

Candidacy Assessment Oral Presentation Rubric

Criteria	Insufficient	Developing	Proficient	Exceptional
Presentation <i>Voice, tone, clarity, precision in terminology, flow, use of media/technology</i>	Voice is unclear or monotonous. Terminology is used incorrectly or imprecisely. Presentation is disorganized and difficult to follow. Media is distracting or poorly integrated.	Voice and tone vary but lack confidence. Some terminology is unclear or inconsistent. Presentation needs better flow and structure. Media is somewhat helpful but not engaging.	Voice is clear and confident with appropriate tone. Terminology is mostly accurate. Presentation is logical and easy to follow. Media effectively supports the presentation.	Voice is vibrant, expressive, and dynamic. Terminology is precise and well-articulated. Presentation flows smoothly. Media is creative and significantly enhances communication.
Research Question <i>Importance, originality, justification</i>	Research question lacks relevance or clarity. Justification is weak or missing.	Question is relevant but lacks originality. Some justification is provided but needs depth.	Clear, well-justified question. Shows understanding of importance in the field.	Novel and highly relevant research question. Reflects new thinking or proposes a paradigm shift.
Study Design <i>Connection to research question, methodological rigour, knowledge of methods</i>	Design is disconnected from the research question. Lacks methodological detail or rigour. Weak understanding of research methods.	Some connection to the question. Basic understanding of methodology with minor gaps.	Research design is clearly tied to question. Demonstrates good understanding of appropriate methods.	Design is original or challenges conventional approaches. High-level understanding and application of methods.
Clarity of Thinking <i>Response to questions, explanation of rationale, foundational knowledge</i>	Unable to respond effectively to questions. Displays significant gaps in understanding. Demonstrates little foundational knowledge.	Responses show limited depth. May struggle to explain rationale or understand feedback.	Responds clearly to questions. Justifies reasoning with evidence. Solid foundational knowledge.	Responds to all questions with insight and confidence. Engages in discussion beyond the topic. Demonstrates expert-level reasoning and teaching ability.



Candidacy Assessment Oral Presentation Rubric

Outcome	Insufficient	Developing	Proficient	Exceptional
	Must select this outcome if TWO or more assessed criteria are in this column.	Outcome is typically selected if the majority of the criteria assessed are in this column.	Outcome is typically selected if the majority of the criteria assessed are in this column.	Outcome is typically selected if the majority of the criteria assessed are in this column.
<i>Note. Final assessment decisions may weigh more heavily on specific criteria based on committee discussions.</i>				
Key Characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Minimal subject knowledge.Communication is ineffective.Misconceptions or bias present.Research proposal is illogical or unfeasible.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Proposal has flaws but shows some logic.Needs assistance understanding feedback.Difficult to follow without clarification.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Research question and design are strong and justified.Responds well to critique.Demonstrates solid knowledge base.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Inspires and teaches through presentation.Responds expertly to all questions.Demonstrates a deep, original understanding and challenges audience perspectives.
Final Assessment	FAIL	CONDITIONAL PASS	PASS	PASS