



Center of Excellence for Energy Scholarship:Phase III-Presentation Screening Rubric

Criteria	Comments				Remarks
Clarity of the Presentation form and style	1	2	3	4	
	The slides are not suitable for a university level presentation. There are many spelling and typographical errors.	The slides are meet minimum requirements for a university level presentation. There are many spelling and typographical errors.	The slides are on average suitable for a university level presentation. There are some spelling and typographical errors.	The slides are suitable for a university level presentation. There are few to no spelling and typographical errors.	
Ability to discuss all parts in the motivation letter	1	2	3	4	
	The ability to discuss all parts are limited or unable to discuss the concept.	Minor ability to discuss parts of the document. The applicant seems not to have written the document his/her	The ability to discuss most parts of the document is good. The applicant has adequate knowledge of the	The ability to discuss the whole document is evident. The applicant has excellent knowledge of the document contents.	



		own self.	contents.		
Ability to refer to reviewed literature	1	2	3	4	
	The ability to refer to literature is limited or does not exist.	The ability to refer to literature is minor. The applicant seems to not have carried out a sufficient literature review.	The ability to refer to literature is good. But the applicant did not use up-to-date or relevant sources	The ability to refer to literature is clear. The applicant carried out extensive scientific and literature review methodology	
Ability to answer panelists' questions	1	2	3	4	
	The applicant is not able to answer most of the panelists' questions.	The applicant answers the panelists' questions but off topic.	The applicant answers the panelists' questions partially in a fair way.	The applicant is able to adequately answer the panelists' questions.	
Ability to argue scientifically	1	2	3	4	



	The applicant is not able to scientifically argue the concept in front of the panel.	The applicant is unable to partially scientifically argue the concept in front of the panel but makes a few relevant points.	The applicant is able to partially scientifically argue the concept in front of the panel.	The applicant is able to scientifically argue the concept in front of panelists, answer questions and give further explanations.	
Total	/20				



- Recommended as a finalist? Why?

- Not recommended as a finalist? Why?

Comments:

Panel Member Signature: _____

Date: _____