

		5 points	3 - 4 points	1 - 2 points
Sharing the results of your study	Alignment of research question and questionnaire	Research question and questionnaire are excellent, appropriate, and match each other. Justification is given for the type(s) of questionnaire questions asked, and the questionnaire question(s) are included.	Includes some of the points listed to the left (to get full points)	Includes few of the points to listed to the left
	Data analysis and results presentation	Data analysis and presentation of results are excellent, appropriate, and match each other and the research question. There are at least 25 questionnaires analyzed per group member.	Includes some of the points listed to the left (to get full points)	Includes few of the points to listed to the left
	Discussion and conclusion	Discussion and conclusion are excellent, appropriate, and match the question and results. Discussion is thoughtful, and the meaning of the results are clearly interpreted.	Includes some of the points listed to the left (to get full points)	Includes few of the points to listed to the left
Scientific / geologic background	Scholarly knowledge	Up-to-date information is presented; subtleties or differences of opinions explored.	Conveys accurate information	Inaccurate or uninformative
	Background material	Appropriate amount of geologic background information presented	Not enough or too much geologic information to fill the allotted space	Little geologic information given
	References	At least 3 peer-reviewed references used appropriately, with all citation information given in APA format (Note: total number of references should be at least 7)	Insufficient references, not all citation information given for references, or insufficient scope or depth	Only one reference or major inaccuracies with references; references incorporated only tangentially
Local relevance	Appropriateness of scale	Most updated information presented at as local/small a scale as is possible for your group's topic	Topic is presented at a reasonable scale, but missed a clear opportunity to narrow in more	Topic is presented at much too large a scale
	Engaging information provided	Topic is presented in an interesting and engaging way to draw the audience in	Topic is presented in a straightforward way, but relevance to audience is not immediately obvious	Topic is presented in a cursory way; audience is unlikely to be engaged
	References	At least 2 popular press references used appropriately, with all citation information given in APA format. (Note: Total number of references should be at least 7.)	Insufficient references, not all citation information given for references, or insufficient scope or depth	Only one reference or major inaccuracies with references; references incorporated only tangentially

		<b>3 points</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>1 point</b>
<b>Overall Poster Quality</b>	<b>Visuals</b>	Aided in the poster; clearly explained; thoughtfully used	Visuals shown but not clearly explained or fully aid poster/understanding of topic	Visuals not helpful in understanding poster/topic
	<b>Presentation</b>	Succinctly presents main components of the poster; frequent eye contact; enthusiastic and interesting.	Includes some of the points listed to the left (to get full points)	Includes few of the points listed to the left
	<b>Knowledge demonstration</b>	Demonstrate group members know much more than what was put on the poster; presentation is focused, engaging, and highlights the most important information	Demonstrate group members know a bit more than what was put on the poster; presentation is succinct and accurate	Demonstrate group members know as much as you put on the poster; presentation may be way too long, short, or unfocused
	<b>Organization</b>	Logically organized with explanation of research study; headings used effectively. Includes all required sections (abstract, introduction, relevance, methods, results, discussion, conclusion, and references).	Poster jumps a bit from point to point, sections are hard to find or headings are missing/unclear.	Poster needs more organization; missing sections; headings missing or poorly used.
<b>Other</b>	<b>Engagement</b>	Asked good questions to other students and had thoughtful discussions. Circulated around the room to see multiple posters.	Met some of the criteria listed to the left (to get full points)	Met few of the criteria listed to the left
	<b>Timeliness</b>	Submitted final poster and arrived to presentation on time	--	Includes 1 of the 2 points listed to the left
	<b>Evaluation of Other Students (x2)</b>	Thoughtfully evaluated 4 other posters and gave comments.	Evaluated 4 other posters, but not many thoughtful comments	Did not evaluate 4 other posters <u>OR</u> no thoughtful comments
	<b>Evaluation of Group Members (x2)*</b>	Consistently positive reviews from your group mates; individual may have gone "above and beyond" with project	Mixed reviews from your group mates	Generally negative reviews from your group mates

*\* Additional points may be lost OR earned based on evaluations from your group mates; students working individually for any reason will not receive a grade for this category, and the total will be scaled appropriately.*

**The following will detract points but are not explicitly graded:**

- Poster topic not appropriate for GEOL 103 course
- Content repeats too closely material from this class or another class, lab, book, homework, etc.
- Text is cut/pasted from another source, including for figure legends. This is plagiarism and will be penalized and reported to the office of academic integrity
- Grammatical errors, typos or other inaccuracies