

Lab Group #:

BIO 111 Group Scientific Poster Rubric

Group Members:

Category	Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Very good to excellent	SCORE (Max)	Score Earned
Title and Author(s) Information	Point of experiment cannot be determined from title. (0)	Title could be more concise, but still conveys main point of experiment; 2 or more key components are missing Name or Affiliation Given. (1)	Title is concise & conveys main point of experiment, but 1-2 key components is missing Both Name and Affiliation Provided. (2-3)	Title is concise, conveys main point of experiment, and includes all key components (study system, variables, expected result). (4-5)	5	
Introduction	Does not connect or introduce background information of research. (0)	Provides small amount of relevant background but still insufficient information. (1-5)	Adequately presents background information, just lacks some connections to all parts of project. May not specifically point out project objectives. (6-10)	Clearly introduces the topic presented and contains important points to all parts of poster/presentation. Presents objectives/hypotheses. (11-15)	15	
Poster Content	Connection not found between poster content and purpose of study, research hypothesis/question(s), method, conclusions, or implications. (0-3)	Content presented was difficult to understand and did not sufficiently convey a connection to the study, hypothesis, research question(s), method, conclusion, and/or implications. (4-8)	The content was adequately presented but support for the study, research hypothesis, or question(s) is somewhat general. Conclusion and implications were reasonable. (9-15)	Strong material. Well summarized. Clearly shows development of study or research. Material appears to accurately support purpose of study, hypothesis, or research question. Strong conclusion and implications presented. (16-25)	25	
Poster Appearance/Clarity/Organization	Not visually effective. Unable to understand link between information presented and topic of research. (0-2)	Poster was acceptable but needs work to improve visual appeal through better utilization of fonts, colors, headings, and white space. Topic of research is not clear. Information presented is somewhat confusing. (3-5)	Poster was adequate but could improve effectiveness through better use of space through font size, colors, headings, and white space. Topic of the research is apparent. The presentation of information could use refining. (6-12)	Topic of research is clearly evident. Layout of poster is logical, and provides sequential information from intro to conclusion and references. Visually appealing and strongly effective presentation. Easy to read. Utilized creativity in use of fonts, headings, colors, and white space. (13-20)	20	
Graphs and Images	Many graphics are not clear or are too small. No color, or are completely lacking. (0)	Most graphics are in focus and the content is easily viewed and identified from 4 ft. away. (5)	Most graphics are in focus and the content easily viewed and identified from 6 ft. away. (10)	Graphics are all in focus and the content easily viewed and identified from 6 ft. away. In color. (15)	15	
References	No References Cited (0)	Very few references are cited in text of paper; final citation list is largely incomplete and/or is not formatted appropriately, OR less than 3 citations. (2)	References (at least 4 citations) within introduction/conclusions & references in final citation list are done appropriately for the most part, but with exceptions - OR there are consistent formatting errors in text and final citation list. (3-4)	References (at least 4 citations) are properly formatted within introduction/conclusions & references in final citation list are done appropriately and formatted consistently. (5)	5	
Oral Presentation to Lab Section	Presenter(s) were not prepared. Demonstrated problems in several areas (no eye contact, no clear discussion of research, lack of professionalism). (0-2)	Presenter(s) did not convey a sense of confidence or ability to <i>clearly</i> discuss the research problem, methods, conclusion, and implications. Additional preparation would have been useful. (3-6)	Demonstration of understanding of project and implications was acceptable. Some problems (speaking too softly, use of jargon, hesitation, inability to handle questions, etc.) were still present. (7-11)	Presenter(s) was confident and professional. Established eye contact. Conveyed research problem, methods, conclusions, and implications. Answered questions. Discussed research in layman's terms or at appropriate level based on instructor or audience questions. (12-15)	15	

Add scores across and then down the right column to obtain total score. (Maximum total of 100)

Total: 100