

**RUBRIC FOR 2022 DELTA OMEGA HONORS DAY POSTER SESSION (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 understand purpose of study * Sufficient to explain experimental approach * Clearly stated objective and/or testable hypothesis | Significance is stated but not sufficiently rationalized   * Lacks some introduction material to motivate rational for study or experimentation * Objective or hypothesis present but not clearly stated | Significance not sufficiently stated   * Work not put into ‘big picture’ * Approach explained but hypothesis or objective not stated * Approach is rational and acceptable but doesn’t   address stated   * hypothesis | Significance not stated   * General approach not stated |
| **Criteria** | **8-10 Excellent** | **5- 7 Good** | **3-4 Fair** | **1-2 Poor** | |
| **Methods** | Sufficient methodology detail so approach can be judged and correct methodology to address hypothesis/questions asked   * Methodology is explained so approach is understandable but not overdone * Good use of flowcharts * Chosen methodology is rational | Good approach but some minor points may be missing   * Methodology section could benefit by diagram * Too much methodology detail – distracting * Best experimental approach may not have been chosen | Some components of approach are minimal or missing.   * Methodology missing, incorrectly or confusedly presented * Methodology does not address questions | Approach is absent or reader is not able to follow |  |
| **Results** | Results clearly stated   * Purpose of each experiment clearly stated * Figures/tables convey intended information * Results appear sound based upon the data collected * Results address hypothesis | Results clearly stated but may be some minor errors, confusion.   * Experimental question not stated * Insufficient detail/information in figures/ tables * Experiments good but not address question * Presentation of data could be improved | Some components of results are missing   * Lack of figures/ tables; all text   Inappropriate presentation of data   * Insufficient statement of rationale * No statistics when needed | Insufficient presentation of results   * Incorrect interpretation of data * No statistics when needed * No rationale for experiments stated |
| **Conclusions** | Conclusions address the research question/ hypothesis.   * Supported by results and literature background * Presented logically * Understandable to those outside the field * Overall take-home message presented * Future directions presented | Conclusions 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 study objective/ 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 |  |