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**Instructions to reviewer:** Use these criteria to rate the poster presentation on a scale of 1-5

(1=strongly disagree; 3=neutral; 5=strongly agree).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Appearance** | **5 is strong agreement** |
| 1. Display attracts viewer's attention. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. Words are easy to read from an appropriate distance (3-5 feet). | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. Poster is well organized and easy to follow. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. Graphics and other visuals enhance presentation. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. The poster is neat and appealing to look at. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|  |  |
| **Content** |  |
| 6. Content is clear and easy to understand. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 7. Purpose of model (question being addressed) is stated clearly. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 8. I understand why someone might be interested in the model results. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 9. There is enough detail about methods (e.g., creating new variables) for me to understand the model and results. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 10. The sample characteristics are fully described. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 11. The approach taken is appropriate for the problem and technically sound. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 12. Conclusions are stated clearly. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 13. Conclusions are supported by model results. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 14. Limitations of the study are clear. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|  |  |
| **Presentation** |  |
| 15. Presenter's response to questions demonstrated knowledge of subject matter and project. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 16. The presenters conducted themselves professional during the presentation. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 17. It was clear that all team members understood what was being presented and had an equal contribution to the data analysis. One member did not dominate the presentation and questions. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

**Other comments**