

Criteria for Evaluation

Each participant will be assessed according to these criteria, taken into account in equal parts.

Grading scale:

0 – criterion not met, 1 – criterion partially met, 2 – criterion met

Criteria	Description
Comprehension and content	
Background and significance	Did the presentation convey an understanding of the significance of the research question to an audience without a field-related background?
Impact and results	Did the presentation clearly describe the impact and/or results of the research, including conclusions and outcomes?
Logical sequence	Did the presentation follow a clear and logical sequence?
Communication	Were the research results, impact, and outcomes communicated in language appropriate for a non-specialist audience?
Time management	Did the presenter spend adequate time on each element of their presentation – or did they elaborate for too long on one aspect or the Commission required increasing the dynamics of the PhD student's speech
Clarity of message	Was the central thesis clear and easy to understand?
Use of analogies	Did the presenter use analogies or examples to explain complex concepts?
Audience understanding	At the end of the presentation, did the audience understand the research?
Engagement and communication	
Audience engagement	Did the oration make the audience want to know more?
Research presentation	Was the presenter careful not to trivialise or generalise their research?
Enthusiasm	Did the presenter convey enthusiasm for their research?
Attention maintenance	Did the presenter capture and maintain their audience’s attention?

Stage presence	Did the speaker have sufficient stage presence, eye contact and vocal range; maintain a steady pace, and have a confident stance?
Slide quality	Did the PowerPoint slide enhance the presentation – was it clear, legible, and concise?