OTX 2026 Presentation Review Rubric

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="7">Scoring Key:

5 – Excellent: Exceeds expectations, very strong in all criteria.

4 – Good: Strong overall, with only minor areas that could be improved.

3 – Satisfactory: Meets basic expectations but has room for improvement.

2 – Limited: Significant gaps or weaknesses.

1 – Poor: Does not meet minimum expectations or is unclear.</td><td colspan="2">Review rubric</td><td>5</td><td>3</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="4">Quality of the Presentation summary (25 points total)</td><td>Title (5)</td><td>Title is under 12 words, jargon-free, easy to understand, and clearly helps delegates decide relevance.</td><td>Title is somewhat long or uses minor jargon/abbreviations but still conveys the topic.</td><td>Title is unclear, too long, or full of acronyms/jargon, not helpful for delegates.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Presentation Summary (15)</td><td>Summary is clear, concise, follows the suggested structure, and informative. Each required component is addressed with strong relevance to OT.</td><td>Summary includes most elements but may lack clarity, depth, or flow. Some jargon or vague descriptions may be present.</td><td>Summary is unclear, incomplete, or fails to convey the purpose and value of the presentation.</td></tr>
<tr><td>NB. Workshops & Occupation Stations presentation summary must also include information on audience engagement</td><td>Summary provides comprehensive evidence of approach to audience engagement, with clear description of audience learning and contribution through active engagement.</td><td>Summary provides some evidence of approach to audience engagement, with vague description of audience learning and contribution through active engagement.</td><td>Unclear or missing evidence of approach to audience engagement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Key Takeaways (5)</td><td>Clear, concise takeaways highlighting the core message. Strong link to OT practice. Easy to grasp and actionable.</td><td>General points provided. Some relevance or clarity but lacks depth or clear takeaways.</td><td>Vague, confusing, or missing takeaways. Unclear benefit to attendees.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Educational Value (15 points)</td><td></td><td>Highly relevant and engaging for OT audience. Clear contribution to practice/research. Innovative or novel in concept or application.</td><td>Generally relevant and somewhat engaging. Contribution is clear but not distinctive.</td><td>Unclear relevance, limited educational value, or lacking innovation.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Quality of Written Submission (10 points)</td><td></td><td>Writing is concise, self-contained, logically structured, jargon-free, and uses clear, active voice.</td><td>Mostly readable but includes some jargon, unnecessary quotes, or poor flow.</td><td>Difficult to read, lacks coherence, overly wordy or vague.</td></tr>
</table>