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<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>
</table>
| 1     | • Background was not stated
       • Hypothesis/Objective was not stated | • Methods were not stated | • Results were not provided | • Conclusions were missing
       • Statement about Future Work was not included |
| 2     | • Background was either unclear or lacked a proper connection to the Hypothesis/Objective
       • Hypothesis/Objective was not clear or relevant to the project | • Methods were unclear or not directly relevant to Hypothesis/Objective | • Results were presented; however, they lacked sufficient data to address the Hypothesis/Objective effectively
       • Data were difficult to comprehend | • Conclusions were included but little connection was made to the Results
       • Statement about Future Work was provided but did not logically follow from Results |
| 3     | • Background was unclear or incomplete
       • Hypothesis/Objective was clear but not appropriately linked to the Background | • Methods were appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective however, they lacked sufficient relevant information to fully understand the procedures followed in the study | • Results included sufficient data to address the Hypothesis/Objective
       • Data were difficult to comprehend | • Conclusions drawn from Results were reasonably supported but did not explicitly establish relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective
       • Statement about Future Work somewhat followed the Results |
| 4     | • Background was clear and relevant to the Hypothesis/Objective but included information that went beyond the scope of the project
       • Hypothesis/Objective was clear and appropriately linked to the Background | • Methods were clear, appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective and provided sufficient details to understand the procedures carried out in the study | • Results included sufficient data to effectively address the Hypothesis/Objective
       • Data were comprehensive and easily understandable | • Conclusions were supported by the Results but the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective was unclear or not fully explained
       • Statement about Future Work logically followed from the presented Results |
| 5     | • Background provided a clear and relevant overview of previous research that informed the project’s hypothesis/objective
       • Hypothesis/Objective was clear and appropriately linked to the Background | • 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 | • Results included sufficient high-quality data to successfully address the Hypothesis/Objective
       • Data were clear, logical, thorough, and easy to comprehend allowing for a comprehensive understanding of the findings | • Conclusions drawn form Results were strongly supported and the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective was clearly demonstrated
       • Statement about Future Work logically followed the Results and included clear next steps |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>OVERALL PRESENTATION AND HANDLING QUESTIONS</th>
<th>QUALITY OF THE POSTER OR ORAL PRESENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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