



# Undergraduate Research Symposium

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) Poster Evaluation Rubric

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Presentation Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Total: \_\_\_\_\_/90 Rank: \_\_\_\_\_

	0-3	4-6	7-9	10	Score
<b>Poster Heading</b>	Several components missing. Title is not provided or does not adequately describe the research. Student(s) names and/or advisor not provided. Institution and/or department are missing.	All components are present. Title only vaguely describes the research project and is somewhat illogical to the topic presented.	All components are present. Title adequately describes the topic. Language is somewhat consistent with topic and methodology.	All components are present. Title is logical and clearly describes the research project. Language is consistent with topic and methodology.	
<b>Abstract</b>	No abstract is included and/or is very difficult to identify.	Abstract provides a minimal and/or unclear overview of key aspects of the project. Abstract is not consistent with topic.	Abstract provides a reasonable overview of key aspects of the project. Abstract is consistent with topic.	Abstract provides a clear and concise overview of key aspects of the project. Abstract is consistent with topic.	
<b>Research Question</b>	Research question(s) is/are not appropriate for the topic and/or research methodology. Student's research question(s) is/are unidentifiable. Student states a research topic rather than a research question.	The research question(s) is/are present, but is/are confusing or difficult to identify. Question(s) is/are somewhat appropriate for the topic and/or research methodology, but is/are either too broad or too narrow. Question(s) might be easily answered.	Research question(s) is/are identifiable. Question(s) is/are reasonably appropriate for the topic and research methodology. Question(s) display some aspects of original thought.	Research question(s) is/are clearly identifiable, focused, and well stated. Question(s) are highly consistent with the topic and research methodology. Question(s) display independent thought and inquisition.	
<b>Introduction or Background</b>	Does not or is very difficult to identify a problem(s). Is not related to the question(s) and objective(s). Provides none or very little context for the relevance of the research.	Somewhat difficult to identify a problem(s) and is loosely related to the research question.	Attempts to state a problem(s). Is reasonably focused, concise, and relates to research question(s) and objective(s). Is supported by current literature. Provides reasonable context for the relevance of the research.	Clearly states a problem(s). Is focused, concise, and logically relates to research question(s) and objective(s). Is supported by current literature. Provides clear context for the relevance of the research.	

<b>Method</b>	Method not indicated or not easily identifiable.	Method indicated, but somewhat unclear. Somewhat inappropriate for topic, inaccurately stated and/or executed.	Method identified. Appropriate for topic, but somewhat inaccurately stated and/or executed.	Method clearly identified. Highly appropriate for topic, accurately stated and executed.	
<b>Results, Findings, Or Main Argument</b>	Results, findings, or arguments are inadequate and/or not identified, not clear or concise, and not related to the research question(s) or objective(s).	Results, findings, or arguments are identified, but are somewhat vague or illogical and/or difficult to decipher, minimally relate to the research question(s) and objective(s). Presentation is somewhat inconsistent with the topic and/or method.	Results, findings, or arguments are identified and relatively comprehensive. Attempt to answer the research question(s) addresses objective(s). Clear and concise with presentation, fairly consistent with the topic and/or method.	Results, findings, or arguments are identified and comprehensive. Attempt to answer the research question(s) addresses objective(s). Clear and concise with presentation highly consistent with the topic and/or method.	
<b>Conclusion And/or Discussion</b>	Conclusions not indicated and/or do not relate to or attempt to answer the research question(s) and/or research objectives.  If appropriate for the methodology: Limitations and/or suggestions for future research not identified or are unidentifiable.	Conclusion is present, but is somewhat unclear or vague. Does not directly relate to the research question(s) and/or objectives. Conclusions minimally summarize overall project.  If appropriate for the methodology: Limitations and/or suggestions for future research is identified, but do not demonstrate a clear understanding of the method or literature.	Conclusion is present and attempts to address the research question(s) and objectives. Conclusions adequately summarize overall project.  If appropriate for the methodology: Limitations and suggestions for future research are identified and demonstrate an understanding of the method and literature.	Conclusion is present and clearly addresses the research question(s) and objectives. Conclusions concisely summarize overall project.  If appropriate for the methodology: Limitations and suggestions for future research are discussed and demonstrate an extensive understanding of the method, literature, and logically continue to advance the topic.	
<b>References</b>	References provided in either reference section or in-text, but not from scholarly sources. Format utilized not appropriate for the topic and/or not correct.	References provided in either reference section or in-text; some not from scholarly sources. Format is appropriate for the topic with some formatting errors.	References provided in both reference section and in-text; most from scholarly sources. Format is appropriate for the topic with few errors.	All provided references in both reference section and in-text are from scholarly sources. Format is appropriate for the topic with no formatting errors.	
<b>Images and Overall Design</b>	Disorganized or hard to follow. Images are either not included and/or detracts from research. Gross spelling and/or grammatical errors. Formatting and headings not appropriate to topic/method.	Adequate organization, but logically somewhat hard to follow. Images did not add nor detract from effectiveness. Some spelling and/or grammatical errors. Formatting and headings fairly appropriate to topic/method.	Well organized and fairly logical flow. Images add to understanding of topic. Well written with few errors. Formatting and headings appropriate to topic/method.	Professional appearance and organization. Highly logical and clear flow. Images provide clarity and greatly improve understanding of the material presented. No grammatical or spelling errors. Formatting and headings consistent with topic/method.	