

A. Abstract

Score	Category	Comments
1.00	Total Failure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section did not follow the established guidelines and/or was incomprehensible.
7.90	Below passing, MAJOR Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract is confusing and makes very little reference to the rest of the report. Objective not stated
8.00	Just Passing, Moderate Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract is ambiguous / Does not adequately summarize the report The abstract refers to some of the key components of the project. Critical points are absent. Objective poorly stated / exceeds word limits or is far too short
8.50	Average, Fair, Extensive Deficiencies,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract does not adhere to the word limits, rambles on exceeds word limits (or is too short) Objective stated but unclear
9.00	Very Good, Moderate Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract pulls most of the key components of the project together in a concise fashion Abstract a little too long Objective stated, but could be stated a little more clearly / mostly adheres to word limits
9.30	Great, Minor Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective logical and succinct The abstract adheres to the word limits
10.00	Outstanding, Top Notch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract precisely pulls all the key components of the project together in a clear and concise fashion. The abstract strictly adheres to the word limits Objective showed relevance beyond project

B. Background and Rationale

Score	Category	Comments
1.00	Total Failure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section did not follow the established guidelines and/or was incomprehensible.
7.90	Below passing, MAJOR Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The hypothesis/objective/statement of problem not stated / inadequate Background information was missing
8.00	Just Passing, Moderate Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background information insufficient A questionable rationale / statement of problem presented or rationale not sufficiently supported
8.50	Average, Fair, Extensive Deficiencies,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some relevant background information/introduction missing Presented information not clearly connected with the project or did not support rationale Rationale of project was somewhat unclear
9.00	Very Good, Moderate Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The hypothesis/statement of problem presented clearly, for the most part Background introduction was mostly relevant, mostly supports rationale
9.30	Great, Minor Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background missing only minor details but otherwise clear and strongly supports the rationale Rationale clearly stated
10.00	Outstanding, Top Notch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connections to previous literature and broader issues were clear Background information relevant, summarized well and clearly supports rationale Presentation of a logical rationale / statement of problem was clear and insightful

C. Methods

Score	Category	Comments
1.00	Total Failure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section did not follow the established guidelines and/or was incomprehensible.
7.90	Below passing, MAJOR Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No discussion of methods or reason for methods No discussion of statistical analysis or proper use of control groups Methods section completely disorganized
8.00	Just Passing, Moderate Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No discussion of the choice of methods / why chosen methods were the best for the project Methods were not adequately described / poorly organized Statistics insufficiently described
8.50	Average, Fair, Extensive Deficiencies,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methods discussed insufficiently (missing key information to fully understand what was done) Little or now discussion of why specific methods were chosen Statistics described adequately
9.00	Very Good, Moderate Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good explanation of methods used Good explanation of the choice of methods Good description of statistics used, including a discussion of control vs experimental groups
9.30	Great, Minor Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear and accurate discussion of methods used to carry out the research Appropriate rationale for listed for specific methods used Clear description of statistics used.
10.00	Outstanding, Top Notch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Superb discussion of methods used The rationale for the methods was clear and insightful Superb discussion of the statistics employed, including an excellent discussion of control vs experimental groups

D. Results

Score	Category	Comments
1.00	Total Failure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section did not follow the established guidelines and/or was incomprehensible.
7.50	Below passing, MAJOR Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results were insufficient or severely lacking Presentation of data was insufficient or severely lacking Statistics was insufficient or severely lacking: eg reporting an average without a standard error or standard deviation
8.00	Just Passing, Moderate Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some results lacking or insufficient Results did not sufficiently address the rationale Presentation of data was unclear or difficult to comprehend Inconsistent use of statistics (such as averages and standard errors). Statistical discussion lacked any mention of statistical significance.
8.50	Average, Fair, Extensive Deficiencies,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results mostly sufficient Adequate amounts of data were presented to address the rationale Presentation of data was not entirely clear / data was of low quality Statistical results discussed adequately. Statistical significance mentioned
9.00	Very Good, Moderate Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results addressed most aspects of the rationale Sufficient amounts of good quality data were presented clearly and logically Statistical results and significance were sufficiently discussed.
9.30	Great, Minor Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results addressed the rationale Presentation of high quality data was clear, thorough, and logical Statistical results and levels of significance demonstrated a good understanding of hypothesis testing
10.00	Outstanding, Top Notch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results clearly addressed the rationale Substantial amounts of high quality data were presented Presentation of data was clear, thorough, and logical Statistical results and levels of significance presented clearly and demonstrated a strong understanding of hypothesis testing

