### “Virtual” Fall Undergraduate Research Symposium 2020

**West Virginia University**

**Judging Rubric for Poster Presentation of Social Science and Behavioral Science Research**

*adapted from the rubric developed by the American Society for Microbiology and the Committee for the Annual Biomedical Research Conference for Minority Students (ABRCMS) and modified for non-STEM/Social Science Research by Paul Hernandez.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>5 (Excellent)</th>
<th>4 (Very Good)</th>
<th>3 (Good)</th>
<th>2 (Fair)</th>
<th>1 (Poor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis/ Goals and Background</strong></td>
<td><strong>Background information</strong> was relevant and summarized well. Connections to previous literature and broader issues were clear. Project had a <em>goal or a logical hypothesis</em> that was stated clearly and concisely; showed clear relevance. <em>Broader impacts</em> beyond project clearly stated.</td>
<td><strong>Background information</strong> was relevant, but connections were not clear. A project goal or a logical hypothesis was presented and was reasonably clear and concise. <em>Broader impacts</em> beyond project were present.</td>
<td><strong>Background information</strong> was relevant, but connections were not made. <em>Questionable project goal or hypothesis</em> was presented. <em>Broader impacts</em> beyond project were unclear.</td>
<td><strong>Little background information</strong> was included or connected. <em>Questionable hypothesis</em> was presented and was not well supported or the goal of the project was unclear. <em>Broader impacts</em> beyond project were absent.</td>
<td><strong>Background information</strong> was absent. <em>Hypothesis or goal</em> was inappropriate or not stated. <em>Broader impacts</em> beyond project were absent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Design Logic</strong></td>
<td>Excellent choice of research design methodology (e.g., experiment, interview) to address project goal or hypothesis. Excellent original thinking or innovation of technique. Clear discussion of counterfactuals (e.g., controls groups); all appropriate counterfactuals were included.</td>
<td>Very good choice of research design methodology to address hypothesis or project goals. Very good original thinking. Clear discussion of counterfactuals (e.g., control groups); most controls or comparative groups were included.</td>
<td>Good choice of research design methodology to address hypothesis or project goals. Good original thinking. Adequate discussion of counterfactuals (e.g., control groups); some significant counterfactuals were lacking.</td>
<td>Research design methodology not appropriate to address hypothesis or project goals. No original thinking. Counterfactuals (e.g., control groups) not adequately described; some counterfactuals missing.</td>
<td>Research design methods section missing. No original thinking. Serious lack of counterfactuals (e.g., control groups) or discussion of counterfactuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Substantial amounts of high quality data were presented sufficient to address hypothesis or project goals. <em>Presentation of data</em> was clear, thorough, and logical.</td>
<td>Substantial amounts of good data were presented sufficient to address hypothesis or project goals. <em>Presentation of data</em> was clear and logical.</td>
<td>Adequate amounts of reasonably good data were presented to address hypothesis or project goals. <em>Presentation of data</em> was not entirely clear.</td>
<td>Some data were lacking, or not fully sufficient to address hypothesis or project goals. <em>Presentation of data</em> was included, but unclear or difficult to comprehend.</td>
<td>Results are not yet available or reproducible. <em>Presentation of data</em> was missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions and Future Work</strong></td>
<td>Reasonable conclusions were given and were strongly supported with evidence. <em>Conclusions were connected</em> to project goals or hypothesis and their relevance in a wider context was discussed.</td>
<td>Reasonable conclusions were given and were supported with evidence. <em>Conclusions were connected</em> to project goals or hypothesis but their relevance was not discussed.</td>
<td>Reasonable conclusions were given. <em>Conclusions were not compared</em> to project goals or hypothesis and their relevance was not discussed.</td>
<td>Conclusions were given.</td>
<td>Conclusions were missing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The rubric is designed to evaluate the quality and presentation of research projects. Each category (Hypothesis/Goals and Background, Research Design Logic, Results, Conclusions and Future Work) is scored on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest score for Excellent performance and 1 being the lowest score for Poor performance. The rubric is intended to provide clear and specific criteria for evaluating the different aspects of a research project.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>5 (Excellent)</th>
<th>4 (Very Good)</th>
<th>3 (Good)</th>
<th>2 (Fair)</th>
<th>1 (Poor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Poster Board** | • All expected components are present, clearly laid out, and easy to follow in absence of presenter.  
  • Text is concise, free of spelling or typographical errors; background is unobtrusive.  
  • Figures and tables are appropriate and labeled correctly.  
  • Photographs/tables/graphs *improve understanding* and *enhance visual appeal*. | • All components are present, but layout is crowded or confusing to follow in absence of presenter.  
  • Text is relatively clear, mostly free of spelling and typographical errors; background is unobtrusive.  
  • Most figures and tables are appropriate and labeled correctly.  
  • Photographs/tables/graphs improve understanding. | • Most expected components are present, but layout is confusing to follow in absence of presenter.  
  • Text is relatively clear, but some spelling and typographical errors; background may be distracting.  
  • Figures and tables not always related to text, or are not appropriate, and/or are poorly labeled.  
  • Photographs/tables/graphs limited and do not improve understanding. | • Some expected components are present, but layout is untidy and confusing to follow in absence of presenter.  
  • Text is hard to read due to font size or color, some spelling and typographical errors; background may be distracting.  
  • Figures and tables not related to text, or are not appropriate, and/or are poorly labeled.  
  • Photographs/tables/graphs limited and do not improve understanding. | • Some expected components are present, but poorly laid out and confusing to follow in absence of presenter.  
  • Text is hard to read, messy and contains multiple spelling and typographical errors; very poor background.  
  • Figures and tables are poorly done.  
  • Visual aids not used. |
| **Knowledge of Project: Ability to Answer Questions** | • Presenter *clearly states what is to be discussed*.  
  • Entire talk is *organized around defined goals* and has *smooth transition* between sections.  
  • Concluding portion of talk *re-emphasizes the goals* and *what was learned*.  
  • Presenter answers difficult questions clearly and succinctly. | • Presenter clearly states what is to be discussed.  
  • Entire talk is organized around defined goals and has smooth transition between sections.  
  • Concluding portion of talk re-emphasizes the goals and what was learned.  
  • Presenter answers most questions. | • Overall goals are not clear to the listener.  
  • Some sections of the talk are not clearly related and/or somewhat choppy transitions.  
  • Concluding portion of talk re-emphasizes the goals and what was learned.  
  • Presenter has some difficulty answering challenging questions. | • Overall goals are not apparent to the listener.  
  • Presentation moves off topic in a way that is not relevant or valuable.  
  • It was not possible to explain what was learned.  
  • Presenter has difficulty answering challenging questions. | • Overall goals are not apparent to the listener.  
  • Presentation moves off topic in a way that is not relevant or valuable.  
  • It was not possible to explain what was learned.  
  • Presenter does not understand questions. |