



University of Colorado
Anschutz Medical Campus

CAPSTONE 2025 POSTER PRESENTATIONS JUDGE PACKET

[LINK TO EVALUATION FORM HERE](#)

To Evaluate a Poster:

- Go to the poster number that coincides with the poster(s) you have been assigned.
- Scan the QR code posted to access the electronic judging form.
- Complete a judging form for each presenter.
- Answer each question accurately based on the rubric below. The rubrics are specifically tailored to the student's application of methodology within their project. (Confirm the intended methodology with the student during the presentation).
- Please only use the rubric as a guide; enter your evaluation score into the survey directly.
- Complete **one** electronic evaluation per presenter. Upon completion, if you have another poster to judge, start a new evaluation after you select "Submit." A new form will automatically load. If you do not have any more posters to judge, simply close the window.

The screenshot shows a web form titled "Capstone Poster Presentations" with the University of Colorado logo. Below the title is the text "Judge Evaluation Form Monday, April 7, 2025". A note says "Please refer to the judge packet and rubric on the [Capstone Website](#) for full category details." The form contains several sections: "Are you a:" with radio buttons for Faculty Judge, MS 1 Student Judge, and MS 4 Student Judge; "Session" with radio buttons for Session 1 (1:00pm - 2:00pm), Session 2 (2:00pm - 3:00pm), Session 3 (3:00pm - 4:00pm), and N/A; "Poster Number" with a text input field; "Presenter Name(s)" with a text input field and a note "First and Last. If you are judging a group, please list all presenters."; "Judge Name" with a text input field and a note "First and Last"; and "Selection of an appropriate problem statement, question, hypothesis, aim:" with a legend "1 = Below Expectations 2 = Meets Expectations 3 = Exceeds Expectations" and a radio button for "1".

The form will appear as the above photo.

April 7, 2025
In Person

Session 1: 1:00pm - 2:00pm Session 2: 2:00pm - 3:00pm Session 3: 3:00pm - 4:00pm

Poster Presentation Assessment Rubric—Appropriate Application of Methodology

Evaluation Criteria	Exceeds Expectations 3 Points	Meets Expectations 2 Points	Below Expectations 1 Points
Selection of an appropriate problem statement, question, hypothesis, aim	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets criteria plus the problem, hypothesis, aim is compelling and insightful	<input type="checkbox"/> Problem statement, hypothesis, aim complete, clear, and credible; Key constructs are defined and variables explained	<input type="checkbox"/> Vague problem statement, research question(s) not measurable; key constructs too broad and/ not clearly defined
Selection of an appropriate methodology to answer problem statement, question, hypothesis, aim *See expanded criteria on page 2 for arts, humanities, and ethics projects.	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets criteria plus selection of methodology represents creative thinking and demonstrates a new or improved approach to a problem	<input type="checkbox"/> Problem statement, question, hypothesis, and aim clearly translated into appropriate choices at the design level; appropriate research objectives	<input type="checkbox"/> Vague or incorrect methodology chosen to answer/address problem. Hypothesis, aim; inappropriate research objectives
Familiarity with background literature and previous work in the field * Note: A "references" section is not required.	<input type="checkbox"/> More extensive knowledge of background evidence	<input type="checkbox"/> Adequate knowledge of background evidence	<input type="checkbox"/> Subpar knowledge of background evidence in subject area
Clarity Of Poster	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets expectations, plus poster is visually attractive, catches the reviewer's eye, and holds his/her attention long enough to convey its message	<input type="checkbox"/> Well organized and clear; presents complex ideas/data in an understandable way; <u>includes all key components – abstract, introduction, methods, results, limitations, conclusions, references, statement of funding, potential conflicts of interest, and acknowledgments</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Disorganized and unclear; missing key component(s)
Clarity of Presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets expectations, plus presentation is concise and clear	<input type="checkbox"/> Organized; all components are present	<input type="checkbox"/> Disorganized and unclear; missing key components
Responses to Questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets expectations, plus student is able to demonstrate creative and original thinking and apply the concepts of the work to other domains	<input type="checkbox"/> Student is able to respond adequately to questions about the project	<input type="checkbox"/> Student unable to respond adequately to questions about the project

