Each item is scored on a scale of 1-5

CONTENT

5 points  **Abstract** Did the author describe the problem succinctly? Did the author describe how they solved it and what they discovered, or how they plan to solve it?

5 points  **Title/Objectives** Are the title and objectives (or questions) stated clearly and provide the reader with enough information to know specifically what the poster is about?

5 points  **Background** Does the background information provide good rationale for whatever was done? Does it allow the reader to understand usage or potential application? Does it grad your interest?

5 points  **Methods/Analysis** Are the methods clear and complete? Is the project feasible?

1 = **poor**: section is not specifically included, or author’s meaning in this section is only understood with difficulty.

2 = **fair**: author’s meaning is only partially understood.

3 = **good**: author’s meaning is generally understood.

4 = **very good**: clearly articulates author’s meaning but may be too wordy.

5 = **excellent**: clearly articulates author’s meaning without being too wordy.

DESIGN

5 points  **Appearance** How does it look? Is it professional, flashy, hard to read, messy? Are there grammar or typos? Is it sized correctly? Does it pique your interest to read further? Does it have substance? Is there a natural flow to the purpose, methods, results, and conclusions?

1 = **poor**: poster contains none of the following: effective use of visual aids, good flow of ideas, good organizational structure, no grammatical and/or spelling mistakes.

2 = **fair**: poster contains only one of the following: effective use of visual aids, good flow of ideas, good organizational structure, no grammatical and/or spelling mistakes.

3 = **good**: poster contains two of the following: effective use of visual aids, good flow of ideas, good organizational structure, no grammatical and/or spelling mistakes.

4 = **very good**: poster contains three of the following: effective use of visual aids, good flow of ideas, good organizational structure, no grammatical and/or spelling mistakes.

5 = **excellent**: poster is professional and contains all of the following: effective use of visual aids, good flow of ideas, good organizational structure, no grammatical and/or spelling mistakes.

PRESENTATION

5 points  **Presenter** Does the presenter appear and behave in a professional manner? Is their name tag visible? Does they engage an audience by making eye contact and speaking to them? Are they knowledgeable about their project and able to communicate the important points succinctly?

5 points  **Data Presentation** If the poster presents results, do these results correspond with the study objectives? Are the details specified? If the poster presents a proposal, is it clear how the data will be used to draw conclusions? Is the significance of the study made clear?
Each item is scored on a scale of 1-5

1 = **poor**: presenter does none of the following: makes clear and succinct presentation, answers questions accurately and directly, addresses audience members politely and respectfully, makes eye contact.

2 = **fair**: presenter does one of the following: makes clear and succinct presentation, answers questions accurately and directly, addresses audience members politely and respectfully, makes eye contact.

3 = **good**: presenter does two of the following: makes clear and succinct presentation, answers questions accurately and directly, addresses audience members politely and respectfully, makes eye contact.

4 = **very good**: presenter does three of the following: makes clear and succinct presentation, answers questions accurately and directly, addresses audience members politely and respectfully, makes eye contact.

5 = **excellent**: presenter engages the audience by doing all of the following: makes clear and succinct presentation, answers questions accurately and directly, addresses audience members politely and respectfully, makes eye contact.

**Data Presentation** (NOTE: this is only averaged into the presentation score if data are presented)

1 = **poor**: conclusions are contrary to data presented and/or mistakes are made in the data analysis.

2 = **fair**: study’s significance is not described.

3 = **good**: study’s significance is described, but no data analysis given AND no recommendation provided for improving future studies.

4 = **very good**: study’s significance is clearly described. Presenter understands limitations of data set/sampling methods OR has recommendations for improving future studies, but not both.

5 = **excellent**: study’s significance is clearly described. Presenter understands limitations of data set/sampling methods, AND has recommendations for improving future studies.