| **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
 |  |