CEDAR Workshop Student Poster Competition:
2nd Round Score Sheet

Judges grade the poster in 6 weighted categories from 1 (low) to 5 (high)

Student's Last Name_____First Name_____Institution_____ Poster # _____

Below Average 1	2	Average 3	4	Above Average 5	Weight	Points
1. Did the student summarize the poster in a relatively coherent way? (max 50 points)						
The poster was not presented or was not explained clearly.		The poster was well-summarized, with opportunities to improve clarity or time management.		The poster was clearly summarized within the time given, showing ability to tailor the delivery for the audience.	10	
2. Was the student able to clarify the scientific issues and objectives, demonstrating understanding? (max 50 points)						
The scientific issues and objectives were not clearly explained.		The scientific issues and objectives were explained clearly, with opportunities for improvement.		Clear and comprehensive understanding of scientific issues and objectives, and how they were addressed, were demonstrated.	10	
3. Was the student able to describe and demonstrate understanding of the methodology? (max 50 points)						
The methodology was not clearly described and/or the understanding was not demonstrated in the presentation.		The methodology was presented in a way that was generally comprehensible and demonstrated understanding.		The methodology was comprehensively and clearly presented, demonstrating significant understanding.	10	
4. Were the conclusions stated concisely and clearly? (max 50 points)						
The presented conclusions of this study are unclear.		The conclusions are stated, but not fully supported by the work presented.		The conclusions and significance of the results are clearly shown and supported.	10	

5. Did the student demonstrate the ability to interpret results, charts, tables, etc.? (max 50 points)					
The presentation content and interpretation of the results and figures presented were not clearly explained.		The presentation content and relationship to results were appropriate and generally comprehensible.		Compelling explanations of the content were provided to strongly support the results of the study.	10
6. Was the student able to defend the approach, explaining caveats or assumptions? (max 100 points)					
An adequate defense for the approach was not provided, and possible caveats or uncertainties not identified.		The approach was reasonably defended and uncertainties or caveats explained when prompted.		The approach was convincingly defended, with voluntarily-explained caveats and uncertainties, as well as how they could be addressed.	20
7. Is the significance of the results clearly presented? (max 75 points)					
The significance of the results was not clearly demonstrated.		The significance of the results is stated, but not fully supported by the presentation.		The significance of the results is clearly highlighted, and its impact for the community clearly supported.	15
8. Is the quality of the research effort apparent from the presentation? (max 75 points)					
The research effort is limited, and/or results may demonstrate significant errors or oversights.		The quality of the research effort meets expectations, with reasonable opportunities for improvement.		The quality of the research effort is impressive and high-impact. The demonstrated effort is in the top 10% of CEDAR student presentations.	15
TOTAL (max 500)					

Comments to student: