

Poster Presentation Rubric

	Deficient (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Baseline (3)	Outstanding (4)	Professional (5)
I. Abstract	Not focused, poorly written, did not state the problem(s), or outcome(s). Spelling and grammatical errors.	Vague in presenting the problem, some logic to the solution, but possibly confusing or flawed. Spelling and grammatical errors.	Logical title; Provided logical progression of ideas; Most cue to information are clear and direct; Indicated the problem.	Attractive correlative title Well written with logical progression; Stated the problem; Acknowledged funding source.	Strongly descriptive title Clearly, concisely written. Logically strong and stated the problem; Provided indication/ statement/results to the problem; Acknowledged funding source.
II. Presentation - Content					
1. Importance of problem	Importance of problem is missing.	Importance of problem is stated but lacks clarity.	Importance of problem stated but does not fit well with introduction.	Importance of problem is clearly stated and fits well with introduction.	Importance of problem is clearly stated within introduction. Provides a concise understanding for the need of this research.
2. Objectives & Hypothesis	Objectives / Hypothesis is missing.	Objectives / Hypothesis stated but lacks clarity.	Objectives / Hypothesis stated but does not fit well with introduction.	Objectives / Hypothesis clearly stated and fits well with introduction.	Objectives / Hypothesis are clear and seamlessly integrated within introduction. Provides a concise understanding of research problem.
3. Research Method	Not explained or eluded to	Poorly explained	Basic explanation provided	Detail explanation provided	Detailed explanation provided with strong reasoning/correlation to past experimentation.
4. Experimental Design & Rigor of Analytical Methods	Experimental design & Rigor of Analytical Methods is incoherent or missing.	Experimental design & Rigor of Analytical Methods is present but lacks clarity.	Experimental design & Rigor of Analytical Methods is clear, but relevance to topic not apparent.	Experimental Design & Rigor of Analytical Methods is relevance to the topic & is compelling.	Reader has firm understanding of how and why steps are taken, and that the Methods are rigorous & relevant to the topic.
5. Data Quality	Poor quality graphs/ illustrations and confusing and none flowing	Limited quality of graphs / illustration, but missing explanation and/or analysis.	Quality of graphs / illustration sound quality, with a basic analysis, descriptive title/ legend.	Superior quality of graphs / illustration. Strong analysis, highly descriptive title/ legend.	Publication standard quality for graphs / illustrations. Stand alone; Referred to in text. Draws reader to specific details within graphs / illustrations.
6. Summary of Results, Interpretation & Findings	None drawn or provided	Summarized work, which, may require question(s) for clarification	Provided discussion/ conclusions that summarized main points	Provided clear persuasive conclusions that stimulated non-clarifying questioning	Provided strongly persuasive and stated conclusions that stimulated questioning that conveys main concepts accurately
III. Visual Aids	Cluttered & confusing, poorly organized. Spacing and headings do not enhance readability.	Shows some structure but is cluttered, busy, or distracting. Poor balance; inappropriate text/font sizes.	Appropriate use of white space. Level of balance, Appropriate font/ text sizes used.	Aesthetically pleasing. Contributes to message with appropriate use of headings and white space.	Appears professionally designed. Highly organized; superior aesthetics & well balanced. Legible font /text size. Left with the WOW factor (attention getting).
IV. Interview/ Question & Answer Period	Answers ramble, are off-target; Not engaged or professional (including attire)	Answers are inconsistent in quality, substance or delivery.	Answers are uniformly good, both in substance and delivery. Shows a sound level of engagement with judges.	Answers are uniformly good, and show knowledge beyond presentation; engages the judges questioning.	Shows knowledge at professional level for the topic. Answers questions with authority. Thanks Judges for their questions; Professional attire.