

Intersections
SOURCE Symposium & Poster Session

Student Name _____ Reviewer Name _____

Abstract

	5 pts	4pts	3pts	2pts	1pt
Abstract	Contains the relevant information about the study. Succinctly written.	Contains relevant information, but needs to be more concise.	Contains relevant information about the study, but also includes unnecessary information. Needs to be more concise.	Contains more unnecessary information than relevant information. Needs to be more concise.	Lacks relevant information about the study. Needs to be more concise.

Poster

	5 pts	4pts	3pts	2pts	1pt
Public speaking skills	Speaks clearly and loudly. Makes appropriate eye contact. Expresses confidence. Succinct. Invites questions and discussion. Directly answers all questions. Is confident and knowledgeable.	Speaks clearly and loudly but does not often make eye contact. Confident. Less succinct. Answers questions but is weak in one area of question (ex. Methods)	Speaks loudly and clearly at times but becomes quiet or speaks too quickly during parts of the presentation. Makes eye contact sporadically. Answers most questions but becomes defensive or glib.	Consistently speaks quietly or too quickly. Does not make eye contact. Has an informal tone. Needs to be more concise. Is unable to answer several questions.	Mumbles. Reads from the poster. Has an informal tone. Not concise. Bluffs answers. Responds in a condescending tone.
Content	Presents a logical flow of ideas from one point/result to another. If applicable: Understands the methods involved in the project Tailors explanations to a general audience. Explains how their work relates to the broader issues in the field and the faculty member's work (if applicable). Or, explains why this project is significant. Poster has more visuals than text if applicable . Very easy to read and follow. Attractive to the eye.	Presents a logical flow of ideas. Some explanations are unclear. Uses relevant images. Some may be unclear.	Organization is choppy. Uses jargon suitable for a presentation to peers working in this area. Somewhat explains how their work relates to the field and/or the faculty mentor(s) work. Figures are cluttered and unorganized. Additional figures or images would help illustrate main points. A few too many words.	Hard to determine the presenter's points. Explanations are unclear. Needs additional figures. Important details are missing. Too wordy.	Presentation is a jumble of random thoughts. Does not understand the methods (how they are done) or why the specific method was used Explanations are unclear. Leaves out important details or issues. Is not able to explain how work relates broader issues or significance in general Few illustrative figures. Too much reliance on text.

Adapted from the scoring rubric designed by Sean Psujek (2006), Department of Biology.

Please add your comments on the back. Return forms to Meeting Room A. Thanks.