IAS Judging Rubric – Poster Evaluation

SCORE	HYPOTHESIS AND/OR OBJECTIVE OF THE PROJECT	METHODS AND CONTROLS/COMPARISON	RESULTS	RESULTS, CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK
5	• A logical hypothesis or project objective was presented. • Background information was relevant and summarized well. Connections to previous literature and broader issues were clear. • Goal of project was stated clearly and concisely; showed clear relevance beyond project.	• Thorough explanation of why particular methods were chosen. • Clear discussion of controls or comparative groups; all appropriate controls or comparative groups were included.	• Presentation of data was clear, thorough, and logical. All necessary statistical analysis was present.	• Reasonable conclusions were given and strongly supported with evidence. • Conclusions were compared to hypothesis/objective and their relevance in a wider context was discussed. • Project has significant impact on the field.
4	• A logical hypothesis or project objective was presented. • Background information was relevant, but connections were not clear. • Goal of project was stated clearly; showed relevance beyond project.	• Good explanation of choice of methods • Clear discussion of controls or comparative groups; most controls or comparative groups were included.	• Presentation of data was clear and logical. Some statistics were missing.	• Reasonable conclusions were given and supported with evidence. • Conclusions were compared to hypothesis/project objective, but their relevance was not discussed.
3	• A questionable hypothesis or project objective of problem was presented. • Background information was relevant, but connections were not made. • Goal of project was stated understandably.	• Little comment on why the methods were chosen and others not chosen. • Adequate discussion of controls or comparative groups; some significant controls or comparative groups were lacking.	• Presentation of data was not entirely clear. Statistical analysis was missing.	• Reasonable conclusions were given. • Conclusions were not compared to the hypothesis/ objective and their relevance was not discussed.
2	• A questionable hypothesis or project objective was presented. • Some relevant background information was included, but not connected. • Goal of project was not clear.	• No discussion of choice of methods. • Controls or comparative groups not adequately described; some appropriate controls or groups were missing.	• Presentation of data was included, but unclear or difficult to comprehend. Statistics were missing.	• Conclusions were given. • Little connection with the hypothesis/project objective was apparent.
1	• The hypothesis or project objective was inappropriate or was missing. • Little or no background information was included or connected. • Goal of project was not stated.	• Methods section missing. • Serious lack of controls of discussion of controls.	• Presentation of data was missing.	• Conclusions were missing. • There was no connection with the hypothesis/ project objective.

Modified from the Annual Biomedical Research Conference for Minority Students (ABRCMS) and American Society of Microbiology (ASM) Judging Handbook. Some judging instruction language and judging questions were modified from the American Astronomical Society's Chambliss Astronomy Achievement Student Awards Competition packet.

SCORE	OVERALL PRESENTATION & HANDLING QUESTIONS	POSTER BOARD
5	Presenter: • Demonstrates a very strong knowledge of the research project. • Speaks clearly, naturally and with enthusiasm. • Comfortably uses visual aids to enhance presentation. • Answers difficult questions clearly and succinctly. • Presentation is consistently clear and logical.	• All expected components are present, clearly laid out, and easy to follow in the absence of presenter. • The text is concise and consistently free of spelling or typographical errors; the background is unobtrusive. • The figures and tables are appropriate and consistently labeled correctly. • Photographs/tables/graphs improve understanding and enhance the visual appeal.
4	Presenter: • Demonstrates a good knowledge of the research project. • Speaks clearly and naturally. • Uses visual aids to enhance the presentation. • Answers most questions. • Presentation is clear for the most part, but not consistently.	• All expected components are present, but layout is crowded or jumbled and somewhat confusing to follow in the absence of presenter. • The text is relatively clear and mostly free of spelling or typographical errors; the background is unobtrusive. • Most of the figures and tables are appropriate and labeled correctly. • Photographs/tables/graphs improve understanding.
3	Presenter: • Demonstrates some knowledge of the research project. • Reads from the poster (or script) some of the time. • Uses some visual aids to enhance the presentation. • Has some difficulty answering challenging questions. • Presentation is generally unclear and inconsistent.	• Most of the expected components are present, but layout is confusing to follow in the absence of presenter • The text is relatively legible, but there are some typographical errors; the background may be distracting • The figures and tables are not always related to the text, or appropriate, or are labeled incorrectly. • Photographs/table/graphs do not improve understanding.
2	Presenter: • Demonstrates a poor knowledge of the research project. • Reads from the poster (or script) most of the time. • Does not use the available visual aid to enhance presentation effectively. • Has difficulty answering questions. • Presentation is unclear.	• Some of the expected components are present, but layout is untidy and confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter. • The text is hard to read due to font size or color and inconsistently free of typographical errors; the background may be distracting. • The figures and tables are not related to the text, or are not appropriate, or are poorly labeled. • Photographs/tables/graphs do not improve understanding of the project.
1	Presenter: • Does not demonstrate any knowledge of the project. • Reads from the poster (or script) all the time. • Does not use the available visual aid to enhance Presentation; Presentation is very confusing. • Does not understand questions.	• Some of the expected components are present, but poorly laid out and confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter. • The text is hard to read and contains multiple typographical errors; There is a poor background. • The figures and tables are poorly done or are missing.

Modified from the Annual Biomedical Research Conference for Minority Students (ABRCMS) and American Society of Microbiology (ASM) Judging Handbook. Some judging instruction language and judging questions were modified from the American Astronomical Society's Chambliss Astronomy Achievement Student Awards Competition packet.