring** if necessary to make sure that your scores reflect your ranking of the presenters.

The deadline to enter your scores for all presenters in your assigned group is February 9, 2022.

Thank you once again for being a Qualifying Round judge for our 2022 competition!