

Student Name:

	Excellent	Good	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
<u>Oral</u> – Ability to Explain Study	Student clearly understood the study and was able to explain clearly.	Student clearly understood the study and was able to explain clearly, with the exception of a few minor difficulties.	Student mostly understood the study but had some significant difficulties in explanation or understanding.	Student did not understand the study and was unable to explain clearly.
<u>Oral</u> – Complex Understanding of Anatomical Structure	Student demonstrated in-depth knowledge the complex anatomy of the structure being studied.	Student demonstrated clear knowledge the complex anatomy of the structure being studied.	Student demonstrated some knowledge the complex anatomy of the structure being studied, possibly making a few errors..	Student did not demonstrate knowledge of the complex anatomy of the structure being studied.
<u>Poster</u> – Introduction and Hypothesis	Background well researched with all academic sources that lead to a clear and refined hypothesis.	Background researched with some academic sources that lead to a clear and refined hypothesis.	Background researched with some academic sources that mostly lead to a hypothesis in need of some refinement.	Background lacked academic sources and did not clearly lead to a hypothesis
<u>Poster</u> – Materials & Methods and Results	Methods concisely and accurately explained. Results depicted data in a form that allows easy assessment of the anatomy and evaluation of the hypothesis. Species in tables clearly grouped by relationship or some other clearly relevant criterion.	Methods accurately explained. Results depicted data in a form that allows clear evaluation of the hypothesis. Species in tables grouped by some relevant criterion.	Methods accurately explained. Results depicted data in a form that does not help the reader evaluate the hypothesis. Species in tables alphabetized or grouped by some other irrelevant criterion.	Methods inaccurate. Results depicted data in a form that makes it difficult to evaluate the hypothesis. Species in tables arranged randomly.
<u>Poster</u> – Discussion, Hypothesis	Clearly and correctly explained why the hypothesis was supported or rejected.	Correctly explained why the hypothesis was supported or rejected.	Incorrectly explained why the hypothesis was supported or rejected.	Did not address the hypothesis directly.
<u>Poster</u> – Discussion, Discussion of Anatomical Variation	Clearly discussed observed anatomical variation, demonstrating understanding of typical anatomy and out-of-the-ordinary anatomy.	Discussed some anatomical variation, demonstrating understanding of typical anatomy and some out-of-the-ordinary anatomy.	Unclearly discussed some anatomical variation, demonstrating some understanding of typical anatomy but does not mention out-of-the-ordinary anatomy.	Did not discuss anatomical variation explicitly, did not demonstrate understanding of the typical anatomy.
<u>Poster</u> – Discussion, Error & Difficulties	Clearly identifies difficulties and future directions.	Identified some difficulties and future directions.	Identified only one difficulty and/or future direction.	Did not identify difficulties and future directions.
<u>Poster</u> – Clarity of Organization	Visually clear with materials ordered and displayed in a way that facilitated viewing.	Visually clear with materials mostly ordered and displayed in a way that facilitated viewing.	Mostly clear with a few problems with displaying in a way that facilitated viewing.	Unclear with a many problems displaying material in a way that facilitated viewing.
<u>Poster</u> –Appearance	Neat and visually appealing with limited color borders used.	Mostly neat and visually appealing with limited color borders used.	Some parts sloppy and less visually appealing with some variation in color borders used.	Sloppy and not visually appealing with many different color borders.

Additional Notes: