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|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **8-10 Excellent** | **5- 7 Good** | **3-4 Fair** | **1-2 Poor** |
| **POSTER LAYOUT** |
| **Organization** | Clear and logical flow of sections.* Reader can easily follow line of reasoning.
* Major points stand out.
 | Poster is generally clear.* A few minor points may be confusing.
 | Organization not well thought out.* Reader can follow poster with effort.
 | Poster is very confused and unclear.* Readers cannot follow it.
 |
|  **Design** | Excellent and appropriate design* Appropriate use of font and color
* Graphics and figures clearly and logically presented and appropriately placed
 | Design generally appropriate.* May have some trouble in reading or understanding a figure.
* Font too small, poor color choice
 | Design is difficult to master.* Generally, fonts are inappropriate
* Color scheme is inappropriate
 | Design is consistently inappropriate.* Typographical errors
 |
| **POSTER CONTENT** |
| **Background** | Significance of work is clearly stated* Sufficient information to understand purpose of study
* Sufficient to explain experimental approach
* Clearly stated objective and/or testable hypothesis
 | Significance is stated but not sufficiently rationalized* Lacks some introduction material to motivate rational for study or experimentation
* Objective or hypothesis present but not clearly stated
 | Significance not sufficiently stated* Work not put into ‘big picture’
* Approach explained but hypothesis or objective not stated
* Approach is rational and acceptable but doesn’t

address stated * hypothesis
 | Significance not stated* General approach not stated
 |
| **Criteria** | **8-10 Excellent** | **5- 7 Good** | **3-4 Fair** | **1-2 Poor** |
|  **Methods** | Sufficient methodology detail so approach can be judged and correct methodology to address hypothesis/questions asked* Methodology is explained so approach is understandable but not overdone
* Good use of flowcharts
* Chosen methodology is rational
 | Good approach but some minor points may be missing* Methodology section could benefit by diagram
* Too much methodology detail – distracting
* Best experimental approach may not have been chosen
 | Some components of approach are minimal or missing.* Methodology missing, incorrectly or confusedly presented
* Methodology does not address questions
 | Approach is absent or reader is not able to follow |  |
| **Results** | Results clearly stated* Purpose of each experiment clearly stated
* Figures/tables convey intended information
* Results appear sound based upon the data collected
* Results address hypothesis
 | Results clearly stated but may be some minor errors, confusion.* Experimental question not stated
* Insufficient detail/information in figures/ tables
* Experiments good but not address question
* Presentation of data could be improved
 | Some components of results are missing* Lack of figures/ tables; all text

Inappropriate presentation of data* Insufficient statement of rationale
* No statistics when needed
 | Insufficient presentation of results* Incorrect interpretation of data
* No statistics when needed
* No rationale for experiments stated
 |
| **Conclusions** | Conclusions address the research question/ hypothesis.* Supported by results and literature background
* Presented logically
* Understandable to those outside the field
* Overall take-home message presented
* Future directions presented
 | Conclusions generally good but may lack some minor points* May not include all points in box on left
 | Conclusions not entirely appropriate* Do not accurately reflect results
* Difficult to follow, too complex
* No overall message
 | Conclusions insufficient; not present* Does not reflect study objective/ results
 |  |
| **Student** | Clear presentation with enthusiasm for the topic * Kept within time
* Effective presentation
* Clear, concise presentation that enhances understanding of the poster
* Questions answered and evidence of understanding of work
* Easy to understand
 | Good presentation with some minor flaws* Slightly overtime
* Overall very good, but does not enunciate or speak clearly throughout whole presentation
 | Presentation acceptable, but not comfortable with delivery or material* Does not present concisely within time limit – doesn’t hit major points
* Reads poster
* Responds poorly to questions.
* Difficult to understand
 | Poor presentation* Reads poster
* Not clear evidence of understanding
* Cannot respond to questions
 |  |