ABRCMS Judging Rubric – ePoster 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 either unclear or lacked a proper connection to the Hypothesis/Objective • Hypothesis/Objective was not clear or relevant to the project	• Methods were unclear or not directly relevant to Hypothesis/Objective	• Results were presented; however, they lacked sufficient data to address the Hypothesis/Objective effectively • 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 from Results
3	• Background was unclear or incomplete • Hypothesis/Objective was clear but not appropriately linked to the Background	• Methods were appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective however, they lacked sufficient relevant information to fully understand the procedures followed in the study	• Results included sufficient data to address the Hypothesis/Objective • Data were difficult to comprehend	• Conclusions drawn from Results were reasonably supported but did not explicitly establish relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective • Statement about Future Work somewhat followed the Results
4	• Background was clear and relevant to the Hypothesis/Objective but included information that went beyond the scope of the project • Hypothesis/Objective was clear and appropriately linked to the Background	• Methods were clear, appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective and provided sufficient details to understand the procedures carried out in the study	• Results included sufficient data to effectively address the Hypothesis/Objective • Data were comprehensive and easily understandable	• Conclusions were supported by the Results but the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective was unclear or not fully explained • Statement about Future Work logically followed from the presented Results
5	• Background provided a clear and relevant overview of previous research that informed the project's hypothesis/objective • Hypothesis/Objective was clear and appropriately linked to the Background	• Methods were clear, effectively linked to the Hypothesis/Objective and accompanied by a clear rationale. They provided comprehensive details that enable a full understanding of the procedures conducted in the study	• Results included sufficient high-quality data to successfully address the Hypothesis/Objective • Data were clear, logical, thorough, and easy to comprehend allowing for a comprehensive understanding of the findings	• Conclusions drawn from Results were strongly supported and the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective was clearly demonstrated • Statement about Future Work logically followed the Results and included clear next steps

SCORE	OVERALL PRESENTATION	QUALITY OF THE POSTER PRESENTATION
1	- Lacks knowledge about the research project and does not demonstrate understanding - Relies on reading directly from text throughout the entire presentation - Presentation is confusing and difficult to follow	- Some of the expected components* are missing and the layout is confusing and difficult to follow - Text in the poster is hard to read, messy and illegible, or has spelling or typographical errors - The background of the poster is very poor - Photographs/tables/graphs are poorly done and fail to effectively convey communication
2	- Exhibits weak understanding of the research project - Relies on reading directly from text most of the time - Presentation is generally unclear	- Not all the expected components* are present and the layout is untidy and confusing to follow - Text in the poster/slides is hard to read due to font size or color, or has spelling or typographical errors - The background of the poster 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 a partial understanding of the research project - Presentation is somewhat unclear and contains inconsistencies in the delivery of information	- Most of the expected components* are present, but the layout is confusing - Text is relatively clear and legible, but has spelling or typographical errors - The background of the poster 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 understanding of the research project - Communicates clearly and naturally - Presentation is clear for the most part, but contains inconsistencies in the delivery of information	- All expected components* are presented, but layout is crowded or jumbled making it confusing to follow - Text is relatively clear, legible, and mostly free of spelling or typographical errors - The background of the poster is unobtrusive - Most photographs/tables/graphs are appropriate and labeled correctly, which improve understanding of the project
5	- Demonstrates strong understanding of the research project - Communicates clearly, naturally and with enthusiasm - Presentation is logical, effective, and clearly conveys information	- 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 - The background of the poster 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