# 3rd Annual Undergraduate Spring Symposium (2019)

West Virginia University

Judging Rubric for Poster Presentation of Science and Engineering 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).*

<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 goal or a logical hypothesis that was stated clearly and concisely; showed clear relevance. • <strong>Broader impacts</strong> beyond project clearly stated.</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td>• Background information was relevant, but connections were not made. • Questionable project goal or hypothesis was presented. • Broader impacts beyond project were unclear.</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td>• Background information was absent. • Hypothesis or goal was inappropriate or not stated. • Broader impacts beyond project were absent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental Logic</strong></td>
<td>• Excellent choice of experimental methods to address hypothesis or project goals. • Excellent original thinking or innovation of technique. • Clear discussion of controls or comparative groups; all appropriate controls or comparative groups were included.</td>
<td>• Very good choice of experimental methods to address hypothesis or project goals. • Very good original thinking. • Clear discussion of controls or comparative groups; most controls or comparative groups were included.</td>
<td>• Good choice of experimental methods to address hypothesis or project goals. • Good original thinking. • Adequate discussion of controls or comparative groups; some significant controls or comparative groups were lacking.</td>
<td>• Experimental methods not appropriate to address hypothesis or project goals. • No original thinking. • Controls or comparative groups not adequately described; some controls or comparative groups missing.</td>
<td>• Experimental methods section missing. • No original thinking. • Serious lack of controls or discussion of controls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>• Substantial amounts of high quality data were presented sufficient to address hypothesis or project goals. • Presentation of data was clear, thorough, and logical.</td>
<td>• Substantial amounts of good data were presented sufficient to address hypothesis or project goals. • Presentation of data was clear and logical.</td>
<td>• Adequate amounts of reasonably good data were presented to address hypothesis or project goals. • Presentation of data was not entirely clear.</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td>• Results are not yet available or reproducible. • Presentation of data was missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions and Future Work</strong></td>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td>• Reasonable conclusions were given and were supported with evidence. • Conclusions were connected to project goals or hypothesis but their relevance was not discussed.</td>
<td>• Reasonable conclusions were given. • Conclusions were not compared to project goals or hypothesis and their relevance was not discussed.</td>
<td>• Conclusions were given. • Little connection of conclusions to project goals or hypothesis was apparent.</td>
<td>• Conclusions were missing. • Conclusions were not connected to the project goals or hypothesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>5 (Excellent)</td>
<td>4 (Very Good)</td>
<td>3 (Good)</td>
<td>2 (Fair)</td>
<td>1 (Poor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</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. |