Judging Rubric for Student Poster Presentations

		Emerging (1 pt)	Good (2 pts)	Very Good (3 pts)	Excellent (4 pts)	Truly Exceptional (5 pts)
Poster	Presentation & Clarity	Layout needs work and there are text errors. Tables and images are poorly executed or confusing.	Layout is good with occasional text errors. Tables and images are present but do not always help with understanding the project.	Layout is very good and mostly free of text errors. Tables and images look very good and help with understanding of the project.	Layout is creative, free of text errors. Tables and images enhance understanding of the project.	Layout is highly creative, visually compelling, and free of text errors. Tables and images enhance understanding of the project.
	Organization & Cohesion	Presentation may be disorganized or presented in short sections rather than as an integrated story.	Presentation is not completely organized and not presented as a cohesive story	Presentation is a bit uneven, but overall a mostly cohesive story.	Presentation is well organized, and material is presented as a mostly cohesive story.	Presentation is well organized, and material is presented as a cohesive story.
Background and Objective	Disciplinary Question	Disciplinary question that inspired the project as well as the value of the project is absent.	Disciplinary question that inspired the project as well as the value of the project is not clearly stated.	Disciplinary question that inspired the project is provided but its value is not completely clear.	Disciplinary question that inspired the project as well as the value of the project is provided.	Disciplinary question that inspired the project is clearly stated along with an understanding of the value of the project.
	Significance & Background	Significance of project in context with other works is not clearly stated.	Significance of project in context with other works is presented, but connections are not always clear. Background sections rely on only one source.	Significance of project in context with other works is present. Background comes from limited sources and may lack integration.	Significance of project in context with other works is present, with some acknowledgement of limitations. Background may lack integration.	Significance of project in context with other works is clearly identified, while fully acknowledging limitations. Background synthesizes numerous sources.
	Goal of Project	Goal of project is missing or not relevant.	Goal of project is vague; hypothesis lacks depth or clear reasoning.	Goal of project generally stated, but lacks clarity or is generalized and predictable.	Goal of project stated and, generally focused; demonstrates significant insight in study area.	Goal of project clearly stated and focused; demonstrates outstanding insight in study area.
Method	Pros & Cons	Demonstrates only partial or vague awareness of other methodologies.	Is aware of different methodologies but has difficulty putting them in context.	Not always clear on advantages and limitations of methodology.	Examines the advantages and limitations of methodology.	Examines with clear precision the advantages and limitations of methodology.
	Why this method?	Explanation of _why_ the specific approach/process was chosen was vague or lacking and did not link to the goals/thesis.	Explanation of _why_ the specific approach/process was chosen is provided but lacked straightforward rationale to link to the goals/thesis.	Explanation of _why_ the specific approach/process was chosen is provided but link to the goals/thesis was not explained clearly.	Explanation of _why_ the specific approach/process was chosen provided some rationale linked to the goals/thesis.	Exceptional explanation of _why_ the specific approach/process was chosen with clearly stated rationale linked to the goals/thesis.

		Emerging (1 pt)	Good (2 pts)	Very Good (3 pts)	Excellent (4 pts)	Truly Exceptional (5 pts)
Method	Clarity of Process	Only partially describes the process with relevant details left out.	Describes the process with some confusion or difficulty.	Describes the process, but occasionally with too much or too little detail.	Describes the process clearly (without problems in clarity.)	Describes the process with great clarity.
Results to Date	Presentation of Results	Presents results but data is limited or not connected to hypothesis/thesis.	Presents results but data is difficult to comprehend or connect to goals/thesis.	Presents results and connects these to the goals/thesis but there are minor lapses in clarity.	Effectively presents product or results and clearly connects these to the goals/thesis.	Effectively presents product or results and connects these to the goals/thesis with exceptional clarity.
	Analysis of Implications	May partially understand the significance and limitations of results	Analyzes implications of results but does not present significance.	Analyzes implications of results and presentation of the significance is limited.	Analyzes implications of results and attempts to present significance.	Analyzes implications of results and clearly illustrates significance.
	Next Steps	Next steps, lessons learned, or future work were vague or limited.	Discusses next steps which follow the results and generally support/reject hypothesis but with errors or lack of clarity.	Discusses next steps which follow the results and generally support/reject hypothesis.	Discusses next steps which follow the results and support/reject hypothesis.	Discusses next steps which clearly follow the results and support/reject hypothesis with exceptional clarity.
Oral Communication	Engagement with Audience	Engagement with audience was limited.	Good engagement, but persistently spoke too fast, too slow, or with reliance on slides or notes.	Effective in engaging audience with confidence and accessible language.	Engages audience actively and effectively with confidence and accessible, discipline-specific language.	Engages audience with highest enthusiasm and confidence, ignites great interest in the presentation.
	Communi-cation	Communicating about the research project was limited.	Communicates about the project but not always clearly and uses visual aids adequately.	Communicates well and uses visual aids adequately.	Communicates skillfully and uses visual aids effectively.	Communicates with exceptional skills and uses visual aids highly effectively.
	Questions & Answers	Unable to answer some basic questions.	Answers basic questions but has some trouble with difficult questions.	Answers to inquiries are adequate, although not always clear and concise.	Answers inquiries with some clarity and concision, demonstrating good knowledge about the field.	Answers inquiries with great clarity and concision, demonstrating exceptional knowledge about the field.