E. Discussion / Broader Impacts

Score	Category	Comments
1.00	Total Failure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section did not follow the established guidelines and/or was incomprehensible.
7.50	Below passing, MAJOR Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions / implications of results grossly insufficient No connection / no reference made back to background / rationale Insufficient discussion of broader impacts
8.00	Just Passing, Moderate Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions / implications of results insufficient Few connections / little reference made back to background / rationale Poor discussion of broader impacts / missing critical points
8.50	Average, Fair, Extensive Deficiencies,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions / implications of results present but missing critical detail Connections / reference made back to background / rationale were lacking or not clear Discussion of broader impacts not convincing / missing some critical points
9.00	Very Good, Moderate Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions / implications of results presented well with only few details missing Logical Connections made back to background / rationale Discussion of broader impacts thoughtful but missing a few points
9.30	Great, Minor Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions supported by results Solid connections were made between the conclusions and the rationale Broader implications of the results were clearly discussed
10.00	Outstanding, Top Notch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions strongly supported by results Clear connections were made between the conclusions and the rationale Broader implications of the results were presented in a clear and insightful manner

F. Capstone Mechanics

Score	Category	Comments
1.00	Total Failure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section did not follow the established guidelines and/or was incomprehensible.
7.50	Below passing, MAJOR Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The text is incomprehensible due to excessive grammatical errors or overly complex sentence structure Font size too small or too large / text illegible The tone of the writing is not professional, reads more like a personal diary than a scientific article Contains numerous spelling or typographical errors
8.00	Just Passing, Moderate Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The text has many spelling or typographical errors The manuscript adheres to the formatting guidelines specified for the Report The writing is confusing Literature citations do not consistently follow guidelines. In text citations are sometimes inaccurate
8.50	Average, Fair, Extensive Deficiencies,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The text is legible, but inconsistently free of spelling or typographical errors; The manuscript adheres to the formatting guidelines specified for the Report The writing is sometimes confusing Literature citations do not consistently follow guidelines. In text citations are sometimes inaccurate
9.00	Very Good, Moderate Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The text is mostly free of spelling or typographical errors The writing is clear and understandable The tone is professional Literature Citations mostly follows guidelines / In-text citations mostly accurate
9.30	Great, Minor Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The text is legible, and almost completely free of spelling or typographical errors The writing is clear and easy to follow The tone is professional Literature Citations follows guidelines / In-text citations accurate
10.00	Outstanding, Top Notch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The text is concise, legible, and completely free of spelling or typographical errors Writing is of the highest quality - worthy of publication Literature Citations follows guidelines to the letter. All in-text citations are accurate and appropriately used

G. Capstone Mechanics: Figures and Legends

Score	Category	Comments
1.00	Total Failure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section did not follow the established guidelines and/or was incomprehensible.
7.50	Below passing, MAJOR Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figure legends insufficient. The resolution of the figure photos/tables/graphs not suitable for printing and makes finer details impossible to read High resolution images and/or 3D models not included Figures do not appear to be related to text
8.00	Just Passing, Moderate Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figure legends sporadically sufficient, contain errors, or are unclear Figures are poorly labeled - content is confusing Figures are inconsistently linked to text Certain photographs/tables/graphs appear superfluous - reason for inclusion not sufficiently detailed
8.50	Average, Fair, Extensive Deficiencies,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figure legends contain little edifying information Figure photos/tables/graphs generally improve understanding of the report Figures are of sufficient quality.
9.00	Very Good, Moderate Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figures are of good quality, need some revision for publication Figure legends explain the figures well Figure photos/tables/graphs improve understanding of the project
9.30	Great, Minor Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figures are high quality, almost publication ready Figure legends are informative, explain the figures well Figure photos/tables/graphs extend understanding of the project Some high resolution images and/or 3D models enhance the overall visual appeal of the report.
10.00	Outstanding, Top Notch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figures are of the highest quality - publication ready Figure legends clearly describe the figures Figure photos/tables/graphs greatly extend understanding of the project. Many high resolution images and/or 3D models included enhance the overall visual appeal of the report

A. Poster Composition and grammar (Required sections: Title, Background / Rationale, Methods, Results, Discussion, Broader Impacts)

