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|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **1 - Unacceptable** | **2 - Acceptable** | **3 - Good** | **4 - Exemplary** | **Rating** |
| **Project**  **Overview**  **(Purpose**  **Or Goal)** | The central idea is unclear throughout the poster. It is never clearly stated. | By the time the viewer reads the conclusions, the main idea is clear, but it took real work to figure out that main idea. | The main idea is generally clear, but the poster sometimes wanders off topic. The importance of the project may need to be inferred rather than being explicit. | The central idea of the project is immediately clear to the viewer. The overall idea clearly has merit. |  |
| **Disciplinary**  **Context & Importance** | Neither the broad context for the project nor the existing background that justifies the current narrow project are presented. The project’s importance is unclear. | The project is presented with a narrow focus. Wider connections aren’t fully presented, but a solid background for the narrow focus area is included. | The broader context of the project is presented, although not clearly. The audience has to infer those interconnections or the project’s importance. | The project is clearly placed within the broader context of the discipline. The importance of the project is clearly explained. |  |
| **Organization** | The flow of ideas is unclear. The viewer struggles to see organization, and has trouble figuring out how things are interconnected. | The main ideas are understandable, but the flow is disordered or awkward. There are small problems in multiple parts of the poster. | The reasoning flows well overall, but there are detours along the way, distracting the audience. The main points come through clearly, nonetheless. | The ideas flow smoothly on the poster. The progression from thesis to background to evidence and discussion is clear, with good flow and transitions. |  |
| **Mechanics** | The poster is unclear and prevents the audience from understanding a significant portion of the ideas. Design issues are frequent and annoying. | The poster is just standard, without distinction. Design problems occur repeatedly, but are not dominant. The viewer perceives the poster as just “okay”. | The poster is clear, but not unusually interesting. There are a few design problems (font, color, lack of white space, unclear graphics, etc.) that distract the audience, but no major disruptions to the flow of the poster. | The poster is well designed, with appropriate titles, fonts, white space, text, and graphics. There are no major distractions present. |  |
| **Oral Presentation** | The author’s introduction is unclear or scattered. Main ideas aren’t presented. More detailed discussion is mostly confusing. | The author’s introduction is okay, mostly explaining the project. Deeper discussions are awkward, but mostly help the viewer understand the project. | The author gives a clear 30-60 second introduction. More detailed discussion is mostly successful, but with some awkwardness. | The author clearly states the main ideas in a 30-60 second introduction. The author is comfortable expanding the discussion to include more detail. |  |
| **Results &**  **Discussion** | The discussion is significantly unclear or the conclusions are unsupported. The project appears incomplete or incorrect. The “bottom line” is truly weak. The author’s discussion is not clear, and shows limited understanding of the project. | The discussion is sometimes incomplete or the logic for a conclusion is incorrect. The core content and conclusions are present but not totally correct or easy to see. The author’s oral explanations are only partially helpful. | Arguments or experimental analysis or creative explanations are clearly done. The depth may sometimes be lacking a little, or the logic for a conclusion is incomplete. Main conclusions are present, but not totally clear. The author explains most content in conversation. | Main student ideas/creations or experimental ideas are clearly presented and discussed. The logic behind conclusions is laid out clearly. Conclusions are easy to find, and the author can explain them in conversation. |  |
| **Overall**  **Depth** | The project does not have much complexity. The ideas and analysis are lower level undergraduate only. The feel of the project is one of being scattered or incomplete. | A good amount of work is represented in this project. The presentation of that work is uneven, and connections with published work are incomplete, as is some of the analysis. | The content of this project has good detail, but not an unusual amount. The integration of fresh work with past knowledge is good, but not perfect. | The content of this project is rich and deep. Ideas are fleshed out with ideas from references and from fresh knowledge or analysis. The level is clearly upper level undergraduate. |  |