

## 2023 Research Symposium Scoring Rubric for Poster Presentations

Criteria	Excellent (4-5 points)	Average (2-3 points)	Poor (0-1 point)	Score
<b>Background and Rationale</b>	Covers the problem and associated literature gaps in sufficient detail; concisely communicates the related hypothesis, problem statement, and/or research question	Communicates some of the background and rationale but needs clarification and more information; overall understandable	Background and rationale are unclear, missing, and/or not logical	
<b>Methods</b> <i>Do not score case reports for methods</i>	Methods are clearly described and appropriate for the study; includes relevant details about study sample, materials, recruitment, data collection, and data analysis	Minor issues in research design and/or methods; appears appropriate but some elements are missing, need additional clarification, or are questionable	Major errors or little to no explanation; methods and/or study design are not feasible, logical, or ethical	
<b>Results/Findings/Case Presentation</b>	Findings are presented clearly and concisely through text, figures, and/or photos; findings follow from the methods and address the research questions/hypothesis/aims  For case reports: case description is in chronological order; clearly describes appropriate clinical information as well as treatment, follow up, and final diagnosis/prognosis	Minor issues with the findings; somewhat or mostly appropriate but some text, figures, and/or photos need further clarification	Major errors or little to no explanation of findings; text, figures, and/or photos are confusing; findings are unrelated to the research question/hypothesis/case introduction	

<b>Discussion</b>	Most important elements of the findings/case presentation are highlighted and discussed in the context of existing knowledge; clear gaps or needs for further research and limitations are indicated	Minor issues with the discussion; some elements of the findings/case presentation are discussed in the context of existing knowledge but could use further exploration	Major errors with the discussion; no or few elements of the findings/case presentation are highlighted and discussed in the context of existing knowledge; presenter reiterates but does not expand on the findings	
<b>Poster Quality</b>	Poster is organized in a logical way; self-explanatory and sufficient (but not excessive text); adequate and understandable graphics; authors proofread carefully; absence of jargon\	Poster organization is mostly logical; poster has a handful of spelling errors; some graphics may be harder to read than others or may not be useful to the presentation	Poster has major issues with organization and readability; presentation has major/numerous spelling errors; graphics are illegible or confusing	
<b>Poster Presentation</b>	Presenter gives clear and concise summary of their project; Presenter is well prepared and exhibits a high level of professionalism	Presenter gives a somewhat clear and concise summary of the project but some information may be missing; presenter does not appear to be thoroughly prepared or does not conduct themselves professionally	Presenter has major issues with describing their project; Presenter is unprepared for presentation or lacks professionalism	
<b>Responses to Questions Posed by Judges</b>	Presenter demonstrates knowledge of the subject in response to questions; presenter answers questions fully and clearly	Presenter responds to questions but some responses could be more clear; presenter demonstrates mediocre knowledge of the subject	Presenter responds to no or few questions; presenter demonstrates little knowledge of the subject	
		Was a presenter there (either in person or over Zoom) to present the poster?	Yes/No	
Total Score:				

