

Poster Presentations – Score Card



Presenter: _____

Poster Title: _____

Monday May 5th, 2014

Scored by: _____

Criteria/Score	4	3	2	1
Content /4	Details on poster clearly explain the scope and context of the research, and increase the audience's understanding of the topic. Direction and objectives of research are clear.	Details on poster include important information about the scope and context but the audience may need more information to understand fully. Direction and objectives of research could use elaboration.	Details on poster relate to the topic but are too general or incomplete. The audience needs more information to understand the subject matter. Direction and objectives of research are too vague.	Details on the poster do not present a coherent overview or seem unrelated to the main topic. Direction and objectives of research are not evident.
Use of Graphics /4	All graphics are clearly presented, easy to interpret, and effectively enhance the audience's understanding of the topic.	Graphics are related to the topic and help enhance the audience's understanding, but some are unclear, ineffective or difficult to interpret.	Graphics relate to the topic but are largely ineffective in enhancing the audience's understanding.	Supporting graphics are absent or seemingly unrelated to the topic.
Organization /4	Information is well-organized with effective use of titles and subheadings. Order of content follows a logical flow.	Titles and subheadings are present but could have been used more effectively. Order of content follows a logical flow.	The information is organized but titles or subheadings are missing or are ineffective at enhancing the audience's understanding.	The information appears disorganized and the content does not flow.
Layout and Design /4	Layout is clear and fluid, poster content is easily viewable from 4-6 ft away, font and colour choices enhance readability and visual appeal.	Layout is clear and fluid, but needs better viewability from 4-6 ft away, or color/font choices hinder the readability or visual appeal.	Layout is clear and fluid, but text/graphics are too small, and the poster is too wordy.	Layout appears cluttered, information is too small, poster is too wordy.
Sources & Polish /4	Sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented, and no obvious grammatical or spelling errors are present.	Sources (information and graphics) are documented, but there are obvious errors in the grammar/spelling, or distracting formatting issues.	Sources (information and graphics) are rarely documented, and some of the text is worded incoherently.	Poor source documentation, much of the text is worded incoherently.
Presentation /4	The presenter spoke clearly, concisely, and made effective use of the poster. The presentation was an appropriate length (4-5 minutes), and the pacing did not seem hurried or too slow. The presenter kept the audience engaged the entire time, made eye contact, and avoided reading directly from the poster. The presenter answered all questions clearly and confidently.	The presenter spoke clearly and concisely most of the time, and often made effective use of the poster. The presentation length was appropriate but the pacing seemed too slow or too rushed. The presenter kept the audience engaged most of the time, maintained eye contact, and answered most questions clearly and confidently.	The presenter mostly spoke clearly and concisely, but did not make effective use of the poster, or failed to engage the audience. The presenter may have read directly from the poster a few times or had poor eye contact with audience. Answers to questions were unclear or lacked confidence.	The presenter did not speak clearly and concisely, or read directly from the poster. The presenter lost the audience's interest and established little eye contact. Questions were answered poorly or vaguely.
Connections Bonus /4	Addressed broader impact of work, and clearly communicated opportunities for multidisciplinary or collaborative work related to research.	Addressed broader impact of work; vaguely connected research to multidisciplinary or collaborative work; suggestions did not seem well thought-out.	Addressed broader impact of work, but did not connect research to multidisciplinary or collaborative opportunities, or made extremely vague statement with little content.	Made no reference to broader impact of work; did not connect research to multidisciplinary or collaborative opportunities.

Total Score: /28

Signature: _____

Oral Presentations – Score Card



Presenter: _____

Talk Title: _____

Monday May 5th, 2014

Scored by: _____

Criteria/Score	4	3	2	1
Content /4	Presentation clearly explains the scope and context of the research, and increases the audience's understanding of the topic. Terminology is appropriate for the audience. Direction and objectives of research are clear.	Presentation includes important information about the scope and context but the audience may need more information to understand fully. Direction and objectives of research could use elaboration.	Presented content seems too general or incomplete. Terminology is not defined or difficult for the audience to understand. Direction and objectives of research are too vague.	Presentation does not give a coherent overview or seems unfocused. Direction and objectives of research are not evident.
Use of Graphics /4	All graphics are clearly presented, easy to interpret, and effectively enhance the audience's understanding of the topic.	Graphics are related to the topic and help enhance the audience's understanding, but some are unclear, ineffective or difficult to interpret.	Graphics relate to the topic but are largely ineffective in enhancing the audience's understanding, or are used infrequently.	Supporting graphics are absent or seemingly unrelated to the topic.
Organization /4	Information is well-organized with effective use of titles and subheadings. Order of content follows a logical flow.	Titles and subheadings are present but could have been used more effectively. Order of content follows a logical flow.	The information is organized but titles or subheadings are missing or are ineffective at enhancing the audience's understanding.	The information appears disorganized and the content does not flow.
Layout and Design /4	Slides are clear and easily readable, font and colour choices enhance readability and visual appeal.	Slides are mostly clear and readable, but sometimes color/font choices hinder the readability or visual appeal.	Slides are sometimes effective, but generally too wordy or hard to read.	Entire presentation appears cluttered, too wordy, hard to read or has zero visual appeal.
Sources & Polish /4	Sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented, and no obvious grammatical or spelling errors are present.	Sources (information and graphics) are documented, but there are obvious errors in the grammar/spelling, or distracting formatting issues.	Sources (information and graphics) are rarely documented, and some of the text is worded incoherently.	Poor source documentation, much of the text is worded incoherently.
Presentation /4	The presenter spoke clearly, concisely, demonstrated professional body-language, and made effective use of their slides. The presentation was an appropriate length with comfortable pacing. The presenter kept the audience engaged the entire time, made eye contact, and avoided reading directly from their slides. The presenter answered all questions clearly and confidently.	The presenter spoke clearly and concisely most of the time, made effective use of the slides, but did not always demonstrate professional body language (i.e. they swayed, fidgeted, etc). Appropriate presentation length, but pacing seemed rushed or too slow. The presenter kept the audience engaged most of the time, maintained eye contact, and answered most questions clearly and confidently.	The presenter mostly spoke clearly and concisely, but did not make effective use of the slides, or failed to engage the audience. The presenter may have read directly from the slides a few times, had poor eye contact with audience, or had distracting body language. Answers to questions were unclear or lacked confidence.	The presenter did not speak clearly and concisely, or read directly from the slides. The presenter lost the audience's interest and established little eye contact. Questions were answered poorly or vaguely.
Connections Bonus /4	Addressed broader impact of work, and clearly communicated opportunities for multidisciplinary or collaborative work related to research.	Addressed broader impact of work; vaguely connected research to multidisciplinary or collaborative work; suggestions did not seem well thought-out.	Addressed broader impact of work, but did not connect research to multidisciplinary or collaborative opportunities, or made extremely vague statement with little content.	Made no reference to broader impact of work; did not connect research to multidisciplinary or collaborative opportunities.

Total Score: /28

Signature: _____