

**Poster Title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Presenter:** \_\_\_\_\_ **E-Mail:** \_\_\_\_\_

### Instructions to Reviewer

Use the criteria to rate the poster presentation (1=Strongly Disagree, 3=Neutral, 5=Strongly Agree)

### Appropriateness

The poster presents the results of a process-based, mechanistic model rather than a statistical (curve-fitting) model..... No Yes

**Note:** If “No” the poster is not appropriate and the score for the poster is zero.

### Appearance

**5 is strong agreement**

1. Display attracts the viewer’s attention .....1 2 3 4 5
2. Words are easy to read from an appropriate distance (3-5 feet) .....1 2 3 4 5
3. Poster is well organized and easy to follow .....1 2 3 4 5
4. Graphics and other visuals enhance presentation .....1 2 3 4 5
5. The poster is neat and appealing to look at .....1 2 3 4 5

### Content

6. Content is clear and easy to understand .....1 2 3 4 5
7. Purpose of model (question being addressed) is stated clearly .....1 2 3 4 5
8. I understand why someone might be interested in the model results .....1 2 3 4 5
9. Key simplifying assumptions are identified .....1 2 3 4 5
10. There is enough details about methods for me to understand the model and results .....1 2 3 4 5  
(e.g., deriving rate equations and parameter values)
11. The approach taken is appropriate for the problem and technically sound .....1 2 3 4 5
12. Poster is free of unnecessary detail .....1 2 3 4 5
13. Conclusions are stated clearly .....1 2 3 4 5
14. Conclusions are supported by model results .....1 2 3 4 5

### Presentation

15. Presenter’s response to questions demonstrated knowledge of subject matter and project .....1 2 3 4 5
16. Overall, this was a really good poster presentation .....1 2 3 4 5

**Other Comments (use other side)**