

Standards for Poster Presentation Rubric

I) **Writing and organization of layout** (circle one score on the scale below, corresponding to the qualities described):

- | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| 1. Inadequate: The poster was not adequately organized, and was hard to follow. | 2. Basic: The poster appeared to have a systematic organization to it, but it was not easy to follow. | 3. Good: The poster was easy enough to follow, but some questions about the writing or flow of the topic remain. | 4. Excellent: The poster appeared very well organized and written. |
|--|--|---|---|

II) **Effectiveness of the poster content** (circle one score on the scale below, corresponding to the qualities described):

- | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| 1. Not Effective: The poster content appeared incomplete and could not be understood without clarification. | 2. Adequate: The poster content appeared adequate for the topic, but could have been more intellectually engaging. | 3. Effective: The poster content appeared complete, and could be understood by an educated lay audience with careful attention. | 4. Compelling: The poster elucidated much about a rigorous topic, making it accessible and engaging to an educated lay audience. |
|--|---|--|---|

III) **Depth of understanding** (circle one score on the scale below, corresponding to the qualities described):

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. None/Little: The student did not seem to comprehend the material presented in the poster. | 2. Basic: The student had adequate understanding of the poster topic. Although prepared, the student was not in command of the material, and verbal responses seemed rote. | 3. Intermediate: The student understood the material shown in the poster well, and discussed related topics adequately but without displaying expertise. | 4. Advanced: The student was fluent in explaining the poster and addressed issues on related topics with confidence and expertise. |
|---|---|---|---|

IV) **Construction of the poster** (circle one score on the scale below, corresponding to the qualities described):

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| 1. Poor: The poster itself was poorly constructed; care had not been taken in selecting materials for the poster or its attachments. | 2. Acceptable: The poster itself was of decent quality; the general appearance left room for improvement, but was acceptable for a scholarly conference. | 3. Good: The poster itself was of good quality; its general appearance was professional, but it could have had greater visual impact. | 4. Appealing: The poster was visually appealing and impeccably constructed of high-quality materials. It could serve as a model for future poster presentations at Scholars' Day. |
|---|---|--|--|