

## SURCA 2024 – Rubric for Evaluating Poster Presentations

		Emerging (1 pt)	Good (2 pts)	Very Good (3 pts)	Excellent (4 pts)	Truly Exceptional (5 pts)
<b>Poster</b>	Presentation & Clarity	Layout needs work and there are text errors. Tables and images are poorly executed or confusing.	Layout is good with occasional text errors. Tables and images are present but do not always help with understanding the project.	Layout is very good and mostly free of text errors. Tables and images look very good and help with understanding of the project.	Layout is creative, free of text errors. Tables and images take appropriate space and enhance understanding of the project.	Layout is highly creative, visually compelling, and free of text errors. Tables and images enhance understanding of the project.
	Organization & Cohesion	Presentation may be disorganized or presented in short sections rather than as an integrated story.	Presentation is not completely organized and some sections are disconnected.	Presentation could be uneven, but overall a mostly cohesive story.	Presentation is well organized, and material is presented as a mostly cohesive story.	Presentation is well organized, and material is presented as a highly cohesive story.
<b>Background and Objective</b>	Disciplinary Question and Significance	Disciplinary question and the significance of the project are absent.	Disciplinary question and the significance of the project lack clarity.	Disciplinary question and the significance of the project are stated vaguely.	Disciplinary question and the significance of the project are explained with clarity.	Disciplinary question and the significance of the project are explained with substantial comprehension.
	Goal of Project	Goal of project is missing or not relevant.	Goal of project is vague; hypothesis lacks depth or clear reasoning.	Goal of project and hypothesis are presented but lack clarity or appear disconnected.	Goal of project and main hypothesis are clearly stated and connected with each other.	Goal of project and main hypothesis are presented with comprehension and accompanied by graphical models.
<b>Method</b>	Why this method?	Explanation of <u>why</u> the specific approach/process was chosen is vague and disconnected from the goals/thesis.	Explanation of <u>why</u> the specific approach/process was chosen is provided but poorly connected to the goals/thesis.	Explanation of <u>why</u> the specific approach/process was chosen is provided but the link to the goals/thesis is not explained clearly.	Explanation of <u>why</u> the specific approach/process was chosen is provided and linked to the goals/thesis.	Exceptional explanation of <u>why</u> the specific approach/process was chosen with clearly stated link to the goals/thesis.
	Clarity of Process	Only partially describes the process with relevant details left out.	Describes the process with some confusion or difficulty.	Describes the process, but occasionally with too much or too little detail.	Describes the process clearly and with appropriate level of details.	Describes the process with great clarity and with support of figures.

		<b>Emerging (1 pt)</b>	<b>Good (2 pts)</b>	<b>Very Good (3 pts)</b>	<b>Excellent (4 pts)</b>	<b>Truly Exceptional (5 pts)</b>
<b>Results to Date</b>	Presentation of Results	Presents results but data is limited or not connected to hypothesis/thesis.	Presents results but data is difficult to comprehend or connect to goals/thesis.	Presents results and connects these to the goals/thesis but there are minor lapses in clarity.	Effectively presents product or results and clearly connects these to the goals/thesis.	Effectively presents product or results and connects these to the goals/thesis with exceptional clarity.
	Analysis of Implication	Shows partial understanding of the significance and limitations of results.	Analyzes implications of results but does not present significance.	Analyzes implications of results and presents the significance, but occasionally lacks clarity.	Analyzes implications of results and clearly presents the significance.	Analyzes implications of results and clearly illustrates significance with the help of figures.
	Conclusions	Lessons learned or future work are limited or vague.	Discusses the results in the context of the hypothesis and future work with errors or limited clarity.	Discusses how results support or reject the hypothesis and next steps accurately and with clarity.	Discusses next steps which follow the results and support or reject the hypothesis with exceptional clarity.	Discusses next steps which follow the results and support or reject the hypothesis with exceptional clarity and support of figures.
<b>Oral Communication</b>	Engagement with Audience	Engagement with audience is limited.	Good engagement, but persistently spoke too fast, too slow, or with reliance on notes.	Effective in engaging audience with confidence and accessible language.	Engages audience actively and effectively with confidence and accessible, discipline-specific language.	Engages audience with highest enthusiasm and confidence, ignites great interest in the presentation.
	Communication	Communicating the research project was unclear.	Communicates about the project with use of visual aids but occasionally unclear.	Communicates with clarity and uses visual aids adequately.	Communicates skillfully and uses visual aids effectively.	Communicates with exceptional skill and uses visual aids highly effectively.
	Questions & Answers	Unable to answer some basic questions.	Answers basic questions but has some trouble with difficult questions.	Answers to questions are adequate, although not always clear and concise.	Answers questions with great clarity and concision, demonstrating good knowledge about the field.	Answers questions insightfully, demonstrating exceptional knowledge about the field.

