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2023 Undergraduate Research Symposium Poster Evaluation Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Points Earned** | **0-3** | **4-6** | **7-9** | **10** | **Score** |
| **Poster Heading** | Several components missing. Title is not provided or does not adequately describe the research. Student(s) names and/or advisor not provided.  Institution missing. | All components are present. Title only vaguely describes the research project and is somewhat illogical to the topic presented. | All components are present. Title adequately describes the topic.  Language is somewhat consistent with discipline and methodology. | All components are present. Title is logical and clearly describes the research project. Language is consistent with discipline and methodology. |  |
| **Abstract** | No abstract is included and/or is very difficult to identify. | Abstract provides a minimal and/or does not clearly provide an overview of key aspects of the project. Abstract is not consistent with standards of the discipline. | Abstract provides an adequate overview of key aspects of the project. Abstract is consistent with standards of the discipline. | Abstract provides a clear and concise overview of key aspects of the project. Abstract is consistent with standards of the discipline. |  |
| **Research Question** | Research question(s) is/are not appropriate for the discipline and/or research methodology. Student’s research question(s) is/are unidentifiable. Student  states a research topic rather than a research question. | The research question(s) is/are present, but is confusing or difficult to identify. Question(s) is/are somewhat appropriate for the discipline and/or research methodology, but is either too  broad or too narrow. Question(s) might be easily answered. | Research question(s) is/are easily identifiable. Question(s) is/are adequately appropriate for the discipline and research methodology. Question(s) is focused and concise. Displays some aspects of original thought. | Research question(s) is/are clearly identifiable, focused, and well stated. Question(s) are highly consistent with the discipline and research methodology. Question(s) display independent thought and inquisition. |  |
| **Introduction or Background** | Does not or is very difficult to identify a problem(s) and/or gap in field. Is not related to the question(s) and objective(s). Provides none or very little context for the relevance of the research. | Somewhat difficult to identify a problem(s) and/or gap in the field and is loosely related to the research question. | Attempts to state a problem(s) and/or gap in the field. Is reasonably focused, concise, and relates to research question(s) and objective(s). Is supported by current literature in the discipline. Provides adequate context for the relevance of the  research. | Clearly states a problem(s) and/or gap in the field. Is focused, concise, and logically relates to research question(s) and objective(s). Is supported by current literature in the discipline. Provides clear context for the relevance of the research. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Method** | Method not indicated or not easily identifiable. | Method indicated, but somewhat unclear. Somewhat inappropriate  for discipline, inaccurately stated and/or executed. | Method identified. Appropriate for discipline, but somewhat  inaccurately stated and/or executed. | Method clearly identified. Highly appropriate for discipline, accurately stated and executed. |  |
|  | Results, findings, or | Results, findings, or arguments are | Results, findings, or arguments | Results, findings, or arguments are |  |
| **Results, Findings, Or Main Argument** | arguments are inadequate and/or not identified. Not clear or concise and not related to the research  question(s) or objective(s). | identified, but are somewhat vague or illogical and/or difficult to decipher. Minimally relate to the research question(s) and  objective(s). Presentation is | are identified and relatively comprehensive. Attempt to answer the research question(s) address objective(s). Clear and  concise with presentation fairly | identified and comprehensive. Attempt to answer the research question(s) address objective(s). Clear and concise with presentation highly consistent with  the discipline and/or method. |
|  |  | somewhat inconsistent with the | consistent with the discipline |  |
|  |  | discipline and/or method. | and/or method. |  |
|  | Conclusions not indicated | Conclusion is present, but is | Conclusion is present and | Conclusion is present and clearly |  |
|  | and/or do not relate to or | somewhat unclear or vague. Does | attempts to addresses the | addresses the research question and |
|  | attempt to answer the | not directly relate to the research | research question and objectives. | objectives. Conclusions concisely |
| **Conclusion And/or Discussion** | research question and/or research objectives. *If appropriate for the*  *methodology: Limitations and/or* | question and/or objectives. Conclusions minimally summarize overall project. *If appropriate for the methodology: Limitations*  *and/or suggestions for future* | Conclusions adequately summarize overall project. *If appropriate for the methodology: Limitations and*  *suggestions for future research* | summarize overall project. *If appropriate for the methodology: Limitations and suggestions for future research are discussed and demonstrate*  *an extensive understanding of the* |
|  | *suggestions for future* | *research are identified, but do not* | *are identified and demonstrate* | *method, literature, and logically* |
|  | *research not identified or* | *demonstrate a clear understanding* | *an understanding of the method* | *continue to advance the topic.* |
|  | *are unidentifiable.* | *of the method or literature.* | *and literature.* |  |
| **References** | References provided. References are not from scholarly sources. Format appropriate for the  discipline not utilized and/or not correct. | References provided. Some references not from scholarly sources. Format is appropriate for the discipline with some formatting errors. | References provided. Most references from scholarly sources. Format is appropriate for the discipline with few formatting errors. | References provided. All references from scholarly sources. Format is appropriate for the discipline with no formatting errors. |  |
|  | Disorganized or hard to | Adequate organization, but | Well organized and fairly logical | Professional appearance and |  |
|  | follow. Images are either | logically somewhat hard to follow. | flow. Images add to | organization. Highly logical and clear |
| **Images and Overall Design** | not included and/or detract from research. Gross  spelling and/or grammatical errors. Formatting and | Images did not add nor detract from effectiveness. Some spelling and/or  grammatical errors. Formatting and headings fairly appropriate to | understanding of topic. Well written with few errors.  Formatting and headings appropriate to discipline/method. | flow. Images provide clarity and greatly improve understanding of material  presented. No grammatical or spelling errors. Formatting and headings |
|  | headings not appropriate to | discipline/method. |  | consistent with discipline/method. |
|  | discipline/method. |  |  |  |
| **Total** |  | | | | |