

Awards Judging Criteria

The following principles are intended as a guide to assist presenters understand what judges critique assessing an Award presentation.

PRESENTATION:

<u>Timing:</u> Presenters have been given either a 10 min (student) or 12 min (free paper) time slot for presentations. Presenters were asked to leave 1-2 minutes for questions. Points should be deducted for presentations going over time as follows; 1 minute over time -1 points, 2 minutes over time -2 points, etc. If less than 1 minute left for question time then deduct 1 point.

<u>Diction:</u> Diction, articulation, clarity of voice all determine how well a presentation is projected to the listeners. Nervousness may very well inhibit a good presentation, but it is easily noted if such a presenter employs strategies to alleviate their nerves. Speaking slowly, well-rehearsed and good notes are discernible.

<u>Audio/visual</u>: Clever use of the technology whether your own expertise or with some assistance can make a presentation very enthralling. Judicious use should also check the possibility of losing the content within an elaborate display. Bear in mind that the simplest use of technology may suit the presenter's style and the content. The lack of AV use should not be scored detrimentally if message conveyed well.

<u>Background</u>: Consider the following; background literature review, study type, relevance, novel vs repetitive, contribution to the existing literature, scope for development etc.

CONTENT:

For structured presentations:

<u>Methodology:</u> Is the methodology rigorous and presented in enough detail to make the study able to be interpreted. (score 0 for presentations without methodology).

Results: Are adequate results provided to support the conclusions?

OR

For Case Presentations and Fireside chats where detailed methodology and results may not be appropriate:

<u>Subject Matter:</u> Scoring should reflect ability to engage in the topic and stimulate participation and may be scored under subject matter

<u>Impact</u>: Consider the following; relevance, novel vs repetitive, contribution to existing literature or practice, scope for development etc.



Australian and New Zealand College of Perfusionists

| Questions: This assesses the presenter's ability to respond to questions asked of their dissertation. |
|--|
| <u>Abstract:</u> The abstract should have a logical structure and format according to the nature of the presentation. The abstract should represent a brief, complete summary of the presentation. |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |