## **MA-SLP Poster Session Evaluation**

Student:	Date of presentation:
Title:	
Evaluator:	
Evaluator Role: Advisor	2 <sup>nd</sup> Committee member
Please provide a rating for each desc	riptor from 1-5
1= Significant room for improvement	
2= Below average	5= Exceptional
3= Average	
Poster Rating	
Visual impact (e.g., graphs, tables, fig	ures, photos) are clear and understandable
Spelling, grammar, and terminology are	e accuracy
Objectives of project are clearly articular	ated
Relevant content areas included (e.g.	background, clinical question, results, conclusion)
Trelevant content areas moladed (e.g.,	background, similar quocaen, rosaite, sometasion)
	e (e.g., data, patient outcomes with rationale for why
specific evidence is chosen).	
Clinical and/or research methods and poster	data analysis are appropriate to the purpose of the
poster	
Details of research/content are provide	ed (e.g., participant information, treatments description)
Oral Presentation Rating	
Student uses appropriate terminology	
Student supports response to question	ns with evidence from the project
and the same of th	
Student explains methodology and pro	ocess clearly

Rev. 3/2016 1

tudent knows about and is able to evaluate research for the project materials/proce	)SS
tudent suggests future directions for this project	
student communicates with audience with poise and in organized manner	
Student communicates professional issues to a naïve audience	

Intellectual Achievement Rating

Project is appropriately challenging and goes beyond expected work product for a given	
Student shows evidence of independent contribution to the project	
Student articulates how the research or clinical question fits within their topic specialization	
or how it supports their professional development	
Student articulates a contribution of their work to advancing clinical expertise in the area of	
heir topic specialization	
Student identifies ways their study or process could be improved or weaknesses in	
published literature related to the specialization	
Student articulates specific examples to extend the current work into future clinical cases	

General Comments: Total Points /100

If significant deficiencies were noted and/or total points were less than 80, indicate recommendations for areas to be addressed.

Signature of Evaluator