JUDGES: Please score each category between 5 (outstanding) to 1 (requires substantial improvement)

**SCIENTIFIC MERIT**

*Significance*: of interest to a
(5) general audience, results novel  
(3) specialized audience, results confirm previous results  
(1) highly specialized audience, results inconclusive

*Quality*: sample size, experimental design
(5) adequate to address question, conclusions follow from results  
(3) adequate, some conclusions overstated  
(1) inadequate, conclusions unwarranted

**PRESENTATION**

*Organization*: audience can follow presentation with
(5) ease (logical flow clear, repetition of main ideas)  
(3) some difficulty (few ideas out of place)  
(1) great difficulty (student "jumps around")

*Visual aids*: poster can be read/interpreted with
(5) ease (large font, few words); clear ideas, no grammatical errors  
(3) some difficulty (small font, many words); unclear ideas, few errors  
(1) great difficulty (unreadable); unclear ideas, multiple errors

*Delivery/Professionalism*: during presentation, presenter has
(5) good eye contact, clear voice, & mastery of subject  
(3) adequate eye contact, mostly clear voice, & adequate understanding  
(1) poor eye contact, unclear voice, & poor understanding of subject

Comments for the presenter? (below)  

TOTAL