

## **Thank you for reviewing for Round 1 of the 2020 Student Poster Award!**

In this first round of judging, reviewers provide an in-depth evaluation of both poster content and the accompanying research summary. Posters should be evaluated on their ability to communicate the main finding(s) or conclusions in a simple, easy to follow format, in addition to being visually appealing to audience members. Points should not be deducted if posters do not include all the sections found in a traditional template (i.e., background, hypothesis, method, results, and discussion). However, these sections can and should appear in the research summary.

The research summary should provide an overview of the research and offer information that enhances the poster. This may include more detailed explanations of related literature and how the research question was formed, any secondary analyses and results, **or** information the presenter might convey in conversations with an audience at their poster presentation.

Please complete the entire form and comment on the submission's strengths, and/or offer constructive feedback on areas that could be strengthened. Unprofessional comments will be returned to reviewers for revision. Your reviews will be kept anonymous.

The following questions pertain to the research poster only:

<b>To what extent does the title...</b> <i>Make people want to come and visit?</i> <i>Pose a decisive question, define scope of the study, or hint at a new finding?</i> <i>Make the research comprehensible to a broad audience (i.e., short, sharp, and compelling)?</i>	Not At All      A Little Bit      Moderately      Very      Exceedingly 1                  2                  3                  4                  5
<b>To what extent does the layout...</b> <i>Guide the eyes from one frame to another in a logical fashion from beginning to end?</i> <i>Is eye-catching but not overwhelming?</i> <i>Pulls the viewer in without causing them to feel lost?</i>	Not At All      A Little Bit      Moderately      Very      Exceedingly 1                  2                  3                  4                  5
<b>How informative and useful are the visual depictions of the data (the graphs, tables, figures, etc.)?</b> <i>Creatively considers how to best communicate scientific findings with visual tools.</i> <i>The viewer feels like he/she is experiencing more than just an article written in 36-point font.</i>	Not At All      A Little Bit      Moderately      Very      Exceedingly 1                  2                  3                  4                  5
<b>How clear is the overall “message” of the poster?</b> <i>The final takeaway is obvious and understandable to viewers.</i> <i>Presents a clear and obvious research question(s) and ultimate conclusions.</i> <i>Purpose of poster is clear.</i>	Not At All      A Little Bit      Moderately      Very      Exceedingly 1                  2                  3                  4                  5

The following questions pertain to the research summary only:

1. Background and Objectives / Hypotheses				
<b>A.</b> Background information provided is relevant, comprehensive, and succinct. In-text citations are included where appropriate/necessary.	Poor 1	Acceptable 2	Good 3	Excellent 4
<b>B.</b> The research question/objective is clearly defined. The question/objective is scientifically compelling (e.g., novel topic, innovative design, extends existing work or theory, tests boundary conditions of an effect).	Poor 1	Acceptable 2	Good 3	Excellent 4
<b>C.</b> If hypotheses are made, they are clearly defined and logically supported by the background information. If the work is labeled exploratory, potential outcomes are clearly defined and logically supported by the background information.	Poor 1	Acceptable 2	Good 3	Excellent 4
2. Empirical Logic				
<b>A.</b> Methods/procedures are easy to follow and clearly explain how data were collected / how tasks were performed. Sample size and relevant statistics are reported. Demographic information is reported when relevant.	Poor 1	Acceptable 2	Good 3	Excellent 4
<b>B.</b> The project design appropriately addresses the research question(s)/objective(s) (e.g., would a cross-sectional or longitudinal design provide a more direct answer to the research question?).	Poor 1	Acceptable 2	Good 3	Excellent 4
<b>C.</b> The project achieves high validity (i.e., see <b>Notes 2c</b> ).	Poor 1	Acceptable 2	Good 3	Excellent 4
3. Results and Conclusions				
<b>A.</b> If results are reported in text, statistics are reported in APA format and include effect sizes when possible.	Poor 1	Acceptable 2	Good 3	Excellent 4
<b>B.</b> Conclusions are appropriately drawn based on the research design (e.g., no causal conclusions from correlational data) and supported by results; they connect back to project objectives/hypotheses; conclusions are not inappropriately extrapolated	Poor 1	Acceptable 2	Good 3	Excellent 4
4. Complementarity				
<b>A.</b> The summary enhances the understanding of the research poster.	Poor 1	Acceptable 2	Good 3	Excellent 4

**Do the poster and summary combined include (at a minimum) the following sections?**

- *Background or Introduction, Research Question(s) or Objective(s), Hypothesis or Potential Outcome(s), Methods or Procedure, Results or Analyses, Conclusion(s) or Discussion(s) & citations throughout or References?*
- YES/NO**

Would you recommend this application to win the Student Poster Award?

No	Maybe	Yes	Absolutely

### Comments

If you thought this submission excelled, and/or could be strengthened in a particular category, please offer this feedback below. Please reference the rating category (e.g., 2B) and be constructive in your feedback.