

Criterion	1 - Novice	2 - Acceptable	3 - Good	4 - Exemplary	Rating
1 – Introduction	Background is not properly stated	Background is stated but the link is very obscure	Background is stated, but some references can be remotely far from the subject	Background is stated and its link to the objective are completely clear and support the subject	
1 – Project purpose	The central purpose or goal is unclear	The central purpose becomes clear, but the reader has to work to find it	The central purpose is clear from the start of the abstract, but some sentences can wander off topic	The central purpose of the project is immediately clear and the message remains throughout the abstract	
1 – Relevance for your session	The summary has no application or immediate interest in the discipline	The abstract suggests an indirect link to the discipline	The abstract describes a direct link to the discipline but the reader has to infer what it is	The abstract describes a direct link to the discipline and clearly describes the relationships	
2 – Materials and method(s)	Critical terms and method are not defined	Critical terms are not defined and method is not described clearly enough	Method is described but terms are used without being defined	The method is very well described using well-defined critical terms	
3 – Results	Results are not clear or described	Results are present but few and without quality (analysis, small sample size not taking into account)	Results are present, clear and supported with quantitative quality	Results are present, clear and supported with creativity, good experimental design and clear explanation	
4 – Discussion	Conclusions are unclear or unsupported by previous results. The project is incomplete or incorrect	Conclusions are present but some are not answering the issue and objectives stated in the introduction	Conclusions are present, clear and supported by previous results. They answer the objectives of the study but are not discussed in the context of existing knowledge	Conclusions and discussion are clear and supported. They are perfectly linked with the objectives of the study and properly insert into existing knowledge	
5 – Organization	The different parts of the abstract are not written in a logical order	The main idea is understandable but there is a sense of disorder in the flow of the ideas	The abstract is written in a logical way, but occasional detours are made and/or all parts are not presented	The abstract is written logically, the flow of ideas proceeds with smooth transitions	

6 – Mechanics	English writing lacks practice and quality and prevents a good reading of the abstract	English writing issues occur occasionally and may disrupt the reading	English writing issues may be apparent but only disrupt the reading in a minor way	If English writing issues exist, they are not noticeable and do not distract from reading	
7 – Overall depth	The project is rudimentary, scattered, incomplete, or does not address complexity or the real world.	The project represents a good amount of work but the abstract is uneven and few connections to published work are made, and / or the analysis is incomplete	The project represents a good amount of work and it is presented in detail. A reasonable number of connections to published work are made but more connections would strengthen the presentation.	The project represents a huge investment of physical and mental work. Connections between the project and published work are rich and deep, and the project represents a true contribution to the field.	
8 - Comments					
				TOTAL POINTS:	

Freely inspired from **ICCB 2017 Student Oral Presentation Rubric** and from: http://www.oklahomacademyofscience.org/uploads/4/6/0/5/46053599/graduate_competition_evaluator_document.pdf and from the previous YNHM rating grid.

Please keep in mind for the grade of the student during your evaluation (Master degree, PhD thesis, Post-doctoral researcher)

Reviewer's name: _____

Abstract reviewed _____