



Case Poster (a=3 pts, b=2, c=1)

1. Abstract & Introduction
 - A. Topic relevant to medicine (brief abstract less than 250 words)
 - a. Focused clear and concise (under 251 words)
 - b. Focused but not concise (under 251 words)
 - c. Focus unclear (Over 250 words)
 - B. Poster- Introduction
 - a. Complete introduction and history
 - b. Partial introduction and history
 - c. Significant omissions in history and a poor introduction
2. Case Presentation
 - A. H&P, histories medical, social, surgical, medications, allergies test results, case summary
 - a. All component present complies with the format
 - b. Complies with the format but omissions of one section
 - c. Used nonstandard format or multiple omissions
 - B. Tables and Figures
 - a. Appropriate text and graphic size easy to see details
 - b. Text too small or large, graphic blurry but discernible, challenging to see pertinent information
 - c. Exceedingly crowded text, unable to discern pertinent information from graphics
 - C. Appropriate Reference List
 - a. Comprehensive reference list provided
 - b. Excessive or somewhat sparse list of references provided
 - c. Clearly inadequate list of references provided
 - D. Spelling and Grammar
 - a. Correct spelling, use of technical terms, and grammar
 - b. Rare error in spelling, use of technical terms, or grammar
 - c. Frequent errors in spelling, use of technical terms, or grammar
3. Overall impression
 - A. Overall impression of the poster
 - a. Exceptional quality
 - b. High quality
 - c. Poor quality
 - B. Overall perception of Presentation
 - a. Exceptional quality
 - b. High quality
 - c. Poor quality

Research/Educational/Quality Improvement Poster Judging (a=4 pts, b=3, c=2, d=1)

1. Research Question/Hypothesis
 - a. Exceptional- all PICO criteria- clearly passes the so-what test
 - b. Well-developed meets PICO
 - c. At least 2 components of PICO criteria clearly met (patient intervention comparison outcomes)
 - d. Vague poorly defined
2. Originality
 - a. Unique approach
 - b. Innovative study
 - c. Some innovation, few other similar studies
 - d. Many similar studies
3. Study Design
 - a. Excellent design, answers questions, and addresses confounding variables
 - b. Good design, addresses questions
 - c. Partially addresses the question
 - d. Unable to answer question
4. Statistical Analysis
 - a. Full statistical analysis
 - b. Descriptive only
 - c. Inappropriate or inaccurate
 - d. None
5. Data Presentation
 - a. Detailed analysis
 - b. Comparative data
 - c. Data summary
 - d. Raw data
6. Tables/Graphs
 - a. Visually interesting/ innovative
 - b. Basic
 - c. Confusing or inaccurate
 - d. None
7. Conclusion Support
 - a. Supported by data
 - b. Some support by data
 - c. Incomplete support by data
 - d. Unsupported by data
8. Discussion of Limitations
 - a. Clearly defined
 - b. Partially defined
 - c. Not clearly defined
 - d. Not discussed
9. Impact
 - a. Practice changing
 - b. Stimulates further work
 - c. Supports current practice
 - d. Does not align with the research