

# CSU GRAD SLAM

## 2025 RUBRIC



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY  
**GRAD SLAM**  
THREE-MINUTE THESIS COMPETITION  
**MAY 9<sup>th</sup>, 2025**  
HOSTED BY  
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY  
SAN BERNARDINO

Competitors in the CSU Grad Slam come from all fields of research, scholarship, and creative activity, sometimes collectively referred to as "RSCA". The word "research" is used in the descriptions below, and it should be understood to mean this broader collection of research, scholarship, and creative activity.

The CSU Grad Slam is a **research communication** competition; it is not a research competition. Accordingly, competitors in the CSU-wide Grad Slam are scored in two general areas: "**Comprehension & Content**" and "**Engagement & Communication**." Each of these criteria is assessed by evaluating whether a series of specific presentation goals, as outlined below, are met.

Judges of the Grad Slam provide a score from 1.0 to 7.0 (fractional scores like 5.5 are permitted) for each of the two criteria. Each area is scored (with equal weighting) on a 1.0 (does not meet expectations) to 7.0 (Outstanding) scale. The highest possible score earned is 14.0. To help calibrate the scores, the meaning of each of the numerical values is shown below.

### Area 1: Comprehension & Content

- Presenter effectively communicated the background and significance of the research.
- Presenter effectively communicated the research strategy/design and the results/findings of the research.
- Presentation followed a clear and logical sequence.
- Presenter effectively communicated the conclusions, outcomes, and impact of the research.

### Area 2: Engagement & Communication

- The presentation was delivered clearly, and the language was appropriate for a non-specialist audience.
- The slide was well-defined and enhanced the presentation
- The presenter conveyed enthusiasm for their research and captured and maintained the audience's attention.

Scoring Guide	
Score	
1.0	Does not meet expectations
2.0	Demonstrates competency but some major weaknesses
3.0	Demonstrates competency but some significant weaknesses
4.0	Good, but some flaws
5.0	Very good, only very minor flaws
6.0	Excellent, almost flawless
7.0	Outstanding, no flaws