<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS OR OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>METHODS (Study Participants, Research Design, Procedures)</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Background was not stated &lt;br&gt;• Hypothesis/Objective was not stated</td>
<td>• Methods were not stated</td>
<td>• Results were not provided</td>
<td>• Conclusions were missing &lt;br&gt;• Statement about Future Work was not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>• Background was either unclear or lacked a proper connection to the Hypothesis/Objective &lt;br&gt;• Hypothesis/Objective was not clear or relevant to the project</td>
<td>• Methods were unclear or not directly relevant to Hypothesis/Objective</td>
<td>• Results were presented; however, they lacked sufficient data to address the Hypothesis/Objective effectively &lt;br&gt;• Data were difficult to comprehend</td>
<td>• Conclusions were included but little connection was made to the Results &lt;br&gt;• Statement about Future Work was provided but did not logically follow from Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>• Background was unclear or incomplete &lt;br&gt;• Hypothesis/Objective was clear but not appropriately linked to the Background</td>
<td>• Methods were appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective however, they lacked sufficient relevant information to fully understand the procedures followed in the study</td>
<td>• Results included sufficient data to address the Hypothesis/Objective &lt;br&gt;• Data were difficult to comprehend</td>
<td>• Conclusions were drawn from Results were reasonably supported but did not explicitly establish relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective &lt;br&gt;• Statement about Future Work somewhat followed the Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>• Background was clear and relevant to the Hypothesis/Objective but included information that went beyond the scope of the project &lt;br&gt;• Hypothesis/Objective was clear and appropriately linked to the Background</td>
<td>• Methods were clear, appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective and provided sufficient details to understand the procedures carried out in the study</td>
<td>• Results included sufficient data to effectively address the Hypothesis/Objective &lt;br&gt;• Data were comprehensive and easily understandable</td>
<td>• Conclusions were supported by the Results but the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective was unclear or not fully explained &lt;br&gt;• Statement about Future Work logically followed from the presented Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>• Background provided a clear and relevant overview of previous research that informed the project’s hypothesis/objective &lt;br&gt;• Hypothesis/Objective was clear and appropriately linked to the Background</td>
<td>• Methods were clear, effectively linked to the Hypothesis/Objective and accompanied by a clear rationale. They provided comprehensive details that enable a full understanding of the procedures conducted in the study</td>
<td>• Results included sufficient high-quality data to successfully address the Hypothesis/Objective &lt;br&gt;• Data were clear, logical, thorough, and easy to comprehend allowing for a comprehensive understanding of the findings</td>
<td>• Conclusions drawn from Results were strongly supported and the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective was clearly demonstrated &lt;br&gt;• Statement about Future Work logically followed the Results and included clear next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>OVERALL PRESENTATION AND HANDLING QUESTIONS</td>
<td>QUALITY OF THE POSTER OR ORAL PRESENTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1     | • Lacks knowledge about the research project and does not demonstrate understanding  
• Relies on reading directly from text (slide, script, or poster) throughout the entire presentation  
• Does not understand questions  
• Presentation is confusing and difficult to follow | • Some of the expected components* are missing and the layout is confusing and difficult to follow  
• Text in the poster/slides is hard to read, messy and illegible, or has spelling or typographical errors  
• The background of the poster/slides is very poor  
• Photographs/tables/graphs are poorly done and fail to effectively convey communication |
| 2     | • Exhibits weak understanding of the research project  
• Relies on reading directly from text (slide, script, or poster) most of the time  
• Struggles to provide satisfactory answers to questions  
• Presentation is generally unclear | • Not all the expected components* are present and the layout is untidy and confusing to follow  
• Text in the poster/slides is hard to read due to font size or color, or has spelling or typographical errors  
• The background of the poster/slides is distracting  
• Photographs/tables/graphs are not related to the text or are poorly labeled or do not improve understanding of the project |
| 3     | • Demonstrates a partial understanding of the research project  
• Has some difficulty answering challenging questions  
• Presentation is somewhat unclear and contains inconsistencies in the delivery of information | • Most of the expected components* are present, but the layout is confusing  
• Text is relatively clear and legible, but has spelling or typographical errors  
• The background of the poster/slides is distracting  
• Photographs/tables/graphs are not related to the text, or labeled correctly or do not improve understanding of the project |
| 4     | • Demonstrates good understanding of the research project  
• Communicates clearly and naturally  
• Capably addresses most of the questions raised  
• Presentation is clear for the most part, but contains inconsistencies in the delivery of information | • All expected components* are presented, but layout is crowded or jumbled making it confusing to follow  
• Text is relatively clear, legible, and mostly free of spelling or typographical errors  
• The background of the Poster/slides is unobtrusive  
• Most photographs/tables/graphs are appropriate and labeled correctly, which improve understanding of the project |
| 5     | • Demonstrates strong understanding of the research project  
• Communicates clearly, naturally and with enthusiasm  
• Provides clear and concise responses to challenging questions  
• Presentation is logical, effective, and clearly conveys information | • All expected components* are presented and are clearly laid out and easy to follow in the absence of presenter  
• Text is concise, legible, and free of spelling or typographical errors  
• The background of the Poster/slides is unobtrusive  
• All photographs/tables/graphs are appropriate and labeled correctly, which improve understanding of the project and enhance the poster/slides' visual appeal |

*Components are defined as Title, Authors and Institutional Affiliation, Hypothesis/Objective, Background, Methods, Results, Conclusions, Future Work, Bibliography, and Acknowledgments