

CSUMB Fall Research, Scholarship & Creative Activity Showcase~ Competition Criteria
November 7, 2019

Scoring Criteria Definitions

Scoring Criteria	Beginning	Developing	Accomplished
1. Clarity of Purpose	An identifiable central purpose to the research is difficult to discern.	Central purpose is fairly clear; research question premise may be clear or not specific enough.	Clearly stated central purpose, research question or central premise is clear & readily apparent to the audience.
2. Appropriateness of Methodology	The method and/or design did not address the central purpose, hypothesis, or research question. Methodology was not clear or was lacking altogether.	Methodology and design were discussed, but there was some difficulty in comprehension; methodology lacked some detail; did not clearly address the central purpose of the research.	Methodology and design for exploring the central purpose clearly stated; presented logical steps and/or appropriate information that clearly address the central purpose of the research with adequate detail provided.
3. Quality of Analysis and/or Interpretation	Very limited to or no interpretation of results and a vague link to the central purpose hypothesis or research question.	Appropriate information or data were collected, described and linked to the purpose of the research; more in-depth analysis was needed to provide the audience with deeper or more complex insights.	Appropriate information or data were collected, clearly described, and interpreted with a demonstrable understanding and clear link to the purpose of the research; shows a thoughtful, in-depth analysis that provides the audience with insights.
4. Ability to Present the Research or Creative Activity	Had difficulty discussing the research project.	Demonstrated ability to discuss research, but not always clear; seemed able to discuss some aspects of the research more cogently than others.	Demonstrated ability to make complex ideas understandable using appropriate language and examples for audience members both in and outside the discipline.
5. Organization of the Presented Materials	Difficult for the audience to understand the presentation; lack of an organizational structure and/or not completed within the time limits.	Reasonably organized, understandable presentation with an appropriate introduction and conclusion; inadequate time management (significantly shorter than the allotted time or rushed to finish.)	Clear, logical, interesting, and easy for the audience to follow; includes an appropriate introduction and conclusion; completed the presentation within the time limits.
6. Ability to Handle Questions	Had difficulty answering questions.	Answered several of the questions well.	Answered questions thoroughly and precisely.
7. Value of Research or Creative Activity to the Discipline	There is no discussion or very limited discussion of the value of the research. Research is neither original nor significant to the discipline.	Value of the research is mentioned; insufficient discussion of the background and scope to be able to determine the value of this research. Research lacks originality or significance to the discipline.	Value of the research is persuasively argued within the established background and limitations of the research topic. The results are original and have significant contribution to the discipline.