

Front Range Student Ecology Symposium – Poster Presentation Evaluation Form

Presenter Name: _____

Session Name: _____

Judge Name: _____

Total Score: _____/75

Title — 5 points

Score: ____ / 5

- 1 – Title is missing, unclear, or unrelated to the talk.
- 2 – Title is present but vague or loosely connected.
- 3 – Clear and relevant title but not fully informative.
- 4 – Clear, concise, and purposeful title.
- 5 – Title is clear, concise, informative, engaging, and related to content.

Research Question / Objective — 10 points

Score: ____ / 10

- 1–2 – Research question/objective is missing or unsupported.
- 3–4 – Research question/objective is unclear or not connected to background.
- 5–6 – Research question/objective is stated but not strongly connected to background.
- 7–8 – Research question/objective is clearly stated and well-connected.
- 9–10 – Research question/objective is strongly motivated and connected to broader issues/literature.

Introduction & Background — 10 points

Score: ____ / 10

- 1–2 – Background missing or lacks context.
- 3–4 – Some background provided but is unclear or incomplete.
- 5–6 – Background is relevant but lacking depth or clarity.
- 7–8 – Clear, contextualized, and motivating background presented.
- 9–10 – Background is well-developed, well-supported, and connected to broader issues.

Methodology — 10 points

Score: ____ / 10

- 1–2 – No explanation of methods.
- 3–4 – Some discussion of methods but lacking clarity or key details.
- 5–6 – Methods described but missing important information.
- 7–8 – Clear and logical description of methods.
- 9–10 – Clear description of methods with rationale for chosen approach.

Results or Anticipated Results — 10 points

Score: ____ / 10

1–2 – No results/anticipated results presented.

3–4 – Some results/anticipated results but limited or unclear.

5–6 – Results/anticipated results presented but not clearly explained.

7–8 – Clear presentation of results/anticipated results.

9–10 – Substantial, well-explained results/anticipated results that support the research question.

Discussion & Conclusion — 10 points

Score: ____ / 10

1–2 – No discussion or conclusion.

3–4 – Minimal discussion or unclear conclusion.

5–6 – Some discussion and connection to research question but limited.

7–8 – Clear discussion with strong connection to research question.

9–10 – Clear discussion that highlights significance and broader relevance well.

Visual Presentation & Organization — 10 points

Score: ____ / 10

1–2 – Content was poorly organized, difficult to follow, and not readable without the presenter.

3–4 – Some content presented clearly, but overall layout was cluttered, inconsistent, or did not improve understanding of the

5–6 – Appropriate and mostly readable content, but organization lacked smooth transitions or logical flow, making the poster

7–8 – Content clearly presented and organized with effective use of space. Smooth transitions between sections, poster easy

9–10 – Content clearly presented, easy to follow in absence of presenter, demonstrated excellent organization. Space used effectively. Flow between sections enhanced understanding of the project.

Accessibility & Technical Elements — 10 points

Score: ____ / 10

1–2 – Included illegible text, poor color contrast, conflicting backgrounds, or non-functional technical elements (e.g., QR code).

3–4 – Some accessibility considerations present, but issues with font size, contrast, or background choices limited readability.

5–6 – Most elements were readable, but some accessibility issues remained (e.g., low contrast images, color combinations

7–8 – Legible with appropriate font sizes, clear contrast, and minimal conflicting backgrounds. Technical elements (e.g., QR

9–10 – Demonstrated strong accessibility practices: appropriate font sizes, high color contrast, color-blind-friendly design, no conflicting backgrounds. All technical elements (including QR codes) functioned properly.

Comments: