

Final Science Research Poster Rubric – SECOND YEAR

score	Hypothesis/Problem Statement	Background Research	Experimental Logic	Future Work	Poster Board
20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A logical hypothesis/statement of problem was presented clearly • Goal of project was stated clearly and concisely; showed clear relevance beyond project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background information was relevant and well summarized. • Connections to previous literature and broader issues were clear • several relevant journal articles referenced – no lay articles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent choice of experimental methods to address hypothesis or goal of project. • Excellent original thinking or innovation of technique. • Clear discussion of controls or comparative groups; all appropriate controls or comparative groups were included. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly identifies which steps of their research still need to be completed • Expected results were compared to hypothesis and their relevance in a wider context was discussed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All expected components are present, clearly laid out, and easy to follow in the absence of the presenter. • Text is concise, free of spelling or typographical errors; background is unobtrusive. • Figures and tables are appropriate and labeled correctly. • Photographs/tables/graphs improve understanding and enhance visual appeal.
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A logical hypothesis/statement of problem was presented • Goal of project was stated clearly; showed relevance beyond project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background information was relevant, but connections to research question were not clear • several relevant journal articles referenced – no lay articles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good choice of experimental methods to address hypothesis or goal or project. • Very good original thinking. • Clear discussion of controls or comparative groups; most controls or comparative groups were included. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some indication of what still needs to be completed • Expected results were compared to hypothesis, but their relevance was not discussed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All components are present, but layout is crowded or confusing to follow in absence of presenter. • Text is relatively clear, mostly free of spelling and typographical errors; background is unobtrusive. • Most figures and tables are appropriate and labeled correctly. • Photographs/tables/graphs improve understanding.
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A questionable hypothesis/ statement of problem was presented • Goal of project was stated understandably 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background information was relevant, but connections to research question were not made • three or four relevant journal articles referenced – no reliance on lay articles although they are referenced 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good choice of experimental methods to address hypothesis or project goal. • Good original thinking. • Adequate discussion of controls or comparative groups; some significant controls or comparative groups were lacking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No indication of steps to be completed • Expected results were not compared to the hypothesis and their relevance was not discussed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most expected components are present, but layout is confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter. • Text is relatively clear, but some spelling and typographical errors; background may be distracting. • Figures and tables not always related to text, or are not appropriate, or poorly labeled. • Photographs/tables/graphs limited and do not improve understanding.
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A questionable hypothesis/ statement of problem was presented and was not necessarily supported • Goal of project was not clear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some relevant background information was included, but not connected to research question • one or two relevant journal articles referenced – heavy reliance on lay articles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Method not appropriate to address hypothesis or goal of project. • No original thinking. • Controls or comparative groups not adequately described; some controls or comparative groups missing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expected results were given but little connection with the hypothesis was apparent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some expected components are present, but layout is untidy and confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter. • Text is hard to read due to font size or color, some spelling and typographical errors; background may be distracting. • Figures and tables not related to text, or are not appropriate, or poorly labeled. • Photographs/tables/graphs limited and do not improve understanding.
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The hypothesis/statement of problem was inappropriate or was missing • Goal of project was not stated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no background information was included or connected to research question • No journal relevant articles referenced – complete reliance on lay articles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methods section missing. • No original thinking. • Serious lack of controls or discussion of controls. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no indication of plans/ideas for going further 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the expected components are present, but poorly laid out and confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter. • Text hard to read, messy and contains multiple spelling and typographical errors; very poor background. • Figures and tables poorly done. • Visual aids not used.

