## Fall Undergraduate Research Symposium 2021
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>
</table>
| **Hypothesis/Goals and Background** | • **Background information** was relevant and summarized well. Connections to previous literature and broader issues were clear.  
• Project had a **goal or a logical hypothesis** that was stated clearly and concisely; showed clear relevance.  
• **Broader impacts** beyond project clearly stated. | • Background information was relevant, but connections were not clear.  
• A project goal or a logical hypothesis was presented and was reasonably clear and concise.  
• Broader impacts beyond project were present. | • Background information was relevant, but connections were not made.  
• Questionable project goal or hypothesis was presented.  
• Broader impacts beyond project were unclear. | • Little background information was included or connected.  
• Questionable hypothesis was presented and was not well supported or the goal of the project was unclear.  
• Broader impacts beyond project were absent. | • Background information was absent.  
• Hypothesis or goal was inappropriate or not stated.  
• Broader impacts beyond project were absent. |
| **Research Design Logic** | • **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. | • 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. | • 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. | • 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. | • Research design methods section missing.  
• No original thinking.  
• Serious lack of counterfactuals (e.g., control groups) or discussion of counterfactuals. |
| **Results** | • Substantial amounts of high quality **data** were presented sufficient to address hypothesis or project goals.  
• **Presentation of data** was clear, thorough, and logical. | • Substantial amounts of good data were presented sufficient to address hypothesis or project goals.  
• Presentation of data was clear and logical. | • Adequate amounts of reasonably good data were presented to address hypothesis or project goals.  
• Presentation of data was not entirely clear. | • Some data were lacking, or not fully sufficient to address hypothesis or project goals.  
• Presentation of data was included, but unclear or difficult to comprehend. | • Results are not yet available or reproducible.  
• Presentation of data was missing. |
| **Conclusions and Future Work** | • **Reasonable conclusions** were given and were strongly supported with evidence.  
• **Conclusions were connected** to project goals or hypothesis and their relevance in a wider context was discussed. | • Reasonable conclusions were given and were supported with evidence.  
• Conclusions were connected to project goals or hypothesis but their relevance was not discussed. | • Reasonable conclusions were given.  
• Conclusions were not compared to project goals or hypothesis and their relevance was not discussed. | • Conclusions were given.  
• Little connection of conclusions to project goals or hypothesis was apparent. | • Conclusions were missing.  
• Conclusions were not connected to the project goals or hypothesis. |
<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. |