<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>HYPOTHESIS OR OBJECTIVE AND BACKGROUND/INTRODUCTION</th>
<th>METHODS (Sample/Study Participants, Study Design, Procedures)</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>CONCLUSIONS OR DISCUSSION AND FUTURE WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | • Hypothesis/Objective was not stated  
• Background/Introduction was not stated | • Methods were not stated | • Results were not provided | • Conclusions/Discussion were missing  
• Statement about Future Work was not included |
| 2     | • Hypothesis/Objective was not clear or relevant to the project  
• Background/Introduction was not clear or appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective | • Methods were not clear or relevant to Hypothesis/Objective | • Results were provided but lacked sufficient data to address the Hypothesis/Objective  
• Data were difficult to comprehend | • Conclusions/Discussion were included but little connection was made to the Results  
• Statement about Future Work was provided but did not logically follow Results |
| 3     | • Hypothesis/Objective was clear but not appropriately linked to the Background/Introduction  
• Background/Introduction was not clear or was incomplete | • Methods were appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective but lack relevant information to fully understand what was done | • Results included sufficient data to address the Hypothesis/Objective  
• Data were difficult to comprehend | • Conclusions/Discussion were reasonably supported by the Results but the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective was not provided  
• Statement about Future Work somewhat followed the Results |
| 4     | • Hypothesis/Objective was clear and appropriately linked to the Background/Introduction  
• Background/Introduction was clear and relevant to the Hypothesis/Objective but included relevance beyond project’s scope | • Methods were clear and appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective with sufficient details to understand what was done | • Results included sufficient data to address the Hypothesis/Objective  
• Data were sufficient to comprehend | • Conclusions/Discussion were supported by the Results but the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective was unclear or incomplete  
• Statement about Future Work logically followed the Results |
| 5     | • Hypothesis/Objective was clear and appropriately linked to the Background/Introduction  
• Background/Introduction was clear and provided a relevant and concise overview of previous research that informed the project’s Hypothesis/Objective | • Methods were clear and appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective with a clear rationale and comprehensive details to fully understand what was done | • Results included sufficient amounts of high quality data to address the Hypothesis/Objective  
• Data were clear, logical, thorough and easy to comprehend | • Conclusions/Discussion were strongly supported by the Results and the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective and larger body of literature were clearly stated  
• Statement about Future Work logically followed the Results and included realistic next steps |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>PRESENTER’S OVERALL PRESENTATION AND HANDLING QUESTIONS</th>
<th>QUALITY OF THE POSTER BOARD OR POWERPOINT PRESENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | - Does not demonstrate any knowledge of the research project  
- Reads from the poster (slide or script) all the time  
- Does not understand questions  
- Presentation is very confusing | - Not all of the expected components* are presented and the layout is confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter  
- Text is hard to read, messy and illegible, or has spelling or typographical errors  
- Poster/slides’ background is very poor  
- Photographs/tables/graphs are poorly done |
| 2     | - Demonstrates a poor knowledge of the research project  
- Reads from the poster (slide or script) most of the time  
- Has difficulty answering questions  
- Presentation is generally unclear | - Not all of the expected components* are presented and the layout is untidy and confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter  
- Text is hard to read due to font size or color, or has spelling or typographical errors  
- Poster/slides’ background is distracting  
- Photographs/tables/graphs are not related to the text or are poorly labeled or do not improve understanding of the project |
| 3     | - Demonstrates some knowledge of the research project  
- Has some difficulty answering challenging questions  
- Presentation is somewhat unclear and has inconsistencies | - Most of the expected components* are presented, but the layout is confusing to follow in the absence of presenter  
- Text is relatively clear and legible, but has spelling or typographical errors  
- Poster/slides’ background is distracting  
- Photographs/tables/graphs are not related to the text, or labeled correctly or do not improve understanding of the project |
| 4     | - Demonstrates good knowledge of the research project  
- Speaks clearly and naturally; makes eye contact  
- Answers most questions  
- Presentation is clear for the most part, but has a few inconsistencies | - All expected components* are presented, but layout is crowded or jumbled making it confusing to follow in the absence of presenter  
- Text is relatively clear, legible, and mostly free of spelling or typographical errors  
- Poster/slides’ background is unobtrusive  
- Most photographs/tables/graphs are appropriate and labeled correctly, which improve understanding of the project and enhance the poster/slides’ visual appeal |
| 5     | - Demonstrates very strong knowledge of the research project  
- Speaks clearly, naturally and with enthusiasm; makes eye contact  
- Answers difficult questions clearly and succinctly  
- Presentation is logical and very clear | - All expected components* are presented and are clearly laid out and easy to follow in the absence of presenter  
- Text is concise, legible, and free of spelling or typographical errors  
- Poster/slide background is unobtrusive  
- All photographs/tables/graphs are appropriate and labeled correctly, which improve understanding of the project and enhance the poster/slides’ visual appeal |

*Components are defined* as Title, Authors and Institutional Affiliation, Hypothesis/Objective, Background/Introduction, Methods, Results, Conclusions/Discussion, Future Work, Bibliography, and Acknowledgments.