

Presentation title: National Park Analysis and Predictions

Presenter: Alex Christensen, Erica Papke

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).

Appropriateness

The poster presents a topic relevant to the course?

No Yes

Appearance

5 is strong agreement

1. Presentation attracts viewer's attention.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Sentences are easy to read.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Presentation 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 presentation 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 is stated clearly.

1 2 3 4 5

8. Relevance clearly stated.

1 2 3 4 5

9. Key aspects of the topic are stated clearly.

1 2 3 4 5

10. There is enough detail about methods for me to understand the model and results.

1 2 3 4 5

11. The approach taken is in the R example is clear.

1 2 3 4 5

12. Presentation is free of unnecessary detail.

1 2 3 4 5

13. Conclusions are stated clearly.

1 2 3 4 5

14. Conclusions are supported by model results.

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. Overall, this was a great poster presentation.

1 2 3 4 5

Other comments (at least three cohesive sentences for your classmate)

1) Adjusted R-squared for linear regression was .34 which was very low. I don't understand why they still want to do a linear regression.

2) The population of the state where the national parks are located might affect the visitor number.

3) They could have explain more on why they used the Cross-Validated MSE graph. What was the use for it?