

## UGRADS Poster Judging Rubric SCIENCE/MATH TEACHING & LEARNING PROJECT

**Location and Student Name**

Place abstract here

Poster Title (abbrev.): \_\_\_\_\_

Enter scores between 0.5 and 5.0. If student is not present, assign "0" in Oral Quality. If you cannot rate an area, use NA. Comments can be written below.

*Note: Your scores and comments will be shared with the project mentor and student.*

Area	Unacceptable (0.5, 1.0, 1.5)	Acceptable (2.0, 2.5, 3.0, 3.5)	Commendable (4.0, 4.5, 5.0)	Score
<b>Abstract Quality</b>	Project goals & purpose were poorly stated. Accomplishments were unclear. Implications for science/math teaching & learning unclear. There were several writing errors.	Project goals & purpose were clear. Accomplishments were highlighted. Implications for science/math teaching & learning clear. There were a few writing errors.	Project goals, purpose, & accomplishments were clear and concise. Implications for science/math teaching & learning thoroughly described. There were no writing errors.	
<b>Poster quality</b>	Poster is dull, overly creative, hard to follow, or poorly organized. Graphics are missing or have errors. Writing errors are frequent.	Poster holds viewer's attention. Writing is mostly clear; graphics have a few errors. Organization is at an acceptable level.	Poster captures viewer's attention; graphics are used effectively. Writing is crisp and clear, and organization flows.	
<b>Oral quality</b>	Student was poorly prepared and failed to grasp project or did not explain it clearly for non-experts.	Student was prepared, understood most of the project, and explained it reasonably well for non-experts.	Student was well prepared, had a firm grasp of the project, and made it crystal clear for non-experts.	
<b>Project quality</b>	The purpose, importance, goals, methods, accomplishments, and conclusions of the project were often confusing, incomplete, or poorly presented. Implications for science/math teaching & learning were missing or not clear. The student had difficulty answering questions.	The purpose, importance, goals, methods, accomplishments, and conclusions of the project were generally clear and complete, with only a few problems. Implications for science/math teaching & learning were clear. Most questions were answered clearly.	The purpose, importance, goals, methods, accomplishments, and conclusions of the project were clear, complete, and well-organized. Implications for science/math teaching & learning were thoroughly described. Answers to questions indicated true depth of understanding.	
<b>Work effort</b>	It was not clear what work the student actually did, or they presented work largely done by others.	The student made clear what work they did, and they contributed to at least half of the project.	The student made clear what work they did, and they were the major contributor to the project.	
<b>Overall impact</b>	I left the poster rather disappointed and confused. The project was not presented in a way that was compelling or effective.	I enjoyed the presentation and learned a lot about the project. The student conveyed interest and enthusiasm for their work.	The presentation was of professional quality; it sparked my interest and increased my knowledge. The student was inspiring and enthusiastic.	
			<b>TOTAL</b>	

Comments:

Did the rubric categories fit the poster? YES NO    If no, what improvements can you suggest?