CRITERIA	4 (excellent)	3 (Good)	2 (Fair)	1 (Poor)	Score
Hypothesis/objectives of project	Clearly articulated and substantiated by background information, connections to previous literature	Articulated and substantiated but could be more compelling or more developed	Provided hypothesis or objectives, but not directly related to background information	Hypotheses or objectives were underdeveloped with little background information provided *or* unstated	
Approach	Study design/project methods were described clearly and rationale was provided	Study/project methods were provided with little rationale	There was some mention/discussion of study/project methods	There is no discussion/mention of study/project methods	
Data	Results were substantial and addresses objectives/hypotheses of the project	Data was clearly presented and addresses objectives/hypotheses of the project	Data presented - could use some improvement in organization or summary	Data is incomplete or not logically presented	
Conclusions	Discussion/conclusions clearly linked to objectives and includes implications and future directions	Discussion/conclusion was presented with little connection to research/project objective	Minimal discussion/conclusion	There is no discussion/conclusion	
Presentation	Presentation was outstanding in clarity & professionalism. *If in person* – able to answer questions clearly	Presentation was solid in clarity, professionalism, and if in person- presenter addressed most questions.	Presentation was complete and clearly conveyed. Professional appearance could be improved.	Presentation could use improvements in clarity, professionalism, or organization. Professional appearance could be improved.	
Impact of project – scientific/clinical/advocacy	Very significant impact	Significant impact	Some impact	Minimal impact	
Comments/suggestions:				TOTAL Numerical score	