

Biological Inquiry Research Poster Grading Rubric.

<i>Explanation of grading of performance</i>	<i>Inadequate: Performance not acceptable (F)</i>	<i>Below average: Performance not up to minimum standards but shows marginal grasp of concepts (D)</i>	<i>Average to above average: Performance met all minimum standards (C)</i>	<i>Good to very good: Performance representative of good to noteworthy achievement (B).</i>	<i>Particularly strong to exemplary: Performance demonstrates that this team moved beyond expectations and came up with original ideas that provided unique insight (A).</i>
<i>Introduction</i>	Intro is not present, is incoherent, or is unrelated to experiment.	Intro disorganized, or lacks reference to relevant primary literature, or missing purpose/hypothesis.	Background info too broad or too narrow, or weak/missing purpose or hypothesis, or lacks sophistication and/or may contain fallacies of logic.	The intro smoothly pulls reader into topic. It is well organized, flows from general to specific, and makes clear the purpose of experiment.	Intro is uniquely well written and is crafted in such a way (e.g., relevant examples from 1° lit) as to educate the poster audience in a noteworthy and effective way.
<i>Appropriate use of primary literature; including Literature Cited section</i>	No 1° literature cited or it was plagiarized and/or citations missing or inadequate.	Attempts at paraphrasing border on plagiarism, or cited literature seems random and/or irrelevant to topic, and/or literature cited section inadequate and improperly formatted.	Use of reference literature perfunctory without clear context, and/or attribution inappropriate or misplaced, and/or literature cited section is inadequate.	Background information used in context (esp. in intro and discussion). Citations are appropriate and correctly located within text, with literature cited in appropriate format.	Creative and effective use of 1° literature, which is cited appropriately. Paraphrasing of other works represents noteworthy grasp of referenced articles applied to poster's context.
<i>Methods</i>	Methods absent or blatantly inaccurate.	Reader would have a tough time knowing what happened in the experiment and/or the methods was a list of materials and steps (style of H.S. lab report)	Methods gave general view of experiment but were incomplete or imprecise (e.g., only described single team's work rather than combined work across all sections)	Clearly states how experiment was conducted, and how data were collected and analyzed.	Methods are sophisticated, clear, and concise, giving particularly good insight (perhaps with visual aids) into how the study was performed and how the data were analyzed.
<i>Results</i>	No results, no figures, or what is present is grossly inaccurate.	Results are misleading or un-interpretable for reader due to mistakes or omissions (e.g., no figure captions).	Graphs/tables don't conform to minimum standards (e.g., contain raw data), or captions are incomplete, axes are misleading, or supporting text is inaccurate.	Figures & tables provide useful information for discussion. Captions are complete and accurate (include N, p-value, etc.), and supporting text is informative.	Results demonstrate effort beyond the norm, e.g., evidence that authors worked extra hard to create visually appealing, clear, and concise figures and supporting text.

This work was supported with funding from NSF (DUE grant 0836851). For additional information about the above document, please contact Ellen Goldey (goldeyes@wofford.edu).

Biological Inquiry Research Poster Grading Rubric.

<i>Discussion</i>	Discussion is not present, is incoherent, or is unrelated to experiment.	Discussion makes little attempt to address the purpose of the experiment or relate results to prior work and/or misuse of terms suggests ignorance of key concepts.	Discussion attempts to address the purpose of the experiment and relate results to other works, but misuse of scientific terms and/or <i>lack of coherence with other sections</i> confuses reader.	Authors do an adequate job of relating their findings to the hypothesis/purpose and situating their findings relative to background literature.	Communicates original synthesis of evidence in a way that is complex and free of logical fallacies. Future study recommendations are <i>specific</i> and reasonably follow from this study. Findings are discussed (i.e., so what?) in broader context.
<i>Overall unity of poster across sections</i>	Sections vary widely in quality and accuracy, resulting in a confusing hodgepodge.	Poster lacks unity and coherence (sections appear to have been developed separately then thrown together).	Acceptable coherence across some sections, but some sections (hint: often the intro and discussion) still lack any relationship to each other.	Demonstrates generally coherent and unified writing across sections providing a unified whole.	Sections are well integrated and interdependent (e.g., topics of intro are resolved in discussion) with smooth transitions. Discussion reflects back on other sections to provide novel, even exciting, insights.
<i>Title, authors, &amp; acknowledgements</i>	Missing	Any part missing or misleading.	All present, but title is not descriptive of experiment.	All present, title is descriptive and accurate.	All present, title is descriptive yet brief (perhaps even creative).
<i>Sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, spelling</i>	Sentence structure seriously flawed, and/or numerous grammar and punctuation problems, and/or many spelling errors.	Several problems with sentence structure, spelling, grammar and punctuation make poster unprofessional.	Errors in grammar, punctuation, and/or spelling detract from quality. Vocabulary immature or misused. Text would benefit from additional editing!	A few errors in grammar, punctuation, or spelling do not detract too much from overall poster quality. Sentence structure is generally good, but may still contain waste words.	Poster is free of errors in grammar, punctuation, or spelling, and sentences are well structured. Poster demonstrates authors' careful editing. Vocabulary is notably sophisticated.
<i>Creativity</i>	Poster is visually unappealing; use of template not apparent, and/or extraneous clutter completely distracts from the poster's purpose.	Poster fails to meet minimal standards. Sections incomplete or obviously unbalanced in length and layout.	Poster meets minimal requirements (e.g., template used), but problems exist (e.g., overcrowding or reducing text size to squeeze in words) makes it less appealing.	Authors have followed guidelines and added visual interest while preserving white space.	Authors have added creative (e.g., images, humor) touches that enhance their poster's effectiveness <u>without</u> <u>distracting</u> from the poster's purpose. Be careful here!

This work was supported with funding from NSF (DUE grant 0836851). For additional information about the above document, please contact Ellen Goldey (goldeyes@wofford.edu).