

Criteria	Mark: 100 %	85%	74%	65%	55%	45%	35%	15%	0% Weighting	
Background (15%)	Excellent justification of work, which seamlessly presents background context as evidenced by exemplary knowledge of the wider literature, presents excellent case for the focus of the research subject and sets stage for task undertaken	Excellent justification of work, which presents background context as evidenced by advanced knowledge of the wider literature, presents excellent case for the focus of the research subject and primes viewer for task undertaken	Very good justification of work, which presents background context as evidenced by thorough knowledge of the wider literature, presents very good case for the focus of the research subject and fully primes viewer for task undertaken	Good justification of work, presents background context as evidenced by good knowledge of the wider literature, presents strong case for the focus of the research subject and introduces research task undertaken	Work justified but not fully convincing. Either due to a lack of background context, or inaccurate or lack of knowledge of the wider literature. As a result the focus of the research is somewhat weak and / or research task undertaken not properly introduced	Poor attempt to justify the work, either through a lack of background context, little to no reference to the wider literature relevant to topic. Fails to convince viewer that work is of interest or important through lack of, inaccurate or oversimplified detail. Research task poorly introduced.	Very little attempt to present a justification of why the work is of interest and importance. No to little context given with no or inaccurate or very little reference to wider literature and current status of knowledge in the field. Weak set up for the task undertaken.	Rational statement on study background present but no effort to justify the context of the work, why it is of interest or importance. No connection to wider literature.	No rationale or background context given	15
Aims and hypotheses (10%)	Crystal clear aim and testable hypotheses that are linked tightly to the background / rationale	Very clear aim and testable hypotheses linked to background / rationale	Good aim statement and testable hypotheses linked to background / rationale	Good aims and hypotheses but lacking either by being slightly vague and/or weak connection to background / rationale	Aim statement and hypotheses present but vague and / or connection to background / rationale is weak	Aim statement and hypotheses present but vague and untestable and link to background / rationale is weak	Aim statement and hypotheses present but very vague and untestable and totally disconnected to background / rationale	No aim statement or no hypotheses	No aim and no hypotheses	10
Methods (Data, design and analysis) (10%)	Excellent balance between being concise while highly informative to allow viewer to fully understand key points of approach.	Excellent level of detail that is informative enough and concise	Very good presentation of key points required to understand how work was undertaken	Good presentation of how work was undertaken but may be slightly lacking in detail, or alternatively providing excessive or unnecessary detail that detracts from key points	Description of how work was done is present but either lacks detail, or alternatively providing excessive or unnecessary detail that detracts from key points	Method section describes how work was conducted but is either not concise enough or lacks sufficient detail or is written in an unclear or inaccurate manner	Method section lacks sufficient detail required for viewer to understand how work was conducted and / or is error prone	Method section fails to communicate how work was conducted and / or has substantial error	No methods section	10
Statement of results (20%)	Excellent statement of findings that demonstrates ability to critically decide on key results of focus and presents supporting statistics using correct analyses, correct interpretation and presentation of statistics. Methods and findings collectively demonstrate originality and critical insight into topic.	Excellent statement of findings that presents supporting statistics using correct analyses, correct interpretation and presentation of statistics.	Very good clear statement of findings that presents supporting statistics using correct analyses, correct interpretation and presentation of statistics. May tend towards presenting too many findings.	Good statement of findings that is evidenced by supporting statistics from appropriately and correctly implemented statistics. May tend towards presenting too few or too many results and may contain a few errors, which may include incorrect presenting of statistics.	Statement of findings that is based on supporting statistics using appropriate methods but is lacking in detail or with some error, which may include incorrect presenting of statistics.	Statement of findings is error prone, it may apply incorrect statistical methods, or represented them insufficiently, and/or interpreted them unclearly or presented them incorrectly.	Statement of findings that is very inaccurate / superficial or uses incorrect analysis, interpretation or presenting of statistical results	Little to no results presented with a lack of or incorrect use or interpretation or presentation of statistics	No findings or results presented	10
Discussion (10%)	Excellent interpretation of findings which are fully placed within the wider perspective of the existing literature	Excellent interpretation of findings which are well linked to the wider perspective of the existing literature	Very good interpretation of findings which are well linked to the wider perspective of the existing literature	Fair interpretation of findings which are linked to the wider perspective of the existing literature	Findings are interpreted and summarized, but either detail is lacking or elements are inaccurate or the literature is not well or incorrectly used	Some interpretation of findings, that is somewhat lacking due to inaccurate or superficial interpretation. Little or incorrect link between findings and wider body existing literature	Little, no, or incorrect interpretation of findings and no or only superficial link to context of existing literature	No interpretation of findings and/or link to how these fit within context of existing literature	No summary section	20
