

## 2009 San Diego City College Student Project & Research Symposium

### Poster Presentation - Sample Rubric\*

**Note to presenters:** Although the poster presentations in the City College Symposium are not judged, here is a sample of a typical rubric that uses a 5-point scale for judging poster presentations in five different categories. Please use this rubric to help you develop your presentation.

| Poster #                        |   | Faculty Advisor   |   | Total Score  |  |       |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|--|--|-------|
| Presenter(s)                    |   |   |   |  |  |       |
|                                 | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4  | 5  | Score |
| <b>1 Introduction</b>           | Failed to describe project and/or research question. No rationale. Purpose was unfocused and unclear.   | Vaguely described project and/or research question. Weak rationale. Purpose was poorly focused and not sufficiently clear.                                  | Project and/or research question moderately described. Moderately clear rationale. Purpose was somewhat focused and clear.  | Described project and/or research question. Moderately-strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused.  | Clearly described project and/or research question. Strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused.   |       |
| <b>2 Methods / Approach</b>     | Little or no description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.                               | Inadequate description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.   | Moderate or excessive description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.  | Most detail included/slightly excessive detail in description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.                                     | Appropriate detail in description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.   |       |
| <b>3 Results / Outcomes</b>     | Absence of pertinent results. Presentation of results is inappropriate, including tables, figures and/or pictures.                                  | Few pertinent results. Presentation of results is incomplete, including tables, figures and/or pictures.  | Some pertinent results presented in clear and concise manner. Presentation of results is somewhat appropriate, including tables, figures and/or pictures.                             | Most pertinent results reported and in fairly clear and concise manner. Presentation of results is generally appropriate, including tables, figures and/or pictures.                           | All pertinent results reported and in clear and concise manner. Presentation of results is appropriate, including tables, figures and/or pictures.                       |       |
| <b>4 Discussion and summary</b> | Little or no discussion of project findings/outcomes. Displayed poor grasp of understanding. Conclusion/summary not supported by findings/outcomes. | Major topics or concepts inaccurately described. Considerable relevant discussion missing. Conclusions/summary not entirely supported by findings/outcomes. | Discussion is too brief/excessive, needs to be more concise of major findings/outcomes. Several inaccuracies and omissions. Conclusions/summary generally based on findings/outcomes. | Discussion sufficient and with few errors, though not particularly thought-provoking. Greater foundation needed from past work in area. Conclusions/summary based on outcomes and appropriate. | Brief and concise discussion of major findings/outcomes. Was superior, accurate, and thought-provoking. Conclusions/summaries appropriate and clearly based on outcomes. |       |
| <b>5 Appearance</b>             | Aesthetically displeasing, extremely unbalanced alignment of elements, many grammatical or spelling errors, text cannot be read from 6 ft.          | Poor visual presentation and poorly balanced alignment of elements. Numerous grammatical or spelling errors, most text easily read from 6 ft.               | Moderately aesthetically pleasing and moderately balanced alignment of elements. Some grammatical or spelling errors, generally text easily read from 6 ft.                           | Generally, aesthetically pleasing and balanced alignment of elements. Few grammatical or spelling errors, and text easily read from 6 ft.  | Exceptional poster; aesthetically pleasing, balanced alignment of elements, no grammatical or spelling errors, and text easily read from 6 ft.                           |       |
| <b>Comments (optional)</b>      |   |   |   |  |  |       |

\* Source: Adapted from 2008 SDSU Student Research Symposium. *Special thanks to the SDSU Symposium organizers.*