**University Graduate School Researcher Poster Conference 2014 - Judging Sheet**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The Poster** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| (*Content*) Did the poster describe the research subject in a logical manner? |  |  |  |  |  |
| (*Content*) Was the poster accessible to non-specialists? |  |  |  |  |  |
| (*Content*) Did the poster clearly explain what the purpose of the research was? |  |  |  |  |  |
| (*Design*) Did the poster use an appropriate balance of text and images? |  |  |  |  |  |
| (*Design*) Was it clear why pictures, images or graphics had been included? |  |  |  |  |  |
| (*Design*) Was it clear in which order the text should be read? |  |  |  |  |  |

Presenter’s name:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The Presenter** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| Was welcoming, friendly and enthusiastic about their research. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spoke about their research in a way that was accessible to non-specialists |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explained the social impact or real world relevance of their research. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asked for questions and answered any that were asked appropriately. |  |  |  |  |  |

Score each presenter from 1-5 in each of the 10 categories, 1 being the lowest and 5 the highest. Mark your score with a tick (✔)

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments** please add positive or constructive comments, e.g. an improvement to the poster, or a way of making their research more relatable |