

## Student Poster Award Rubric – Poster Template

<b>Reviewer:</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>Poster Number:</b>
------------------	--------------	-----------------------

The Poster rubric (first page) evaluates submissions on criteria that are deemed critical for the successful composition and presentation of an academic poster. The rubric follows guidelines recommended by PLoS, the NIH, and SPSP. These criteria are elements that are unique to posters and differentiate the Student Poster Award from other SPSP hosted competitions. Higher scores should be given to posters that can **effectively communicate the main finding(s) or conclusions in a simple, easy to follow format**, in addition to being **visually appealing**. Points should not be deducted if posters do not include all the sections found in a traditional template (i.e., background, hypothesis, method, results, and discussion). These sections can and should appear in the research summary.

In the Research Summary rubric (second page), reviewers should be provided with an in-depth evaluation of both poster content and the accompanying research summary (500-700 word maximum). The research summary should provide **complementary** information, especially in the form of elaboration or clarification, that would typically be **conveyed through a spoken presentation during a poster session (e.g., details about procedure or tasks participants completed; type of analyses employed)**.

**Do the poster and summary combined include (at a minimum) the following sections?**

*Background or Introduction, Research Question(s) or Objective(s), Hypothesis or Potential Outcome(s), Methods or Procedure, Results or Analyses, Conclusion(s) or Discussion(s) & citations throughout or References? YES/NO*

<p><b>To what extent does the <u>title</u>...</b>  <i>Make people want to come and visit?</i>  <i>Pose a decisive question, define scope of the study, or hint at a new finding?</i>  <i>Make the research comprehensible to a broad audience (i.e., short, sharp, and compelling)?</i></p>	Not At All	A Little Bit	Moderately	Very	Extremely
	1	2	3	4	5
<p><b>To what extent does the <u>layout</u>...</b>  <i>Guide the eyes from one frame to another in a logical fashion from beginning to end?</i>  <i>Is eye-catching but not overwhelming?</i>  <i>Pulls the viewer in without causing them to feel lost?</i></p>	Not At All	A Little Bit	Moderately	Very	Extremely
	1	2	3	4	5
<p><b>How informative and useful are the <u>visual depictions of the data (the graphs, tables, figures, etc.)?</u></b></p> <p><i>Creatively considers how to best communicate scientific findings with visual tools.</i>  <i>The viewer feels like he/she is experiencing <u>more</u> than just an article written in 36-point font.</i></p>	Not At All	A Little Bit	Moderately	Very	Extremely
	1	2	3	4	5
<p><b>How clear is the <u>overall “message” of the poster?</u></b></p> <p><i>The final takeaway is obvious and understandable to viewers.</i>  <i>Presents a clear and obvious research question(s) and ultimate conclusions.</i>  <i>Purpose of poster is clear.</i></p>	Not At All	A Little Bit	Moderately	Very	Extremely
	1	2	3	4	5

**TOTAL SCORE:** \_\_\_\_\_

## Student Poster Award Rubric – Summary

1. Background and Objectives / Hypotheses					
<b>A.</b> Background information provided is relevant, comprehensive, and succinct. In-text citations are included where appropriate/necessary.	Not At All 1	A Little Bit 2	Moderately 3	Very 4	Extremely 5
<b>B.</b> A research question/objective is clearly defined. The question/objective is scientifically compelling (e.g., novel topic, innovative design, extends existing work or theory, tests boundary conditions of an effect).	Not At All 1	A Little Bit 2	Moderately 3	Very 4	Extremely 5
<b>C.</b> If hypotheses are made, they are clearly defined and logically supported by the background information. If the work is labeled exploratory, potential outcomes are clearly defined and logically supported by the background information.	Not At All 1	A Little Bit 2	Moderately 3	Very 4	Extremely 5
2. Empirical Logic					
<b>A.</b> Methods/procedures are easy to follow and clearly explain how data were collected / how tasks were performed. Sample size and relevant statistics are reported. Demographic information is reported when relevant.	Not At All 1	A Little Bit 2	Moderately 3	Very 4	Extremely 5
<b>B.</b> The project design appropriately addresses the research question(s)/objective(s) (e.g., would a cross-sectional or longitudinal design provide a more direct answer to the research question?).	Not At All 1	A Little Bit 2	Moderately 3	Very 4	Extremely 5
<b>C.</b> The project achieves high validity (i.e., see <b>Notes 2c</b> ).	Not At All 1	A Little Bit 2	Moderately 3	Very 4	Extremely 5
3. Results and Conclusions					
<b>A.</b> If results are reported in text, statistics are reported in APA format and include effect sizes when possible.	Not At All 1	A Little Bit 2	Moderately 3	Very 4	Extremely 5
<b>B.</b> Conclusions are appropriately drawn based on the research design (e.g., no causal conclusions from correlational data) and supported by results; they connect back to project objectives/hypotheses; conclusions are not inappropriately extrapolated.	Not At All 1	A Little Bit 2	Moderately 3	Very 4	Extremely 5
4. Complementarity					
<b>A.</b> To what extent does the summary enhance the understanding of the research poster?	Not At All 1	A Little Bit 2	Moderately 3	Very 4	Extremely 5

### Notes:

**2c. Construct Validity:** did the researcher(s) measure what they intended to measure? **Internal Validity:** can conclusions of cause and effect be made? Were controls or comparative groups reported and appropriately used? **External validity:** are results generalizable?

Was a representative sample used?

**3a.** If results are reported in graphs/tables/figures, they are depicted in a way that is easy to interpret, unambiguous and unbiased (e.g. axes are labeled, scaling is consistent, error bars are included and identified).

**3b.** If results were unanticipated/did not support hypotheses, consideration is given as to why.

**4a.** This should include information the presenter might convey in conversation with an audience at their poster, such as:

1) To what extent does the summary enhance the understanding of the research?

2) How clear and engaging is the summary?

3) Impact of project is clearly stated (e.g., novelty? Contribution to field? Impact to the populations being studied?)

4) To what extent does the summary provide future theoretical or applied directions for this line of research.

**Comments:**

If you thought this submission excelled in a particular category, or could use improvement in a particular category, please offer this feedback below.

Category (e.g., 1a, 2b, 3c)	Score (1-5)	Comment / Feedback:

**Would you recommend this application to win the Student Poster Award?**

Strongly <b>Not</b> Recommend -2	Slightly <b>Not</b> Recommend -1	No Opinion 0	Slightly Recommend 1	Strongly Recommend 2
--	--	--------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

**TOTAL SCORE:** \_\_\_\_\_