

## Poster Presentation Rubric for NAU's Undergraduate Symposium

	<b>Novice (0, 1)</b>	<b>Basic (2, 3, 4)</b>	<b>Proficient (5, 6, 7)</b>	<b>Distinguished (8, 9, 10)</b>
<b>Abstract/Project Overview</b>	<p>Does not clearly connect abstract/overview to research poster or presentation.</p> <p>Project goals, purpose, and accomplishments are not included or are confusing and technical.</p> <p>Does not address the findings or value of the work.</p>	<p>Somewhat able to see the connection of abstract/overview to research. Abstract/overview does not contain sufficient information.</p> <p>Project goals and purpose included but are somewhat confusing or too technical.</p> <p>Adequately includes findings but does not address the value of the work.</p>	<p>Abstract/overview adequately represents student's work.</p> <p>Project goals, purpose, and accomplishments are clear and not overly technical.</p> <p>Includes findings of the research and somewhat addresses the value of the work.</p>	<p>Strongly represents student's work.</p> <p>Project goals, purpose, and accomplishments are clear and concise.</p> <p>Includes clear argument for the value and findings of the research.</p>
<b>Content</b>	<p>Information does not support the study, hypothesis, or question; importance of the project is not evident.</p> <p>Very few or no details on the methodology are included.</p> <p>Missing a conclusion or provided conclusion is confusing.</p> <p>No citations provided or citations have several errors.</p>	<p>Information lacks supporting details that explain the study, hypothesis, or question.</p> <p>Poster would benefit from more concise information related to the overall project and its relative importance.</p> <p>Methodology is provided but it is confusing or lacking details.</p> <p>Provides a conclusion but does not evaluate evidence presented; no recommendation for future work included.</p> <p>Cites some information obtained from other sources; citations have some errors.</p>	<p>Information generally appears to support the study, hypothesis, or question with only a few minor gaps</p> <p>Appropriate amount of material is prepared. Some points may seem extraneous to the overall project</p> <p>Describes methodology and provides evidence of valid research</p> <p>Provides an adequate conclusion that shows some evaluation of evidence presented</p> <p>Cites most information obtained from other sources; citations have a few errors</p>	<p>Information supports the study, hypothesis, or question</p> <p>Appropriate amount of material is prepared. Points made reflect their relative importance</p> <p>Describes methodology and provides evidence of extensive and valid research with multiple sources</p> <p>Provides a clear conclusion that shows thoughtful, strong evaluation for evidence presented; offers recommendations for further work in the area</p> <p>Cites all information obtained from other sources; citations are accurate</p>

<p>Poster Appearance</p>	<p>Poster does not have coherent organization or is difficult to follow</p> <p>Design impairs ability to understand and interpret information</p> <p>Font sizes detract from the readability; graphics do not enhance text</p> <p>More than five misspellings or grammatical errors</p>	<p>Poster is acceptable but requires significant work to be visually appealing</p> <p>Organization does not adequately assist the viewer in understanding order without narration</p> <p>Font may be inappropriately sized in areas; graphics adequately enhance the text</p> <p>4-5 misspellings or grammatical errors</p>	<p>Poster is adequately appealing and somewhat creative; could be improved through better design</p> <p>Organized so viewer can mostly understand without narration</p> <p>Uses appropriate font sizes/variation to facilitate readability; graphics enhance the text</p> <p>1-3 misspellings or grammatical errors</p>	<p>Visually appealing and effective in presenting the necessary information</p> <p>Organized logically so the viewer can understand without narration</p> <p>Font sizes/variation facilitate the organization and readability; graphics are engaging and enhance text</p> <p>No misspellings or grammatical errors</p>
<p>Presence, Speaking Style, and Delivery</p>	<p>Reads all or most from notes</p> <p>Demonstrates incomplete knowledge of topic by responding inaccurately or inappropriately to questions</p> <p>Does not discuss research in terms appropriate to audience</p>	<p>At least half the time reading from notes</p> <p>Demonstrates some rudimentary knowledge through responses to questions</p> <p>Discussed research in terms too elementary or too technical for audience</p>	<p>Frequently refers to notes</p> <p>Demonstrates knowledge of the topic by responding appropriately to questions but at times fails to elaborate</p> <p>Generally discussed research in terms appropriate to audience, only having to explain a few technical terms</p>	<p>Well-rehearsed and well communicated</p> <p>Demonstrates extensive knowledge on the topic by responding appropriately to all questions</p> <p>Discussed research in terms appropriate to the audience</p>
<p>Overall Impression</p>	<p>Presentation lacks creative and original elements or was delivered ineffectively</p>	<p>A few creative touches but mostly presented with little originality</p>	<p>Professional quality presentation</p> <p>It sparked my interest and increased my knowledge</p>	<p>Very interesting; original, clever, and creative approach</p> <p>Captures audience's attention</p>

What did you enjoy most about the presentation?

What suggestions would you make for improvement?

Other comments: