| **Organization of poster content** | * Clear logical flow of information that reader/viewer can follow * Demonstrates capacity to creatively organize, analyze, integrate, and synthesize complex information from thesis research and multiple other sources. | * Main points are clear, but flow of information is challenging to follow | * The poster lacked clear, logical organization and the audience had to make considerable effort to understand the flow of ideas * Content is disorganized |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content of Poster** | * Intro provides a convincing argument for the importance of this research * Thesis statement / research question is clear and concise * Methodology is explained in a concise, well-organized, and simple manner. * Resultsare comprehensive and presented in a clear and organized fashion. * States the major (preliminary) finding of the work and clear ‘take-home’ message. * Scientific terminology is adequately defined and used. | * Several topics relevant to the thesis are not addressed * Thesis statement is confusing * Methodology is explained in a way that is correct but poorly organized * Results of analysis are stated but may be confusing or incomplete * Key conclusions are missing | * Intro has very little relevant information * Goal of the investigation is not provided * Methodology is confusing, incorrect, or missing vital information * Results of analysis are not clearly stated or represented * Discussion / take-home conclusion points are missing or do not match the results * Undefined terms or unnecessary use of scientific jargon |  |
| **Illustrations, graphics, and visual style** | * The style engages the reader and enhances understanding of material. * Figures are numbered, easy to read and considerably enhance the understanding of the material. * Figures adequately represent key points, have appropriate captions and are interleaved with the text. * Figures are sharp, each axis/symbol is labeled, units are included and different symbols are legible. | * Figures are relevant, but challenging to interpret / read (e.g., too small, unlabeled, missing units or legends, etc) | * Too many words and/or font too small. Not visually engaging and challenging to digest. * Figures lack captions, are too small to read/interpret, or mislabeled * Figures/Illustrations are not related to the primary content of the poster |  |
| **30 second slide presentation** | * Clear logical flow of information that listener can follow * Makes a compelling case for project (given 30 second time limit) * Slide is legible and clearly put together * Speaking: clearly articulated ideas, spoke fluidly on the topic, and showed evidence of planning & practice | * Information that listener can follow * Slightly over/under time * Slide is legible but too busy or missing key information * Speaking: clearly articulated ideas, spoke fluidly on the topic, and showed evidence of planning & practice | * Flow is disorganized * Significantly over/under time * Slide is difficult to follow or digest * More practice needed |  |