**2022 DELTA OMEGA HONORS DAY JUDGING RUBRIC (NON-RESEARCH)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **8-10 Excellent** | **5- 7 Good** | **3-4 Fair** | **1-2 Poor** |
| **POSTER LAYOUT** |
| **Organization** | Clear and logical flow of sections.* Reader can easily follow line of reasoning.
* Major points stand out.
 | Poster is generally clear.* A few minor points may be confusing.
 | Organization not well thought out.* Reader can follow poster with effort.
 | Poster is very confused and unclear.* Readers cannot follow it.
 |
|  **Design** | Excellent and appropriate design* Appropriate use of font and color
* Graphics and figures clearly and logically presented and appropriately placed.
 | Design generally appropriate.* May have some trouble in reading or understanding a figure.
* Font too small, poor color choice
 | Design is difficult to master.* Generally fonts are inappropriate
* Color scheme is inappropriate
 | Design is consistently inappropriate.* Typographical errors
 |
| **POSTER CONTENT** |
| **Background** | Significance of work is clearly stated* Sufficient information to learn severity of health issue
* Clearly explain purpose of the work
* Sufficient to explain approach
 | Significance is stated but not sufficiently rationalized* Lacks some introduction material
* Purpose of work not clearly stated
 | Significance not sufficiently stated* Work not put into ‘big picture’
* Approach is rational and acceptable but correlate to health issue
 | Significance not stated* General approach not stated
 |
|  **Description** | Sufficient detail so approach and activities can be judged and * Approach and activities are understandable
* Good use of images/graphs
* Activities are rational intervention
 | Good approach but some minor points may be missing* Section could benefit by visual (diagram/images)
* Too much detail – distracting
* Best intervention approach may not have been chosen
 | Some components of approach are minimal or missing.* Information is missing, incorrectly or confusedly presented
* Intervention does not address health issue
 | Approach is absent or reader is not able to follow |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **8-10 Excellent** | **5- 7 Good** | **3-4 Fair** | **1-2 Poor** |
| **Accomplishments** | Results clearly stated* Purpose of each activity clearly stated
* Figures/tables convey intended outcome
* Results appear sound based upon the data collected
* Results address purpose
 | Results clearly stated but may be some minor errors, confusion.* Purpose not stated
* Insufficient detail/information in figures/ tables
* Results are good but do not address need or purpose of intervention
* Presentation of data could be improved
 | Some components of results are missing* Lack of figures/ tables; all text

Inappropriate presentation of data* Insufficient rationale
* No statistics when needed
 | Insufficient presentation of resultsIncorrect interpretation of data* No statistics when needed
* No rationale
 |
| **Future Steps** | Future Steps address the health issue and purpose of project.* Supported by results and literature background
* Presented logically
* Understandable to those outside the field
* Overall take-home message presented
 | Conclusions and future steps generally good but may lack some minor points* May not include all points in box on left
 | Conclusions not entirely appropriate* Do not accurately reflect results
* Difficult to follow, too complex
* No overall message
 | Conclusions insufficient; not present* Does not reflect project purpose and results
 |  |
| **Student** | Clear presentation with enthusiasm for the topic * Kept within time
* Effective presentation
* Clear, concise presentation that enhances understanding of the poster
* Questions answered and evidence of understanding of work
* Easy to understand
 | Good presentation with some minor flaws* Slightly overtime
* Overall very good, but does not enunciate or speak clearly throughout whole presentation
 | Presentation acceptable, but not comfortable with delivery or material* Does not present concisely within time limit – doesn’t hit major points
* Reads poster
* Responds poorly to questions.
* Difficult to understand
 | Poor presentation* Reads poster
* Not clear evidence of understanding
* Cannot respond to questions
 |  |