

**Directions: circle the point value (column) that best represents the criterion (row)
Evaluation Form – 2017 PhD Showcase**

Poster Number:

Judge's Name:

Criteria/Points	Very Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Very Good
<u>Poster</u> Appearance	1 Difficult to read (layout, size, font size); unprofessional design	2	3	4	5 Easily readable (layout, size, font size); poster is neat and professional
<u>Poster</u> Elements	1 Lacks text and graphics (figures, tables, etc.); Correct sections are not listed (objective/purpose, methodology, results, discussion, conclusion)	2	3	4	5 Makes use of text and graphics (figures, tables, etc.); sections clearly identified (objective/purpose, methodology, results, discussion, conclusion)
<u>Oral</u> Understanding of subject	1 No clear understanding of topic; unable to answer questions	2	3	4	5 Extremely knowledgeable of subject; able to answer all questions
<u>Oral</u> Delivery	1 Unclear and disengaged from judge; ineffective presentation	2	3	4	5 Clear, concise, and effective presentation; no mistakes
<u>Research</u> Overall	1 Research project has no benefits; no future research is identified	2	3	4	5 Research project has benefits (or had potential); further aspects of research identified
<u>Research</u> Content	1 Unclear and confusing project goals, methods, results, and outcome (or anticipated outcome)	2	3	4	5 Project goals, methods, results, and outcome (or anticipated outcome) are clear and understandable

Any additional comments or suggestions for the presenter? (Continue on back if necessary)