This rubric was developed based upon multiple different resources and customized for this event (Chemistry Undergraduate Poster Session; April 26th, 2024). Circle the box for the evaluation you wish to give for this presentation and add any comments. The boxes below are just examples of what a presentation can do to obtain that rating. Of note, Sophisticated = Grad Students; Proficient = Experienced UG Students; Apprentice = Inexperienced UG Students.

**Presenter/Project:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Developing (2)</th>
<th>Apprentice (1)</th>
<th>Proficient (2)</th>
<th>Sophisticated (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Background Information, Significance, and Rationale**
Does the presentation clearly state the hypothesis and the background information needed to understand the broader impacts of the hypothesis? | • The goal or hypothesis was not stated. • No background or broader issues provided or discussed. | • The goal or hypothesis was stated. • Connections to previous literature or broader issues were not made clear. • The broader impacts were not made clear. | • The goal or hypothesis was stated. • Connections to previous literature or broader issues were mentioned but not explained thoroughly. • The broader impacts of research were stated. | • The goal or hypothesis was clearly/concisely stated. • Clear connections to previous literature or broader issues. • The broader impacts of the research were clearly stated. |
| **Methods & Results**
Does the presentation state, justify, and explain the (independently selected) methods/data collected? | • Methods/data sections missing. • No original thinking observed. • Lack of understanding of the methods used and/or results gained. | • Articulated and justified some of the methods used and results gained. • Demonstrated little to no independent thinking. | • Articulated and justified the methods used and results gained. • Some independent thinking was observed. | • Clearly articulated and justified the methods used and results gained. • Demonstrated strong independent thinking. |
| **Discussion, Conclusions, & Future Work**
Does the presentation share data and conclusions from data that connect to hypothesis/broader impacts? Are alternatives/limitations of that data discussed? | • No discussion or conclusions drawn from data or did not connect to original project goal. | • Reasonable discussion & conclusions were given but not connected to the presented evidence and goals/hypothesis. • Potential problems/limitations/alternative approaches were not discussed. | • Reasonable discussion & conclusions were given and sometimes connected to the presented evidence and goals/hypothesis. • Potential problems/limitations/alternative approaches partially discussed. | • Reasonable discussion & conclusions were given and connected to the evidence and goals/hypothesis. • Potential problems/limitations and alternative approaches were discussed. |
| **Poster Design and Appearance**
Is the poster design appealing and effective at conveying the student’s work? | • Layout was confusing or missing major components (see above). • Text was hard to read, messy, and contained multiple errors. • Visual aids were not used, were not well labeled, and/or did not support the data. | • Layout was not well organized but contained some expected components. • Text was hard to read and contained errors. • Visual aids were unclear, mislabeled, and/or didn’t enhance the presentation. | • Layout was well organized and contained most expected components. • Text was easy to read, concise, and contained minimal errors. • Visual aids were clear and correctly labeled, but didn’t fully enhance the presentation. | • Layout was well organized and contained all expected components. • Text was easy to read, concise, and contained no errors. • Visual aids were clear, correctly labeled, and greatly enhanced the presentation. |
| **Presentation & Elocution**
Was the speaker prepared and presented at an appropriate pace and level? Did the presenter satisfingly answer any questions posed? | • Presenter was not prepared to go through poster content. • Delivery techniques detracted from the understandability of the presentation. • Presenter did not understand the project. | • Presenter was not fully prepared to go through poster content. • Delivery techniques did not improve understandability of the presentation. • Presenter could not answer many questions or did not fully understand the project. | • Presenter was mostly prepared to go through poster content. • Delivery techniques improved the understandability of the presentation. • Presenter could answer many questions about the project content. | • Presenter was prepared to present project with enthusiasm and naturally. • Takes ownership of material and appears confident. |

**Strengths of Presentation**

**Suggestions for Future Presentations**