

PHYS 590 Poster Marking Template

Student Name: _____, Reviewer: _____

1. Poster Design and Layout

Needs Improvement >1.5	Satisfactory 2	Very Good 2.5	Excellent 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Layout makes poster unattractive or difficult to read and understand. • Too much text. • Text or figures too small to read easily, poster “crammed” and difficult to follow • Excessive use of graphics or “decorations” make the poster look cluttered. • Poster attempts to cover too much material. • Tables and figures not relevant and/or are missing components and/or are difficult to read. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poster looks clean, polished, and professional. • Important information is legible from 2-3m away. • The context, methods, and key achievements of the project are clearly described, without “extra” material. • The layout is attractive, with bullets and headlines making it easy to follow, and effective use of “white space,” graphics, fonts, and colour. • Tables and figures are clear and legible, are large enough to be seen clearly, and have appropriate and complete axes, labels, legends and captions. 	

2. Poster Presentation and Response to Questions

Needs Improvement >1.5	Satisfactory 2	Very Good 2.5	Excellent 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation is clumsy or mechanical, no logical flow. • Presentation contains too much technical detail and jargon, does not focus on the key points. • Presentation delivery is unpolished. • Key achievements of the project are not clearly presented. • Presentation (not counting questions/discussion) is too long - or too short! • Responses to question indicate a lack of understanding of the topic, either in the broader context or in the project details. • Unable to explain key elements of the project. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation is well structured, with logical flow. • Relevant points and key achievements of the project are thoroughly, but concisely, discussed. • Presentation is of appropriate length (about 5 minutes, not counting breaks to respond to questions). • Presentation and responses to questions show excellent grasp of the science, including the larger context of the project and the physical motivation for key project methodologies, as well as the details of the project execution. • Physics issues and challenges identified and understood. • Responses to questions are clear, confident, and insightful. 	

3. Accomplishments in Independent Research

Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
>1.5	2	2.5	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited progress on project. Project has not extended beyond previous work; no original research demonstrated. Work lacked in initiative and/or insightfulness. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good progress was made on project. Project has extended previous work and significant original research results were achieved. Note where progress was hindered by unexpected research developments despite diligent effort, the student may receive the majority of the credit. Work was insightful, personal “ownership” of the project clearly demonstrated. Student clearly took initiative and “drove” the project rather than just following instructions. 	

4. Examiner’s Discretion:

Examiners may add up to one additional mark to bring the overall project mark to the appropriate level. For reference, Queen’s grade descriptors are:

Mark (/10) Greater Than:	Letter Grade	Descriptor
9	A+	Exceptional
8.5	A	Outstanding
8	A-	Excellent
7.7	B+	Very Good
7.3	B	Good
7	B-	Reasonably Good
6.7	C+	Acceptable
6	C, C-	Minimally Acceptable
5	D+, D, D-	Unsatisfactory Pass
<5	F	Fail