

Judge's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Presenter's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Poster Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Research Category: \_\_\_\_\_

PO# \_\_\_\_\_

Post-graduate type (circle one) Resident/Fellow

**Overview:** Values circled reflect the degree of evidence for design goals: (5) Exceptional/Exceeds Standard When Possible; (4) Meets Very Effectively; (3) Meets Somewhat Effectively; (2) Almost Meets/Inaccurate or Unclear; (1) Attempts/Irrelevant; (0) No attempt. *Please note: to meet any design goal below, all aspects listed in the standard (i.e. row) must be met.*

<b>Abstract Review</b>						
a.) Clearly stated questions or hypotheses being addressed	5	4	3	2	1	0
b.) Well-explained rationale/justification for the study	5	4	3	2	1	0
c.) Succinct lit review relevant previous work. Gap in the knowledge identified	5	4	3	2	1	0
d.) Clear description of methods. Methods are appropriate to question.	5	4	3	2	1	0
e.) Conclusion/Discussion addresses study's question and supported by results. Clinical relevance addressed	5	4	3	2	1	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/25</b>					
<b>Poster Presentation</b>						
a.) Poster is professional looking without grammatical errors. Appropriate use of visuals to enhance the information	5	4	3	2	1	0
b.) Flow of information is logical and facilitates understanding	5	4	3	2	1	0
c.) Presenter summarized study clearly and concisely	5	4	3	2	1	0
d.) Presenter response to questions are succinct and provide clear appropriate answers.	5	4	3	2	1	0
e.) Study is innovative/ unique and has potential to contribute to the field	5	4	3	2	1	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>/25</b>					
<b>Presentation Total</b>						<b>/50</b>

Comments:

---