

Assessment Rubric: Poster Presentation for Final Project

For use in grading final project. All categories are worth an equal percentage of the total score.

	Excellent	Pretty Good	Beginning
Content: Introduction	Appropriate background information is presented, with citations, and supporting pictures or schematics as appropriate.	The introduction may lack some appropriate information or some claims are not supported with references.	There is not a good sense as to the topic background (given info is incomplete or too short), and more references are needed.
Content: Objectives	Objectives are clearly and concisely stated, and align with the background information on the topic.	Objectives are noted, but they don't fully align with introduced topic or could be more concisely stated.	Project objectives are unclear.
Content: Research Methods	Methods are described such that it is understood what was done. The methods match up with the stated objectives for the project.	Methods generally line up with stated project objectives, but the description leaves some uncertainty of how the analyses were done.	It is unclear what methods were used in the project or the methods do not align with the stated objectives.
Content: Results	Results fully align with the stated project objectives. Graphs or other visuals are used and easy to interpret.	Results mostly address the stated objectives. Graphs are well-utilized to display results, but there may be some difficulty in interpreting some of them.	Results are poorly displayed and explained, and do not address the stated project objectives. Graphs are not used or are difficult to understand.
Content: Conclusions	Appropriate conclusions are made from the evidence presented.	There are conclusions, but they are scattered and don't flow well, or don't address all the important factors from the results	The conclusions do not align with the evidence presented, or are difficult to understand.
Content: References	Uses mostly peer-reviewed sources but can have some popular media. Claims on poster are supported by appropriate references. References are formatted correctly.	A mix of peer-reviewed and popular media sources are used. There are some statements on poster that should be supported by a reference, or the references are not formatted properly.	References are predominantly not peer reviewed. References are barely or not at all noted on poster.
Critical thinking	Is able to synthesize information and critique aspects of water quality issue. Proposes creative and appropriate solutions for dealing with water quality issue.	Information is pretty well synthesized. There may be difficulty in ability to analyze complex information or critique sources as appropriate. Proposed solutions may be not well thought out or are somewhat impractical	While there's some grasp of the topic, many of the major aspects of the topic are missed or misinterpreted. There doesn't appear to be in depth analysis of topic or consideration of possible solutions.
Visuals & poster layout	Well organized and not cluttered. Text is clear, readable, and just enough to explain the content. Graphs, photos, and schematics make sense and are used to enhance the text.	There may be too much text or the poster layout could be a more balanced. Some graphs or schematics are used but are underutilized or some might be hard to interpret.	The poster is tough to follow. There is not good balance between text and graphics and what graphics are there are challenging to interpret. Lots of unused space on poster.
Oral presentation of work	Able to give concise (2-3 min) but coherent summary of project. Displays enthusiasm for work. Maintains good eye contact.	Displays some enthusiasm for work and generally makes eye contact. May have trouble coherently explaining project within the time limit (2-3 min).	Can talk about some aspects of the project but is unable to give a full summary of the project. Does not seem interested in the topic.
Partner work (if this applies)	Works to complete group goals. Always has a positive attitude about the tasks and work of others. Both partners contribute equally to the project.	Usually has a positive attitude about the tasks and work of others. Performed nearly all assigned duties to contribute to final project.	Did not work well with partner. Often had a negative attitude. Showed little interest in contributing to the collective research project.