	5 (A+)	4 (A)	3 (B)	2 (C)	1 (F)
Data	Data source clearly described. Variables used in analysis described individually along with some context to help understand them (units etc).		Some confusion regarding the data source or variable definitions.		Data not described, misrepresented or misunderstood.
Analysis	Data analysis tackles interesting and well-motivated questions, focussing on depth, not breadth. Conclusions are backed up by multiple lines of evidence. (If not shown on plot, obvious when questioned.)		Questions are bit mixed: some interesting, others not so much. Some statements unsupported by data.		Questions are uninteresting or poorly motivated. Many hypotheses unsupported by the data
Graphics	Graphics are appropriately chosen to answer the questions asked. There is clear evidence that many iterations were used to get to the final form and once there a lot of effort was used to polish an exploratory graphics into an artefact of communication. Statistical summaries are used to augment the raw data, not replace it. No overplotting.		Incomplete iteration or polishing. Quality inconsistent and some plots either display too much data or too little.		Graphics don't answer relevant questions and are hard to read. Plots feature overplotting are over summarised.
Organisation	Clear flow from introduction to findings to conclusions. Most important findings are eye-catching. Less important findings are less prominent. Least important findings are omitted. Evidence of rigorous editing: only the best plots made it on to the poster.		Flow pretty good, but not always obvious where to look next. Importance of findings and visual importance not always well matched.		Confusing and hard to follow; no obvious flow. Importance of findings not obvious from presentation.
Appearance	Title readable from across the room, headings readable from nearby, body text and graph labels are readable from arms length. Whitespace used appropriately to separate content and giving breathing room. Colours support content, not distract from it. Graphics are high quality (not blurred or jagged).		Text is readable, but there are other small problems (graph quality, use of whitespace, distracting colours)		Text hard to read, colours jarring, no whitespace.
Language	Headings are concise but informative. Individual sections use short sentences or bullets to facilitate rapid scanning. No spelling or grammatical errors. Writing is clear and concise.		Text either a bit wordy or too brief. Not easy to scan.		Riddled with spelling and grammar errors. Excessively brief, or too much text to easily scan.
Personal presentation	Dressed professionally. Doesn't block poster. Available to answer questions without being overly annoying. Enthusiastic about all questions. Not afraid to say "I don't know"		Personal presentation good, but interaction with visitors not smooth.		Dressed poorly, uninterested in helping readers.