

**ASP 2018 Student Competition  
2<sup>nd</sup> Round Rubric- Poster Presentation**

<u>Authors</u>	<u>Abstract #</u>	<u>Reviewer</u>			
Criterion	Excellent 5-4	Good 4-3	Average 3-2	Deficient 2-1	Score
Data Blitz	Slide on time; adhered to 2mins/1 slide; effective use of graphics; concisely communicated research in an understandable way; inspired enthusiasm/interest in audience	Some elements deficient or missing	Many, but not most, elements deficient or missing	Slide late; did not adhere to 2mins/1 slide; not enough or too many graphics; overwhelming information; unclear delivery and/or rationale/design/results; did not inspire/enthuse audience	
Research Design	Clearly stated objectives and rationale; specific hypothesis/predictions; appropriate research methods (including statistics); production of reliable data	Some elements deficient or missing	Many, but not most, elements deficient or missing	Objectives/rationale not clearly stated; lack of hypothesis or predictions; flawed methodology and/or analysis; inadequate data to draw conclusions	
Originality & Significance	New research question; creativity in research design/interpretation; study and results are important and shed new light on the issue; suggests new methods/procedures; clear case for importance of research in larger context and in primatology	Some elements deficient or missing	Many, but not most, elements deficient or missing	Old research question using old methodology (new species is not innovative enough); does not add significant value to existing literature; poor case for importance of research in larger context/primatology	
Organization	Poster presents logical flow of ideas, both conceptually and visually; has been designed to make the most effective use of allotted space; easy to follow and interpret	Some elements deficient or missing	Many, but not most, elements deficient or missing	Difficult to read and/or follow, both conceptually and visually; poor use of allotted space; difficult to follow ideas and concepts; relies too much on presenter rather than "stand-alone" traits	
Delivery	Clear speech with an appropriate tempo; no distractive movements or gestures; maintained visitor attention with eye contact, voice inflection, facial expression; did not simply read the poster but used engaging verbal exchange (i.e., "told a story")	Some elements deficient or missing	Many, but not most, elements deficient or missing	Tempo was either too fast, too slow, or often "broken"; speaker had a distractive movement; speaker didn't engage with the visitor; speech was full of jargon and not targeted appropriately to the visitors	
Visual aids & Technical aspects	Well-constructed, easy-to-interpret images/figures/tables that are used effectively; poster is easy to read and not overcrowded; appealing color scheme with no typos; appropriately-sized font	Some elements deficient or missing	Many, but not most, elements deficient or missing	Poor color choices and text difficult to read; images/figures/tables difficult to read or interpret; many editorial errors/typos	
Ability to field questions	Stimulated interesting questions, not just clarification of the technical aspects of the work; repeated or paraphrased questions and answered them appropriately; demonstrated a depth of knowledge about the field and was able to critically apply this knowledge to his/her own work.	Some elements deficient or missing	Many, but not most, elements deficient or missing	Few questions generated about the content beyond clarification of technical aspects; answered questions inappropriately due to failure to understand the question and/or the larger context of the field; became flustered or frustrated during the questioning.	
<b>Total (out of 35 possible):</b>					

**Strengths:**

**Suggestions for improvement:**