Final Project Presentation Content Rubric – THIRD YEAR

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| score | HYPOTHESIS AND/OR STATEMENT OFPROBLEM | METHODS ANDCONTROLS/COMPARISON | RESULTS | CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK |
| 10 | • The hypothesis/statement of problem was inappropriate or was missing• Little or no background information was included or connected• Goal of project was not stated | • Methods section missing• Serious lack of controls ofdiscussion of controls | • Results are not yet available orreproducible• Presentation of data was missing | • Conclusions were missing• There was no connection withthe hypothesis |
| 12 | • A questionable hypothesis/ statement of problem was presented and was not necessarily supported• Some relevant background information was included, but not connected• Goal of project was not clear | • No discussion of choice ofmethods• Controls or comparative groups notadequately described; some appropriate controls or groups were missing | • Some data were lacking not fullysufficient to address the hypothesis• Presentation of data was included, but unclear or difficult to comprehend | • Conclusions were given• Little connection with thehypothesis was apparent |
| 15 | • A questionable hypothesis/ statement of problem was presented• Background information was relevant, but connections were not made• Goal of project was stated understandably | • Little comment on why themethods were chosen and othersnot chosen• Adequate discussion of controls orcomparative groups; some significant controls or comparativegroups were lacking | • Adequate amounts ofreasonably good data werepresented to address thehypothesis• Presentation of data was not entirely clear | • Reasonable conclusions weregiven• Conclusions were notcompared to the hypothesisand their relevance was notdiscussed |
| 18 | • A logical hypothesis/statement of problem was presented• Background information was relevant, but connections were not clear• Goal of project was stated clearly; showed relevance beyond project | • Good explanation of choice ofmethods• Clear discussion of controls orcomparative groups; most controlsor comparative groups were included | • Sufficient amounts of good datawere presented to address thehypothesis• Presentation of data was clearand logical | • Reasonable conclusions weregiven and supported withevidence• Conclusions were compared tohypothesis, but their relevancewas not discussed |
| 20 | - A logical hypothesis/statement of problem was presented clearly- Background information wasrelevant and summarized well. Connections to previous literature and broader issues were clear• Goal of project was stated clearly and concisely; showed clear relevance beyond project | • Thorough explanation of whyparticular methods were chosen• Clear discussion of controls orcomparative groups; allappropriate controls orcomparative groups were included | • Substantial amounts of highquality data were presentedsufficient to address thehypothesis• Presentation of data was clear,thorough, and logical | • Reasonable conclusions weregiven and strongly supportedwith evidence• Conclusions were compared tohypothesis and their relevancein a wider context wasdiscussed |