**UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO DENVER|ANSCHUTZ MEDICAL CAMPUS**  
**POSTDOCTORAL RESEARCH DAY 2014**  
**POSTER SESSION RATING SHEET**

**POSTDOCTORAL PRESENTER’S NAME:** ______________________________________  
**JUDGE’S NAME:** ______________________________________

**POSTER NUMBER:** _________

Poster Session when judged: ___ 1 (9:00-10:15)  
OR  ___ 2 (11:30-12:45)  
Postdoc present: yes ☐ no ☐

---

**Please make notes in the comments section on page two** – hand that page to the postdoc if you wish, or turn it in with page one at judges’ check-in.

**Please notice:** emphasize the importance, clarity, logic and understandability of the abstract more than the technical details.

For each of the categories below, please **CIRCLE JUST ONE APPROPRIATE RATING (NO decimals)**.  
5 = Outstanding  
1 = Needs Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance and Innovation</strong></td>
<td>Is the significance of the main question, hypothesis, or issue addressed in the project clear to the viewers (is it important)? Does the presentation reveal original thinking on the part of the presenter? Has the work required creative input from the presenter?</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology</strong></td>
<td>Is the method or approach clearly stated? Is it rigorous? Is a hypothesis presented and tested? Are adequate controls incorporated?</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Are data and/or other observations clear and convincing? Have sufficient numbers of events been studied? For quantitative studies, have the results been subjected to statistical analysis? For qualitative studies, is the analysis of sufficient breadth and depth?</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion/Conclusions</strong></td>
<td>Are inferences, conclusions, implications, and any future follow-up plans based on the data/observations discussed appropriately?</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation/Understanding</strong></td>
<td>What is the quality of the oral presentation? Is the work presented in a well-organized, concise fashion? Is the presenter capable of presenting complex ideas or data in an understandable fashion? How well does the presenter understand the subject based on responses to questions?</td>
<td>Great!</td>
<td>Needs Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 8  7</td>
<td>6 5  4</td>
<td>3 2  1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Presentation</strong></td>
<td>What is your reaction to the quality, effectiveness, and appearance of the poster presentation overall?</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9 8 7</td>
<td>6 5  4</td>
<td>3 2  1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Total Score**               | (possible score of 40)  
**Score will be added by score-keepers. Please turn sheet in to judges’ check-in table.** |        |    |    |    |    |    |

---

Score will be added by score-keepers. Please turn sheet in to judges’ check-in table.
Reviewer’s Comments  (Feel free to give this page directly to the postdoc – or turn it in to the judges’ check-in table.)

POSTDOC PRESENTER’S NAME: ____________________________  POSTER NUMBER: ______

Strengths:

Areas for Improvement: