

**Directions:** For each judging category, multiply the weight (15, 30, 40, or 15) by the rank (low 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 high) and enter the category score at the bottom of the page. Add the category scores to determine the total score. At the end of the session, confer with your co-judges to determine the winner, and give the results to the Faculty Facilitator.

	Rank	Appearance	Methodology Score	Content	Student Style	
(weight)		15	30	40	15	
	1 (lowest)	Very poor visual presentation. Cluttered, no white space. Unable to read from 6 ft distance. Text too small/poor font; many misspelled words; poor grammar. Graphics not related to research.	Poor methodology. Inappropriate choice of methods. Methods do not match research design.	Problem/purpose hypothesis: difficult to discern relationships of each. Lacks creativity and innovation. Has no significance to field and will make no contribution.	Student(s) seemed disinterested. Unable to answer questions. Poor grasp of project. Poor communication skills.	
	2	Poor visual presentation. Cluttered, little white space. Difficult to read from 6 ft distance. Text small/poor font; some misspelled words and grammar problems. Graphics slightly related to research.	Fair methodology. Choice of methods not best fit for research design.	Problem/purpose hypothesis: not cohesive. Demonstrates minimal creativity and innovation. Little relevance or significance to the field and will make little contribution.	Student(s) unenthusiastic. Has difficulty answering questions. Has some understanding of project. Communication inappropriate or irrelevant.	
	3	Satisfactory visual presentation. Moderate alignment of text, graphics, white space. Can be read from 6 ft distance. Text appropriate font/size; few misspelled words/grammar problems. Graphics related to research.	Methodology relevant. Research methods appropriate.	Problem/purpose/hypothesis: cohesive. Has some creativity and innovation. Moderately relevant and/or significant to field and will make some contribution.	Student(s) displays interest but limited engagement with audience. Able to answer questions with minimal depth. Communication appropriate and relevant.	
	4	High quality visual presentation. Balanced alignment of text, graphics, white space. Easily read from 6 ft distance. Text appropriate font/size; good spelling/grammar. Graphics strongly related to research.	Methodology appropriate to problem/hypothesis. Good choice of research methods.	Problem/purpose/hypothesis: cohesive and able to determine relationships between them. Creative and innovative. Relevant and/or significant and will make a good contribution.	Student(s) interested and engages audience. Enthusiastic while discussing project. Answers to questions show good understanding of project. Good communication skills.	
	5 (highest)	Exceptional visual presentation. Excellent alignment of text, graphics, white space. Easily read from 6 ft distance. Excellent text font/size, spelling and grammar. Excellent choice of graphics; strongly illustrates research.	Methodology very appropriate for topic. Research methods relevant, appropriate, and innovative; introduces new or expands on established ideas.	Problem/purpose/hypothesis: very cohesive and strongly related. Very creative and innovative. Extremely relevant to field and will make an important contribution.	Student(s) very engaged and enthusiastic. Expresses ideas fluently. Answers to questions show profound understanding of project and critical thinking. Excellent communication skills.	
<b>Title / Student(s)</b>		<b>Appearance Score</b>	<b>Methodology Score</b>	<b>Content Score</b>	<b>Student Style Score</b>	<b>Total Score</b>