Score	Category	Comments
1.00	Total Failure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poster did not follow the established guidelines and/or was incomprehensible.
2.00	Below passing, MAJOR Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Format - expected sections are absent or poorly laid out. Poster is confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter. Very poor / distracting background Text - hard to read, messy and illegible; contains multiple spelling or typographical errors.
3.00	Just Passing, Moderate Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Format - most expected sections are present, but layout is untidy and confusing to follow. The board/slide background somewhat distracting Text - hard to read due to font size or color. Some spelling or typographical errors
3.50	Average, Just passing, Minor Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Format - expected sections are present, but layout is confusing to follow in the absence of presenter. The board/slide background may be distracting Text - the text is relatively clear and legible, but inconsistently free of spelling or typographical errors
4.00	Very Good, Moderate Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Format - all expected sections are present, organization is clear, background is unobtrusive Text - text is clear, legible, and mostly free of spelling or typographical errors
4.50	Excellent, Minor Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Format - all expected sections are present, organization is clear, background is unobtrusive, Poster is of high quality Text - text is clear, legible, and mostly free of spelling or typographical errors
5.00	Outstanding, Top Notch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Format - all expected sections are present, clearly laid out, and easy to follow in the absence of presenter. Poster is of the highest quality - near art-level Text - text is concise, legible, and completely free of spelling or typographical errors;

B. Poster Figures and Images

Score	Category	Comments
1.00	Total Failure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figures and / images were unacceptable in quality (overly pixelated poor resolution)
2.00	Below passing, MAJOR Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figures - Figures comprised a small fraction of the entire poster. There is excessive text and/or figures are too small. Quality of figures and tables is inadequate Images - no photographs or 3D models shown
3.00	Just Passing, Moderate Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figures - figures and tables are not related to the text, or are not appropriate, or are poorly labeled and/or do not improve understanding of the project. Images - photographs/models are of poor resolution and detract from the visual appeal of the poster
3.50	Average, Just passing, Minor Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figures - figures and tables are not always relevant, or are labeled incorrectly, or do not improve understanding of project Images - Photographs/models are of adequate quality
4.00	Very Good, Moderate Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figures - Most of the figures and tables are clear, relevant and labeled correctly Images - Photographs/models are of good quality
4.50	Excellent, Minor Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figures - Figures and tables are clearly relevant, appropriately labeled, and improve understanding of project Images - High quality photographs/3D models enhance visual appeal of poster
5.00	Outstanding, Top Notch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figures - figures and tables are labeled clearly and greatly enhance comprehension of project Images - Highest quality photographs/3D models greatly enhance the visual appeal of the poster

C. Poster Presentation: Presence

Score	Category	Comments
1.00	Total Failure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No show / Presentation completely lacking
2.00	Below passing, MAJOR Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not demonstrate any knowledge of the research project Read from the poster all the time. Did not make eye contact with audience Presentation was exceptionally confusing
3.00	Just Passing, Moderate Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrated poor knowledge of the research project Read from the poster most of the time / made little eye contact with audience Presentation was confusing
3.50	Average, Just passing, Minor Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrated some knowledge of the research project Presentation was generally unclear and inconsistent Presentation ran over the allotted time limit, but not excessively
4.00	Very Good, Moderate Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrated good knowledge of the research project Spoke clearly and naturally; made eye contact Used visual aids to enhance the presentation Presentation was mostly clear
4.50	Excellent, Minor Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrated strong knowledge of the research project Spoke clearly and naturally; made eye contact Used visual aids to enhance the presentation Presentation was consistently clear, presentation fell within allotted time limit
5.00	Outstanding, Top Notch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrated exceptional knowledge of the research project Spoke clearly, naturally and with enthusiasm; makes eye contact Presentation was exceptionally clear and logical Managed time precisely

D. Poster Presentation: Answering Questions

Score	Category	Comments
1.00	Total Failure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No show / Questions were unanswered
2.00	Below passing, MAJOR Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not understand questions / did not answer questions Presentation was exceptionally confusing
3.00	Just Passing, Moderate Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Had difficulty answering most questions
3.50	Average, Just passing, Minor Deficiencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has some difficulty answering challenging questions
4.00	Very Good, Moderate Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answered most questions well
4.50	Excellent, Minor Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answered all questions well
5.00	Outstanding, Top Notch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answered difficult questions clearly and succinctly and with poise