Name of Presenter:________________________________________  Abstract Number:_____

Judge's Name: __________________________________________

**CATEGORY 1: Statement of the problem and its significance**

- Has the researcher succinctly defined and delimited the research problem?
- Has the researcher addressed the study's worth to the practitioner, to existing theoretical models, or to both?

SCORE: (Poor) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Exceptional)

**CATEGORY 2: Methods**

- Has the researcher defined the participants, instruments, apparatuses, procedures, research design and statistical analysis where applicable?

SCORE: (Poor) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Exceptional)

**CATEGORY 3: Results**

- Were statistics and/or other modes of analysis presented in sufficient detail (e.g., t test, F test, correlation, post-hoc, percentages, means, standard deviations, etc.)?

SCORE: (Poor) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Exceptional)

**CATEGORY 4: Summary of the findings**

- Did the researcher provide a clear discussion of the results, summarize their relevance, and recommend directions for future research in this area where applicable?

SCORE: (Poor) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Exceptional)

**CATEGORY 5: Could you read the poster from a distance of 3-5 feet?**

SCORE: (Poor) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (Exceptional)

**COMMENTS:**
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________

Please return these evaluations to the registration table after the scores have been tallied.

It would be helpful to the students and to the URCAF committee if you would write three sentences to be distributed to individual participants. The first sentence should be a positive comment about a specific part of their presentation or poster. The second sentence should be a constructive suggestion for improving next time. The third sentence should be a positive comment that mentions topic of presentation.

Example: Ginger Williams organized her presentation well; it was easy to identify her problem statement, methods, date, and results. I noticed a few typographical errors in her slides, so I would encourage her to ask someone to proofread them next time. I enjoyed her presentation on citation analysis.