

## Annual Research Forum -- Scoring Rubric – Poster & Oral Presentations

Modified from the Annual Biomedical Research Conference for Minority Students (ABRCMS) and American Society of Microbiology (ASM) Judging Handbook. Permission for use of this rubric was obtained from ASM/ABRCMS.

**Rating Scale: 5=Highest; 1=Lowest**

	Hypothesis and/or Statement of Problem	Methods	Results	Conclusion and Future Work	Overall Presentation & Question Answering	Poster Appearance	Impact (Poster and Presentation)
<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Logical hypothesis/statement of problem presented clearly</li> <li>Background information relevant and summarized well.</li> <li>Goal of project stated clearly and concisely; showed clear relevance beyond project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thorough explanation of why particular methods chosen</li> <li>Clear discussion of controls or comparative groups</li> <li>Controls, if used are appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Substantial amounts of high-quality data presented sufficient to address hypothesis</li> <li>Presentation of data clear, thorough, and logical</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reasonable conclusions strongly supported with evidence</li> <li>Significance or relevance described.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates very strong knowledge of project</li> <li>Speaks clearly, with enthusiasm; makes eye contact</li> <li>Comfortably uses visual aids to enhance presentation</li> <li>Answers difficult questions clearly and succinctly</li> <li>Presentation clear, logical</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All expected components present, clearly laid out, easy to follow</li> <li>Text concise, legible, font size appropriate; Unobtrusive background</li> <li>Figures and tables appropriate and labeled correctly</li> <li>Photographs/tables/graphs improve understanding or visual appearance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Original idea with frame shifting approach to the field OR</li> <li>Significantly adds to knowledge on this topic</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Logical hypothesis/statement of problem presented</li> <li>Background information relevant, but connections were not clear</li> <li>Goal of project stated clearly; showed relevance beyond project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good explanation of choice of methods</li> <li>Clear discussion of controls or comparative groups if appropriate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sufficient amounts of good data presented to address hypothesis</li> <li>Presentation of data clear and logical</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reasonable conclusions given and supported with study evidence</li> <li>Conclusions compared to hypothesis, but their relevance not discussed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates good knowledge of project</li> <li>Speaks clearly; makes eye contact</li> <li>Uses visual aids to enhance presentation</li> <li>Answers most questions</li> <li>Presentation clear for the most part, but not consistently</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All expected components present, but layout crowded or a bit confusing</li> <li>Text relatively clear, legible, and mostly free of misspelling or typos; unobtrusive background</li> <li>Most figures/tables appropriate and labeled correctly</li> <li>Photographs/tables/graphs improve understanding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work expands on previous work in the field in new and important directions</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questionable hypothesis/statement of problem</li> <li>Background information was relevant, but connections were not made</li> <li>Goal of project stated understandably</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little comment on why methods were chosen and others not chosen</li> <li>Adequate discussion of controls or comparative groups; some significant controls or comparative groups were lacking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate amounts of reasonably good data presented to address the hypothesis</li> <li>Presentation of data not entirely clear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reasonable conclusions given</li> <li>Significance or relevance not discussed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates some knowledge of project</li> <li>Reads from poster (slide or script) some of the time</li> <li>Has some difficulty answering challenging questions</li> <li>Presentation is unclear and inconsistent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most expected components present, but layout confusing</li> <li>Text relatively clear; some misspelling or typos; background may be distracting</li> <li>Figures/tables not always related to text, not appropriate, or mislabeled</li> <li>Photographs/table/graphs do not aid understanding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expands on previous work in the field</li> <li>Of moderate importance</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questionable hypothesis/statement of problem presented and was not well supported</li> <li>Some relevant background information was included, but not connected</li> <li>Goal of project was not clear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No discussion of choice of methods</li> <li>Controls or groups not adequately described; some appropriate controls or groups were missing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some data lacking or not fully sufficient to address hypothesis</li> <li>Presentation of data included, but unclear or difficult to comprehend</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conclusions were given, however study results did not support the conclusions well.</li> <li>Little connection with hypothesis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited knowledge of project</li> <li>Reads from poster (slide or script) most of the time</li> <li>Does not use available visual aids to enhance presentation effectively</li> <li>Has difficulty answering questions</li> <li>Presentation unclear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some expected components, but layout untidy and confusing</li> <li>Text hard to read due to font size, color, misspelling or typos; background may be distracting</li> <li>Figures/tables not related to text, not appropriate, or poorly labeled</li> <li>Photographs/tables/graphs limited and do not aid understanding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replicates previously known work but was a replication that was needed</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hypothesis/statement of problem inappropriate or missing</li> <li>Little or no background was included or connected</li> <li>Goal of project not stated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Methods section missing</li> <li>Serious lack of controls or discussion of controls</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results are not yet available or reproducible</li> <li>Presentation of data was missing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conclusions were missing</li> <li>No connection with the hypothesis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of project is poor</li> <li>Reads from poster (slide or script) all the time</li> <li>Does not use visual aids</li> <li>Does not understand questions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some expected components present, but poorly laid out and confusing</li> <li>Text hard to read, messy, contains multiple spelling or typos, or poor background</li> <li>Poor figures and tables</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replication of previously known work</li> <li>Little impact on field</li> </ul>