

**Southern Region American Society for Horticultural Science
Poster Competition
Evaluation Form**

Student's Name:

Graduate / Undergraduate:

Evaluator's Number:

Check or circle boxes which apply and total score at the bottom of each column. Feel free to provide any constructive comments for participants. Your evaluation will remain anonymous (each evaluator will be assigned an number).

| Rating | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Criteria | Unsatisfactory (0 points) | Fair (5 points) | Satisfactory (10 points) | Good (15 points) | Excellent (20 points) |
| Content: | | | | | |
| Title | Does not reflect content of presentation | Poorly reflects content of presentation | Generally reflects content of presentation | Reflects content of presentation very well but not thoroughly | Thoroughly, accurately, and clearly reflects content of presentation |
| | | | | | |
| Introduction/ Background | Insufficient information from the literature provided to support the objectives; purpose and hypotheses not stated | Very little information from the literature provided to support the objectives; purpose and hypotheses are unclear | Information from the literature provided, but only generally relates to the objectives; purpose and hypotheses are stated | Adequate information from the literature provided to support the objectives; purpose and hypotheses stated well | Thorough information from the literature provided to support the objectives; purpose and hypotheses clearly stated |

| Criteria | Unsatisfactory (0 points) | Fair (5 points) | Satisfactory (10 points) | Good (15 points) | Excellent (20 points) |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Research: | | | | | |
| Materials and Methods | Did not address study question(s); analytical methods used were inappropriate; study design was not considered for testing the hypotheses and/or statistical analyses were not used | Poorly addressed the study question(s); analytical methods used were inadequate; study was poorly designed for testing the hypotheses, and statistical analyses were inappropriate | Generally addressed the study question(s); analytical methods used were adequate, but more appropriate methods are available; study design and statistical analyses not well thought out and were marginally suitable for testing the hypotheses | Adequate for addressing the study question(s); analytical methods used were sufficient; suitable study design and statistical analyses were used for testing the hypotheses | Appropriate for addressing the study question(s); analytical methods used were highly appropriate; study design and statistical analyses used for testing the hypotheses were well thought out |
| Results | Presented poorly; graphics and tables do not present data which supports conclusions | Results, graphics, and tables presented do not clearly present data collected and/or support conclusions | Results, graphics, and tables present data collected; data generally support conclusions but are confusing and some data are lacking | Presented clearly; graphics and tables adequately present the results; slightly too much or too little data presented to support conclusions | Presented logically and concisely; graphics and tables adequately and clearly present results; enough data presented to support conclusions |
| Discussion | No interpretation of results is provided. | Appropriate interpretation of results and supporting information not provided; significant findings not presented clearly or not presented | Adequate interpretation of results provided; more supporting information could be provided; significant findings presented in general terms | Good interpretation of results provided; some supporting information provided; significant findings presented but not highlighted | Excellent and appropriate interpretation of results provided; supporting information provided when necessary; significant findings highlighted |
| Conclusions | Not supported by the results and discussion, or can not be drawn due to the limitations of the study | Not clearly supported by the results and discussion; potential importance of the conclusions discussed. | Generally supported by the results and discussion; importance of the conclusions discussed in general terms | Stated well and are supported by the results and discussion; importance of the conclusions discussed; suggestions for future work are alluded to | Stated clearly and concisely; well supported by the results and discussion; importance of the conclusions is stated clearly; suggestions for future work provided |

| Criteria | Unsatisfactory (0 points) | Fair (5 points) | Satisfactory (10 points) | Good (15 points) | Excellent (20 points) |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Quality: | | | | | |
| Presentation | Poor; text provided poorly explains background, methods, and results and states objectives and conclusions; poster poorly laid out and difficult to read; many grammatical, spelling, and/or punctuation errors | Inadequate; text provided marginally explains background, methods, and results and states objectives and conclusions; lay out and legibility of poster needs improvement; some grammatical, spelling, and/or punctuation errors | Adequate; text provided generally explains background, methods, and results and states objectives and conclusions, but may be lacking in one or more of these areas; poster sufficiently laid out and legible; almost no grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors | Clear and logical; text provided explains background, methods, and results and states objectives and conclusions, but may be slightly excessive or lacking; poster generally well laid out and legible; no grammatical, spelling, and/or punctuation errors | Clear, logical, and concise; text provided is sufficient to explain background, methods, and results and state objectives and conclusions, but is not excessive; poster is well laid out, legible, and contains maps, models, and flow charts as appropriate to help the reader understand |
| Originality | Study does not bring any new information to the field | Study contributes to the field by demonstrating reproducibility or irreproducibility of results | Study demonstrates exploration of areas where further research is needed; information drawn from the study brings important information to the field; presenter is motivated to fill information gaps | Study demonstrates exploration of current research topics; information drawn from the study brings important information which contributes to the growth of the field; presenter is capable of expanding on current research and theory | Study demonstrates originality; information drawn from the study brings new, important information to the field; presenter is capable of exercising independent thought |
| Total | | | | | |

Total Score: _____ (total possible points 160)

Comments (optional) (Feedback helps with breaking ties and allows us to provide both positive feedback and constructive criticism for student participants):