Final Science Research Poster Rubric – SECOND YEAR

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| score | **Hypothesis/Problem Statement** | **Background Research** | **Experimental Logic** | **Future Work** | **Poster Board** |
| **20** | • A logical hypothesis/statement of problem was presented clearly• Goal of project was stated clearly and concisely; showed clear relevance beyond project | • Background information was relevant and well summarized. • Connections to previous literature and broader issues were clear• several relevant journal articles referenced – no lay articles | • 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. | • 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 | • 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** | • A logical hypothesis/statement of problem was presented• Goal of project was stated clearly; showed relevance beyond project | • Background information was relevant, but connections to research question were not clear• several relevant journal articles referenced – no lay articles | • 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. | • Some indication of what still needs to be completed• Expected results were compared to hypothesis, but their relevance was not discussed | • 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** | • A questionable hypothesis/ statement of problem was presented• Goal of project was stated understandably | • 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 | • 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. | • No indication of steps to be completed• Expected results were not compared to the hypothesis and their relevance was notdiscussed | • 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** | • A questionable hypothesis/ statement of problem was presented and was not necessarily supported• Goal of project was not clear | • Some relevant background information was included, but not connected to research question• one or two relevant journal articles referenced – heavy reliance on lay articles | • Method not appropriate toaddress hypothesis or goal of project.• No original thinking.• Controls or comparative groups not adequately described; some controls or comparative groups missing. | • Expected results were given but little connection with the hypothesis was apparent | • 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** | • The hypothesis/statement of problem was inappropriate or was missing• Goal of project was not stated | • Little or no background information was included or connected to research question• No journal relevant articles referenced – complete reliance on lay articles | • Methods section missing.• No original thinking.• Serious lack of controls ordiscussion of controls. | • There was no indication of plans/ideas for going further | • 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. |