# 2023 GSRD Poster Presentation Skills Competition

**Instructions:** This serves as the rubric to assess the poster presentations. Students will be evaluated according to the statements that best describe their performance for each criterion. The scores range from 1–4 per sub-category, where 1 is the least and 4 is the highest; partial points in 0.5 increments may be assigned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>4 Points</th>
<th>3 Points</th>
<th>2 Points</th>
<th>1 Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Background, and hypothesis or objective**    | • Background was clear and provided a relevant and concise overview of previous research that informed the project’s hypothesis or objective.  
  • Background was clear and relevant to the hypothesis or objective, but included relevance beyond project’s scope.  
  • Hypothesis/objective was clear and appropriately linked to the background. | • Background was clear and relevant to the hypothesis or objective.  
  • Hypothesis/objective was clear but not appropriately linked to the background. | • Background was not clear or was incomplete, or appropriately linked to the hypothesis/objective.  
  • Hypothesis/objective was not clear or relevant to the project or was missing. | • Background was not clear or appropriately linked to the hypothesis/objective or was missing.  
  • Hypothesis/objective was not clear or relevant to the project or was missing. |
| **Methods and research design**                | • Methods were clear and appropriately linked to the hypothesis/objective with a clear rationale and comprehensive details to fully understand what was done.  
  • Methods were clear and appropriately linked to the hypothesis/objective with sufficient details to understand what was done.  
  • Methods were reasonably supported by the results.  
  • Methods were not logically followed. | • Methods were clear and appropriately linked to the hypothesis/objective with sufficient details to understand what was done.  
  • Methods were not clearly supported.  
  • Methods were not logically followed. | • Methods were missing or not clear or relevant to hypothesis/objective.  
  • Methods were missing or not clear or relevant to hypothesis/objective. | • Methods were missing or not clear or relevant to hypothesis/objective. |
| **Results**                                     | • Results included sufficient amounts of high quality data to address the hypothesis/objective.  
  • Data were clear, logical, thorough and easy to comprehend. | • Results included sufficient data to address the hypothesis/objective  
  • Data were sufficient to comprehend. | • Results were not provided or they lacked sufficient data to address the hypothesis/objective.  
  • Data were difficult to comprehend. | • Results were not provided or they lacked sufficient data to address the hypothesis/objective.  
  • Data were difficult to comprehend. |
| **Conclusions and future work**                | • Conclusions were strongly supported by the results and were relevant to the hypothesis or objective.  
  • Statement about future work logically followed the results and included next steps. | • Conclusions were supported by the results but the relevance to the hypothesis/objective was unclear or incomplete.  
  • Statement about future work logically followed the results. | • Conclusions were reasonably supported by the results but the relevance to the hypothesis/objective was not provided.  
  • Statement about future work somewhat followed the results. | • Conclusions were missing or included with little connection made to the results.  
  • Statement about future work was missing or was provided but did not logically follow. |
| **Subject knowledge**                          | • Demonstrates excellent knowledge of the topic and able to answer questions with explanations and elaboration. | • Demonstrates good knowledge of the topic and able to answer most questions without elaboration. | • Demonstrates fair knowledge of the topic and can answer only rudimentary questions. | • Demonstrates poor knowledge of the topic and cannot answer questions about the topic. |
| **Poster delivery**                            | • Demonstrates a strong interest in the topic/results during entire presentation.  
  • Purposefully engages the audience throughout presentation with tone and body language, relevant common examples/metakphors, etc, to garner audience interest. | • Demonstrates interest in topic/results during most of the presentation.  
  • Engages with the audience for most of the presentation with tone, body language, relevant common examples/metakphors to garner audience interest. | • Demonstrates some interest in topic/results during most of the presentation.  
  • Lacks some engagement through tone/body language (e.g. monotone, facing the poster majority of time) lacking examples to garner audience interest. | • Demonstrates little interest in topic/results during most of the presentation.  
  • No engagement with the audience; just presents the poster; provides no examples to garner interest in the work. |
| **Poster quality**                             | • All expected components are presented and are clearly laid out and easy to follow  
  • Text is concise, legible, and free of spelling or typographical errors  
  • All photographs/tables/graphs are appropriate and labeled correctly, which improve understanding of the project and enhance the poster visual appeal.  
  • Audio presentation is logical and very clear. | • All expected components are presented, but layout is crowded or jumbled making it confusing to follow  
  • Text is relatively clear, legible, and mostly free of spelling or typographical errors  
  • Most photographs/tables/graphs are appropriate and labeled correctly, which improve understanding of the project.  
  • Audio presentation is mostly clear, but has a few inconsistencies | • Most of the expected components are presented, but the layout is confusing  
  • Text is relatively clear and legible, but has spelling or typographical errors  
  • Photographs/tables/graphs are not related to the text, or labeled correctly or do not improve understanding of the project.  
  • Audio presentation is somewhat unclear and has inconsistencies. | • Not all the expected components are presented and the layout is untidy and confusing to follow  
  • Text is hard to read due to font size or color, or has spelling or typographical errors  
  • Photographs/tables/graphs are not related to the text or are poorly labeled or do not improve understanding of the project.  
  • Audio presentation is unclear or confusing. |

**TOTAL POINTS (28 Max Points)**

*Expected components are title, background, methods, results and conclusions (if applicable) and future work.*