ABRCMS Judging Rubric – Poster & Oral Presentations (Copyright © 2017, American Society for Microbiology/ABRCMS, All Rights Reserved)

SCORE	HYPOTHESIS OR OBJECTIVE AND	METHODS	RESULTS	CONCLUSIONS OR DISCUSSION
	BACKGROUND/INTRODUCTION	(Sample/Study Participants, Study Design, Procedures)		AND FUTURE WORK
1	Hypothesis/Objective was not stated Background/Introduction was not stated	Methods were not stated	Results were not provided	 Conclusions/Discussion were missing Statement about Future Work was not included
2	 Hypothesis/Objective was not clear or relevant to the project Background/Introduction was not clear or appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective 	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/Discussion were included but little connection was made to the Results Statement about Future Work was provided but did not logically follow Results
3	Hypothesis/Objective was clear but not appropriately linked to the Background/Introduction Background/Introduction was not clear or was incomplete	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/Discussion 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	 Hypothesis/Objective was clear and appropriately linked to the Background/Introduction Background/Introduction was clear and relevant to the Hypothesis/Objective but included relevance beyond project's scope 	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/Discussion 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	 Hypothesis/Objective was clear and appropriately linked to the Background/Introduction Background/Introduction was clear and provided a relevant and concise overview of previous research that informed the project's Hypothesis/Objective 	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/Discussion were strongly supported by the Results and the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective and larger body of literature were clearly stated Statement about Future Work logically followed the Results and included realistic next steps

SCORE	PRESENTER'S OVERALL PRESENTATION AND HANDLING QUESTIONS	QUALITY OF THE POSTER BOARD OR POWERPOINT 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/Introduction, Methods, Results, Conclusions/Discussion, Future Work,