Poster Presentation Assessment Rubric—Appropriate Application of Methodology

Methodology Used	Exceeds Expectations 3	Meets Expectations 2	Below Expectations 1
Creative Arts: Visual and Performance	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The media (visual/performance) communicate the goals of the project in a superior manner superior analysis of the goals superior composition and expression superior aesthetic appeal superior discussion of conclusions superior application of appropriate skills (e.g. photography, dark room, staging) in addition, the work is very creative and not just a review of established work 	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The media (visual/performance) adequately communicate the goals of the project adequate analysis of the goals adequate composition and expression adequate aesthetic appeal adequate discussion of conclusions adequate application of appropriate skills (e.g. photography, dark room, staging) 	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The media (visual/performance) do not adequately communicate the goals of the project inadequate analysis of the goals inadequate composition and expression inadequate aesthetic appeal inadequate discussion of conclusions inadequate application of appropriate skills (e.g. photography, dark room, staging)
Creative/Reflective Writing	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The creative/reflective writing communicate the goals of the project in a superior manner superior analysis of the goals superior composition and expression superior aesthetic appeal superior discussion of conclusions. In addition, the work is very creative and not just a review of established work 	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The creative/reflective writing adequately communicate the goals of the project adequate analysis of the goals adequate composition and expression adequate aesthetic appeal adequate discussion of conclusions. 	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The creative/reflective writing does not adequately communicate the goals of the project inadequate analysis of the goals inadequate composition and expression inadequate aesthetic appeal inadequate discussion of conclusions.
Critical Analysis of texts (literature, ethics, philosophy), laws or policies	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Superior analysis of texts/laws/policies arguments clear; counterarguments articulated responses to counterarguments articulated limitations of analysis acknowledged gaps in knowledge identified superior discussion of conclusions appropriate skills applied (e.g. legal research). In addition, critical analysis is creative and not just a review of established work. 	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate analysis of texts/laws/policies arguments clear; counterarguments articulated responses to counterarguments articulated limitations of analysis acknowledged gaps in knowledge identified adequate discussion of conclusions appropriate skills applied (e.g. legal research) 	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate or inappropriate analysis of texts/laws/policies arguments undeveloped or unclear counterarguments not articulated or inadequately articulated responses to counterarguments absent or inadequately addressed limitations of analysis not articulated or inadequately articulated gaps in knowledge not clearly identified or inadequately identified inadequate discussion of conclusions appropriate skills not applied or not adequately applied (e.g. legal research)

Historical Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary sources utilized • gaps in knowledge identified • superior analysis of sources • appropriate skills applied (e.g. locating primary sources) • in addition, application of the methodology represents creative input from the student and not just a repeat of established work. 	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary sources utilized • gaps in knowledge identified • appropriate analysis of sources • appropriate skills applied (e.g. locating primary sources) 	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary sources not utilized or underutilized • gaps in knowledge not identified • inappropriate or inadequate analysis of sources • appropriate skills not applied (e.g. interviewing, transcribing)
Literary Analysis and Interpretation	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior analysis of literary materials • thesis clear • overview of criticism sufficient • limitations of analysis acknowledged • gaps in knowledge identified • superior discussion and illustration of textual interpretations. In addition, critical analysis is creative and not just a review of established work. 	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate analysis of literary materials • thesis clear • overview of criticism sufficient • limitations of analysis acknowledged • gaps in knowledge identified • adequate discussion and illustration of textual interpretations. 	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate analysis of literary materials • thesis unclear • overview of criticism insufficient • limitation of analysis not articulated or inadequately articulated • gaps in knowledge not clearly identified or inadequately identified • inadequate discussion and illustration of textual interpretations.
Meta- analysis or Critical Systematic Review of Existing Literature	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets criteria plus superior discussion of overall results/conclusions • application of the methodology represents creative input from the student and not just a repeat of established work 	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly focused question or case for review • criteria clearly identified for literature review • all relevant studies included validity of studies clearly appraised as appropriate • relevant data extracted from studies • assessment of reproducibility as appropriate • appropriate quantitative analysis where applicable • overall results/conclusions clearly discussed 	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequately focused question • inadequate inclusion criteria for articles • missing relevant studies • validity of studies inadequately appraised • inadequate extraction of relevant data – points missed or misinterpreted • bias in the assessment of studies • inadequate comparison of results from study to study • Overall results/conclusions not adequately discussed

Qualitative analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets criteria plus convincing number of documented observations (reached saturation point of focus groups, document analyses and interviews) • insightful questions that mirror interesting research objectives • superior analysis of transcriptions leading to novel observations and conclusions • application of the methodology represents creative input from the student and not just a repeat of established work 	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient documentation of observations including focus groups, document analysis and interviews • appropriate questions which match research objectives • appropriate analysis of transcripts and/or field notes • limitations acknowledged • applied inductive reasoning and generated appropriate inferences • adequate checks for reliability of analyses and conclusions • appropriate skills applied 	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient documentation of observation • inadequate questions • inadequate analysis of transcripts • no or inadequate limitations acknowledged • inadequate checks for reliability of analyses and conclusions • inadequate application of skills (e.g. interviewing, transcribing)
Quantitative Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria for Meets Expectations. In addition, application of the methodology represents creative input from the student and not just a repeat of established work 	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient number/power to answer the question • adequately designed measures • adequate statistical analysis performed • valid results/conclusions • limitations acknowledged <p>experiments adequately designed and implemented to test hypotheses</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient number/power to answer the question • inadequately designed measures • inadequate statistical analysis performed • invalid results/conclusions • no or inadequate explanation of limitations <p>experiments inadequately designed and implemented to test hypotheses</p>