Visual presentation (25%)	International scientific conference level standard in terms of visual appeal. Clean layout. Use of colour and style enhances readability. Font style and size maximize readability. Organisation and accessibility of information presented. High quality graphics (figures/illustrations) and tables are highly relevant and enhance the text. The order on poster is logical so that viewer can read without any need for narration. Space is fully used, but not cluttered.	Excellent design for visual appeal. Good layout, and use of colour, style, font and font size for enhanced readability. High quality and highly relevant graphics (figures/illustrations) and tables. Presentation of information is logically ordered and standalone, requiring no narration to understand. Space is fully used, but not cluttered.	Very well designed for visual appeal with appropriate use of layout, colour, style, font and font size to maximize readability. Relevant use of good quality graphics/figures/illustrations and tables. Presentation of information is logically ordered and standalone, requiring no narration to understand. Space is well used, but not cluttered.	Overall visually appealing with good use of space (not cluttered, not empty space). Adequate use of layout, font, style, font size for readability of content. Graphic (figures/illustrations) and table quality good and compliment text. Content is quite well arranged requiring mainly little to no extra narration for viewer to understand.	Design is adequate but average. May be cluttered or with empty space. Some thought in layout and use of style, font size is apparent but not to the degree that it enhances readability. Content layout may be not logical, or requires extra narration to make sense. Includes graphics (figures/illustrations) and tables to supplement text that are relevant and adequate quality. Poster may require further explanation to make sense.	Some effort in design but many aspects require further attention to improve visual appeal. Rather ineffective use of space (cluttered or too much empty space). Layout, use of font, style and size detracts from readability. Graphics (figures/illustrations) and tables poor quality or irrelevant to text rather than enhancing it. Order of sections not easy to follow. Poster requires substantial narration to make sense.	Little effort in design leading to visually unappealing product. Ineffective use of space (over cluttered or empty space). Ineffective use of colour, style, font, and font size making for poor readability. Few, irrelevant or poor graphics (figures/illustrations) and tables that do not enhance text. Order of sections not easy to follow. Poster requires substantial narration to make sense.	Visually unappealing. Ineffective use of space by being either overcluttered or with much empty space. Lack of use of colour and/or style, or use that detracts rather than enhances readability. Font size and style detract from readability. Layout disorganized and difficult to read. Poor graphics (figures/illustrations) and tables that do not compliment text. Poster requires substantial narration to make sense.	No effort in design leading to visually poor and totally ineffective visual communication tool.	10
Written style and mechanics (5%)	Clear and concise. Syntax varied, effective and polished. Sentences are entirely correct and writing demonstrates a perfect command of conventions of language.	Clear and concise. Syntax varied, effective and well edited. Sentences are correct and writing demonstrates a very good command of conventions of language.	Clear and mostly concise. Syntax varied, effective and well edited. Sentences are for the most part correct and writing demonstrates a very good command of conventions of language.	Clear and generally concise. Syntax effective and well edited. Minor errors present but they do not impede communication and writing demonstrates a solid command of the conventions of language.	Adequate diction, somewhat generalized. Syntax straightforward. Errors present but they do not unduly impede communication and writing demonstrates general control of the conventions of language.	Imprecise and unclear. Control of syntax is limited. Number of structural and mechanical errors that make it hard to understand points made. Writing demonstrates basic grasp of the conventions of language.	Imprecise, unclear and/or inappropriate diction. Control of syntax is limited. Structural and mechanical errors make it very difficult to understand points made. Writing demonstrates only basic grasp of conventions of language.	Imprecise, unclear and/or inappropriate diction. Extremely poor syntax. Structural and mechanical errors make it very difficult to understand points made. Writing demonstrates no grasp of conventions of language.	Imprecise, unclear and/or inappropriate. Extremely poor syntax. Structural and mechanical errors make it very difficult to understand points made. Writing demonstrates no grasp of conventions of language.	25
Referencing sources (5%)	Publication quality standard. Extent of reference list well beyond that expected. Formatting of in text citations and the reference list is entirely correct and consistent throughout.	Substantial reference list. Formatting of in text citations and the reference list is entirely correct and consistent throughout.	Formatting of in text citations and the reference list is entirely correct and consistent throughout.	Formatting of in text citations and the reference list is generally correct and consistent. Some minor inconsistencies or errors are evident but formatting shows clear understanding	Formatting of in text citations and the reference list shows understanding of the correct approach, but there are a number of errors/ inconsistencies.	Errors/ inconsistencies in formatting of in text citations and the reference list shows a lack of understanding of the correct approach or lack of attention to detail.	There are numerous errors/ inconsistencies in formatting of in text citations and the reference list which shows a lack of understanding of the correct approach or total lack of attention to detail.	In text citations and/ or references are given but formatting is lacking in any consistency or structure.	No in text citations or references are given.	5