

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: _____

Criteria	Developing (2)	Apprentice (1)	Proficient (2)	Sophisticated (3)
Background Information, Significance, and Rationale <i>Does the presentation clearly state the hypothesis and the background information needed to understand the broader impacts of the hypothesis?</i>	- 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 <i>Does the presentation state, justify, and explain the (independently selected) methods/data collected?</i>	- 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 <i>Does the presentation share data and conclusions from that data that connect to hypothesis/broader impacts? Are alternatives/limitations of that data discussed?</i>	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 <i>Is the poster design appealing and effective at conveying the student's work?</i>	- 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 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 <i>Was the speaker prepared and presented at an appropriate pace and level? Did the presenter satisfyingly answer any questions posed?</i>	- 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				