

Marking Criteria for Posters

	Fail	III	II,ii	II,i	I
	0-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+
Poster design	Generally difficult to read. Poor quality figures/images, and/or not relevant. Poor visual impact. Difficult to follow, message not clear.	Some sections difficult to read. Figures/images not always relevant. Basic visual impact. Difficult to follow in certain sections, layout detracts from message.	Text generally easy to read. Majority of figures/images relevant. Satisfactory visual impact. Mostly easy to follow, layout occasionally detracts from message.	Easy to read. Good quality and relevant figures/images. Good visual impact. Easy to follow, logical, clear layout focussed on message.	Text, images/figures and overall visual impact excellent. Very easy to follow, logical, creative layout which enhances message.
Poster content	Inappropriate, generally superficial. Limited relevance, data presented poorly.	Basic content, not always relevant. Some sections lack in focus and clarity.	Adequate relevant content and data presentation. Lack in depth of coverage.	Appropriate depth of coverage and clear data presentation. Data clear and complete with all labelling.	Depth of coverage throughout. Intelligent and complete data presentation targeted to message
Quality of delivery	Too short, and/or generally hard to follow, lacking focus. Reading from poster/notes.	At times difficult to follow. Overreliance on reading from poster/notes.	Generally clear, easy to follow. May be variable with reading from poster/notes.	Good, focussed synopsis, easy to follow and encouraging discussion. Good clarity of expression. Occasional reading from poster/notes.	Very focussed synopsis, fluent delivery pitched correctly for discussion. No reading from poster/notes.
Evidence of understanding	Limited evidence of understanding. Many gaps in knowledge.	Satisfactory evidence of understanding but with some gaps in knowledge.	Adequate evidence of understanding, although may be variable.	Clear evidence of understanding. Discusses data and context competently.	Deep understanding across all aspects, with critical analysis evident.
Handling Questions	Most answers irrelevant and/or incorrect. Needs prompting.	Some answers irrelevant and/or incorrect. Needs prompting at times.	Answers generally appropriate, but with errors. May lack details, needs occasional prompt.	Answers appropriate, relevant and correct. May contain minor errors.	Extremely comprehensive appropriate, relevant & correct answers.
Use of the target language	Systematic grammatical inaccuracy. Inability to use structures and vocabulary to convey what is meant.	Rudimentary level grammatical accuracy (with numerous major flaws and faults); limited ability to use structures and vocabulary to convey what is meant.	Acceptable level of grammatical accuracy (though with a few major flaws and faults); ability to use structures and vocabulary to convey what is meant.	Consistent grammatical accuracy (no major flaws or faults); good range of structures and vocabulary.	Consistent precision and grammatical accuracy; wide range of structures and vocabulary; reads and sounds authentic.