2025 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. **Expected components are Title, Author List, Background/Objectives, Methods, Results/Progress, and Conclusions & Future Work.**

Component	4 Points	3 Points	2 Points	1 Point
Background, and Objectives/ Hypothesis	• Background was clear and provided a relevant and concise overview of previous research that informed the project's hypothesis or objective. • Hypothesis/objective was clear and appropriately linked to the background.	• 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 unclear,, incomplete, or was not appropriately linked to the hypothesis/ objective. • Hypothesis/objective was clear but not appropriately linked to the background.	• Background was unclear, was not 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. • Includes 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 appropriately linked to the hypothesis/ objective but lack relevant information to fully understand what was done.	• Methods were missing or were not clear or relevant to hypothesis/objective.
Results/Progress	• Results included sufficient amounts of high quality data to address the hypothesis/objective. • Data presentation was clear, logical, thorough and easy to comprehend.	• Results included sufficient data to address the hypothesis/objective. • Data presentation was sufficient to comprehend, but could use minor improvements.	• Results included sufficient data to address the hypothesis/objective • Data presentation was difficult to comprehend.	• Results were not provided or they lacked sufficient data to address the hypothesis/objective. • Data presentation was 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 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 topic and can answer only rudimentary questions.	• Demonstrates poor knowledge of 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/ metaphors, 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/metaphors to garner audience interest.	• Demonstrates some interest in the 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.	• All expected components are presented, but may have minor issues that slightly affect comprehension. • 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.	• Some expected components missing or underdeveloped, and the layout is somewhat disorganized • Text is relatively clear and legible, but has spelling or typographical errors • Photographs/tables/graphs do not relate well to the text, may be incorrectly labeled, or do not improve understanding of the project.	• Not all the expected components are present and the layout is 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, are mislabeled/unlabeled or do not improve understanding of the project.
TOTAL POINTS (28 Max Points):				