Poster Rubric

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Excellent | Satisfactory | Needs Improvement |
| Title and Authors | All authors are included, correct titles and departments are given, and the title is both clear and succinct. -- pts | Missing one or two elements from: all authors are included, correct titles and departments are given, and the title is both clear and succinct.-- pts | Missing 3+ elements from: all authors are included, correct titles and departments are given, and the title is both clear and succinct.-- pts |
| Introduction | Includes a well-developed statement of purpose, explanation of how the data was selected and hypothesis-- pts | Includes a statement of purpose, explanation of how the data was selected and hypothesis but the information is not clear-- pts | Missing one or more of the following: statement of purpose, explanation of how the data was selected and hypothesis-- pts |
| Methods | Clearly demonstrate the five-point analysis and correlation used in the project-- pts | The five-point summary and correlation are explained but there are several muddy points-- pts | Detail and/or clarity is lacking in the five-point summary and correlation-- pts |
| Results | An appropriately labeled visual representation of the data is included. An appropriate number of graphs/charts/figures are included -- pts | The appropriate graphs/charts/figures are used but are missing elements or elements are incorrect-- pts | Inappropriate graphs/charts/figures are used or none at all-- pts |
| Discussion | Discussion clearly gives the reader a sense of what conclusions can be drawn and how it ties back to the hypothesis-- pts | There is lack of clarity in what conclusions can be drawn and how it ties back to the hypothesis-- pts | The discussion does not tie back to the hypothesis or explain the conclusions drawn-- pts |
| Future Research | Poster clearly describes how to test the proposed relationship. Describes potential experiment and data to be collected.-- pts | Poster describes a future research idea but is vague in places; it leaves the reader with questions.-- pts | The section is either missing completely or has large pieces of the research design missing.-- pts |
| References | References are appropriately cited-- pts | A few mistakes in the references-- pts | Many mistakes in the references-- pts |
| Overall Appearance | The poster has an eye-catching appearance and is easy to read-- pts | The overall poster is eye-catching but there are a few spots where improvements could be made (e.g., text too small, too much text, etc.)-- pts | The poster is not eye-catching and/or is difficult to read-- pts |
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