

The Effects of Different Fertilizers on *Brassica rapa*

Reid, Frazier, Lau, Allen

Presented in an introductory course for non-majors at Bucknell University

Layout and Appearance		
Criteria	Positive	Negative
<p>APPEARANCE: Is the poster neatly constructed? Do the text and the figures stand out against the background? Are colors and fonts used consistently? Is the text large and legible from 3–6 feet away?</p> <p>SECTIONS: Does each section begin with a descriptive heading? Is there sufficient space between sections? Do the sections naturally flow from top left to bottom right?</p> <p>BALANCE: Is there a nice balance between text and figures? Is there too much text?</p> <p>PROOFREADING: Is the text free of typos and grammatical errors?</p>	<p>Poster is neatly constructed.</p> <p>Nice use of colored paper for contrast.</p> <p>Font size is large and legible.</p> <p>Each section has a descriptive heading.</p> <p>Good use of space.</p> <p>Layout flows from top left to bottom right.</p> <p>Good balance between text and figures.</p>	<p>Reduce amount of text by using bullets for the main points.</p> <p>Handwritten authors' names and figure date look sloppy with everything else typed.</p> <p>Writing style is wordy and there are some grammatical errors ("The number of leaves...were was...").</p>
Content		
Criteria	Positive	Negative
<p>TITLE: Does the title grab your attention?</p> <p>AUTHORS: Are the authors' names, affiliations, and contact information provided?</p> <p>INTRODUCTION: Were the objectives clearly stated? Do you understand why this study was done? Did you get enough background information to understand the system? Were any abbreviations defined for the general visitor? Were the hypotheses rational?</p> <p>METHODS: Were the methods described clearly and concisely?</p> <p>RESULTS: Were the graphs easy to understand? Were any graphics distracting?</p> <p>CONCLUSIONS: Do the conclusions match the data? Are reasonable ideas put forth to explain the observed patterns? Is there a clear connection between the conclusions and the original objectives?</p>	<p>Hypotheses are clearly stated in the introduction.</p> <p>Methods are clearly described.</p> <p>There is a clear connection between the objectives and the conclusions.</p> <p>Possible explanations are given for the results.</p> <p>Potential sources of error are pointed out.</p>	<p>Title is descriptive, but does not hint at the results.</p> <p>For Latin names of organisms, capitalize the genus (<i>Brassica</i>), make the species name lower case (<i>rapa</i>), and italicize both.</p> <p>When stating a hypothesis, use "we hypothesize" or "we expect" instead of "we believe."</p> <p>In the methods, do not describe routine procedures such as "The first step...was to plant the seeds" or "Over the course of the experiment, all of the data was recorded on a chart."</p> <p>Include a ruler as a scale bar in the photos. Add a caption to emphasize the important results.</p> <p>Graph format: Always graph the data points. Delete the gray background. Choose dark colors for lines and symbols (the yellow line on the gray background is barely visible). The <i>x</i>-axis scale should be spaced proportionally. To</p>

		<p>do so, use “scatter” not “line” as the chart type in Excel.</p> <p>In the results section, the exact date is not needed since the experiment was done in the lab.</p> <p>The Conclusion section should be called “Results and Conclusions.” The results are described in only general terms (“least amount of growth,” “biggest growth,” “growth and development.” You spent a lot of time measuring plant height, leaf length, number of leaves, and internode length—describe how the different fertilizers affected these specific aspects of growth.</p> <p>The usual heading is “References” or “Works Cited,” not “Resources Used.”</p>
--	--	--