ABRCMS Judging Rubric – Poster & Oral Presentations

SCORE	BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS OR OBJECTIVE	METHODS (Study Participants, Research Design, Procedures)	RESULTS	CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK
1	• Background was not stated Hypothesis/Objective was not stated	• Methods were not stated	• Results were not provided	• Conclusions were missing • Statement about Future Work was not included
2	• Background was not clear or appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective • Hypothesis/Objective was not clear or relevant to the project	• Methods were not clear or relevant to Hypothesis/Objective	• Results were provided but lacked sufficient data to address the Hypothesis/Objective • Data were difficult to comprehend	• Conclusions were included but little connection was made to the Results • Statement about Future Work was provided but did not logically follow Results
3	• Background was not clear or was incomplete • Hypothesis/Objective was clear but not appropriately linked to the Background	• Methods were appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective but lack relevant information to fully understand what was done	• Results included sufficient data to address the Hypothesis/Objective • Data were difficult to comprehend	• Conclusions were reasonably supported by the Results but the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective was not provided • Statement about Future Work somewhat followed the Results
4	• Background was clear and relevant to the Hypothesis/Objective but included relevance beyond project's scope • Hypothesis/Objective was clear and appropriately linked to the Background	• Methods were clear and appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective with sufficient details to understand what was done	• Results included sufficient data to address the Hypothesis/Objective • Data were sufficient to comprehend	• Conclusions were supported by the Results but the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective was unclear or incomplete • Statement about Future Work logically followed the Results
5	• Background was clear and provided a relevant and concise overview of previous research that informed the project's Hypothesis/Objective • Hypothesis/Objective was clear and appropriately linked to the Background	• Methods were clear and appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective with a clear rationale and comprehensive details to fully understand what was done	• Results included sufficient amounts of high quality data to address the Hypothesis/Objective • Data were clear, logical, thorough and easy to comprehend	• Conclusions were strongly supported by the Results and the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective • Statement about Future Work logically followed the Results and included next steps

SCORE	OVERALL PRESENTATION AND HANDLING QUESTIONS	QUALITY OF THE POSTER OR ORAL PRESENTATION
1	• Does not demonstrate any knowledge of the research project • Reads from the poster (slide or script) all the time • Does not understand questions • Presentation is very confusing	• Not all of the expected components* are presented and the layout is confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter • Text is hard to read, messy and illegible, or has spelling or typographical errors • Poster/slides' background is very poor • Photographs/tables/graphs are poorly done
2	• Demonstrates a poor knowledge of the research project • Reads from the poster (slide or script) most of the time • Has difficulty answering questions • Presentation is generally unclear	• Not all of the expected components* are presented and the layout is untidy and confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter • Text is hard to read due to font size or color, or has spelling or typographical errors • Poster/slides' background is distracting • Photographs/tables/graphs are not related to the text or are poorly labeled or do not improve understanding of the project
3	• Demonstrates some knowledge of the research project • Has some difficulty answering challenging questions • Presentation is somewhat unclear and has inconsistencies	• Most of the expected components* are presented, but the layout is confusing to follow in the absence of presenter • Text is relatively clear and legible, but has spelling or typographical errors • Poster/slides' background is distracting • Photographs/tables/graphs are not related to the text, or labeled correctly or do not improve understanding of the project
4	• Demonstrates good knowledge of the research project • Speaks clearly and naturally; makes eye contact • Answers most questions • Presentation is clear for the most part, but has a few inconsistencies	• All expected components* are presented, but layout is crowded or jumbled making it confusing to follow in the absence of presenter • Text is relatively clear, legible, and mostly free of spelling or typographical errors • Poster/slides' background is unobtrusive • Most photographs/tables/graphs are appropriate and labeled correctly, which improve understanding of the project
5	• Demonstrates very strong knowledge of the research project • Speaks clearly, naturally and with enthusiasm; makes eye contact • Answers difficult questions clearly and succinctly • Presentation is logical and very clear	• All expected components* are presented and are clearly laid out and easy to follow in the absence of presenter • Text is concise, legible, and free of spelling or typographical errors • Poster/slide background is unobtrusive • All photographs/tables/graphs are appropriate and labeled correctly, which improve understanding of the project and enhance the poster/slides' visual appeal *Components are defined as Title, Authors and Institutional Affiliation, Hypothesis/Objective, Background, Methods, Results, Conclusions, Future Work, Bibliography, and Acknowledgments