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 not  discussed | • 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 to  address 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 or  discussion 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. |