

	Scientific Merit Objective Clarity	Scientific Merit Appropriate Methods	Scientific Merit Appropriate Analysis	Scientific Merit Conclusions Supported "Big-Picture" Context	Presentation Oral Clear Delivery Strategic Story Telling	Presentation Oral Evident Independence & Savvy Handling Questions	Presentation Visual Adequate Display
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Logical hypotheses / research objectives were presented clearly.</li> <li>Background information was relevant and summarized well.</li> <li>"Big picture" quite clear. Showed clear relevance beyond project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thorough explanation of methods method choice, justified</li> <li>Important deviations from standard procedures stated.</li> <li>Appropriate controls or comparative groups delineated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Substantial amounts of high quality data drive the point home.</li> <li>Presentation of data analysis clear, thorough, and logical.</li> <li>The manner in which data were analyzed was clearly understood &amp; justified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conclusions seemed entirely justified given the analyzed data</li> <li>Interpretations strongly supported by presented evidence.</li> <li>The broader utility of findings presented convincingly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Story telling strategy highly engaging; efficient, and sensitive to audience; enthusiastic.</li> <li>Presenter was able to express complex points easily and spontaneously.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very strong knowledge of research project; leader</li> <li>Explanations indicate a versatile grasp of field, goals, and findings.</li> <li>An advisor would be proud and confident to have represent lab anywhere based on question responses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expected components are present, clearly laid out, and easy to follow in the absence of presenter</li> <li>The text is concise, error free.</li> <li>Figures/graphs well thought out for clarity and clearly labeled</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Logical hypotheses / research objectives were presented.</li> <li>Background information relevant; broader connections not clear.</li> <li>Goal of project was stated with some relevance beyond project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good explanation of methods choice, deviations from standards mentioned.</li> <li>Clear discussion of comparative groups;</li> <li>Most controls or desirable comparative groups included.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sufficient amounts of good data were presented to address the hypothesis.</li> <li>Handling of data was logical.</li> <li>The manner in which data were analyzed understood</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reasonable conclusions were provided and supported with evidence.</li> <li>Conclusions were compared to hypothesis, but their larger relevance barely discussed;</li> <li>Broader utility of findings presented not so convincing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A story telling strategy was apparent, thought through for efficiency but versatile</li> <li>Presenter not locked to script; delivery seemed memorized &amp; less spontaneous.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Team member with sufficient grasp of goals and findings to teach new students in lab.</li> <li>Independent research, but perhaps not independent thought</li> <li>Answers most questions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expected components present;</li> <li>Text clear, legible very few typos.</li> <li>Figures/graphs improve understanding, show point</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research objectives and hypothesis presented but wishy-washy.</li> <li>Background information relevant, broader connections not made.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little comment on why methods were chosen and others not chosen.</li> <li>Adequate discussion of controls or comparative groups;</li> <li>Some important controls or comparative groups lacking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate data were to address the hypothesis.</li> <li>Presentation of data was not entirely clear.</li> <li>Could describe, but not explain, how data were analyzed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reasonable conclusions were given.</li> <li>Conclusions not compared to hypothesis and no relevance discussed;</li> <li>Little to no presentation of a broader utility for the findings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A story telling strategy was apparent, not showed no versatility</li> <li>Almost seemed like presenter had a script they had to get through -- thrown by interruptions</li> <li>Kept track of basics but lost the listener when complex</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some knowledge of the research project</li> <li>Could be independent once techniques learned, but not as good conveying story</li> <li>Has some difficulty answering challenging questions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most expected components present, but layout confusing to follow without presenter</li> <li>Figures / tables / graphs do not improve understanding or seem unrelated</li> <li>Graphs and tables should have adopted other style</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research objectives and hypothesis presented but not justified and wishy-washy.</li> <li>Relevant background information included, but not connected.</li> <li>Goal of project was not clear.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No discussion of choice of methods.</li> <li>Deviations from standard protocols given insufficient attention</li> <li>Controls or comparative groups not adequately described or justified;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some data were lacking not fully sufficient to address the hypothesis.</li> <li>Presentation of data included, but not explained well.</li> <li>Not clear on how data were analyzed even to describe the process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conclusions were given. The logic behind conclusions left unclear</li> <li>Little connection between conclusions and hypothesis apparent.</li> <li>No mention of broader utility unless prompted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A story telling strategy was apparent, but very inefficient</li> <li>Some jumping back and forth took place between components even when not prompted</li> <li>Keeping track of the theme was difficult largely due to the oral presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor knowledge of the research project</li> <li>Highly likely a follower of instructions, but good follower often insightful</li> <li>Recognizes limitations while answering questions. Careful responding to questions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Layout challenging to follow without presenter</li> <li>Text hard to read, several spelling or typographical errors found.</li> <li>Figures / tables /graphs counterproductive or miss the point.</li> </ul>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The hypotheses / research objectives were inappropriate, missing, or very vague.</li> <li>Little background information included; felt disconnected.</li> <li>Goal of project was not stated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Methods section missing.</li> <li>Serious lack of controls and discussion of controls.</li> <li>Deviations from standard protocols lacked explanation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results are not yet available or reproducible.</li> <li>Presentation of data was missing,</li> <li>Used words like "significant" without care</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conclusions were missing.</li> <li>There was no connection with the hypothesis</li> <li>No mention of broader utility even if prompted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No apparent story telling strategy, totally inefficient</li> <li>Presenter seemed to jump around haphazardly; far too much extra language</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not demonstrate any knowledge of the research project; pre-canned answers.</li> <li>Does not understand questions or speaks without aforethought.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Text hard to read, messy and illegible, with spelling errors</li> <li>The figures and tables are poorly done</li> <li>Figures lack rationale</li> </ul>