

Eastern Colleges Science Conference Judging Rubric
(Approved by ECSC Board April 5, 2014)

CATEGORY	LOW	BELOW AVERAGE	AVERAGE	HIGH	VERY HIGH
I. SCIENTIFIC MERIT:					
A. Background and Research Design (15)	No Goal or Hypothesis (3)	Only Goal or Hypothesis (6)	Goal or Hypothesis Stated. Some Unrelated Background Literature (9)	Stated Goal or Hypothesis with Related Background Literature but no citations (12)	Stated Goal or Hypothesis with Related Background Literature and citations (15)
B. Methodology (10)	Materials Listed as a "grocery list" (2)	Methods included in general terms without description or a list of instructions (4)	Both Material and Methods indicated without explanation of how they are used in the study (6)	Materials are embedded in the Methods with explanation of how they are used in the study (8)	Materials are embedded in the Methods with explanation of how they are used in the study. Protocol is also indicated. (10)
C. Results (25)	Results are presented, however little to no supporting data that addresses the goal or hypothesis are presented, analyzed or summarized in a manner consistent with disciplinary norms. The following flaws may or may not be present and lead to point deductions: Raw, unanalyzed data are included and/or the data are summarized incompletely or unclearly in figures/ tables and/or statistical treatment is not appropriate to the discipline and/or Figure Legends and text are unclear or incomplete. (5)	Data presented minimally address the goal or hypothesis and/or are not analyzed/ summarized in a manner consistent with disciplinary norms. The following flaws may or may not be present and lead to point deductions: Raw, unanalyzed data are included and/or the data are summarized incompletely or unclearly in figures and tables and/or statistical treatment is not appropriate to the discipline and/or Figure Legends and text are unclear or incomplete. (10)	Data presented are somewhat incomplete although it addresses the goal or hypothesis and is consistent with disciplinary norms. The following flaws may or may not be present and lead to point deductions: Data are summarized incompletely or unclearly in figures and tables and/or statistical treatment is not appropriate to the discipline and/or Figure Legends and text are unclear or incomplete. (15)	Data presented are sufficient to address, the goal or hypothesis and is consistent with disciplinary norms. Data are summarized in appropriate figures and tables and statistical treatment is appropriate to the discipline. Figure Legends and text clearly explain figures and/or tables (20)	Data presented are substantial and adequate to fully address the goal or hypothesis and is consistent with disciplinary norms. Data are summarized in appropriate figures and tables and statistical treatment is appropriate to the discipline. Figure legends and text clearly explain figures and/or tables. (25)

<p>D. Discussion and Conclusions (15)</p>	<p>Hypothesis/Goal status is not clear. No additional relevant material presented or additional material is incompletely addressed. (3)</p>	<p>Hypothesis/Goal status is clear. Some category of relevant additional material is included. (6)</p>	<p>Hypothesis/Goal status is clear. Two to three categories of relevant additional material missing or incompletely addressed. (9)</p>	<p>Hypothesis/Goal status is clear. One category of relevant additional material missing or incompletely addressed. (12)</p>	<p>Hypothesis/Goal status is clear. All relevant additional discussion material is included. "Very High" ranked discussion sections would usually include the following categories of additional information: additional conclusions related to the original hypothesis/goal, relationship of results to other published work, future investigations suggested by results, and limitations of current study (15)</p>
--	---	--	--	--	---

II. PRESENTATION MERIT AND DESIGN:					
A. Abstract *Abstract may or may not be included on poster as is appropriate to the discipline. If not included on the poster, refer to the program book.	Abstract more than 250 words a largely incomplete summary of presentation content with omissions of multiple required components: background, goals and/or hypothesis, experimental design, results and conclusions. (1)	Abstract more than 200 words and/or an Incomplete summary of presentation content with omissions in more than two of required components: background, goals and/or hypothesis, experimental design, results and conclusions. (2)	Abstract 200 words or less. Incomplete summary of presentation content with omissions in one or two of required components: background, goals and/or hypothesis, experimental design, results and conclusions. (3)	Abstract 200 words or less. Effective, language completely summarizes all sections of the presentation including background, goals and/or hypothesis, experimental design, results and conclusions. (4)	Abstract 200 words or less. Effective, thorough and concise language completely summarizes all sections of the presentation including background, goals and/or hypothesis, experimental design, results and conclusions. (5)
B. Logical Presentation (10)	Scattered presentation of disconnected Ideas (2)	Student starts to present the work using Standard format (Intro, Hypothesis, M&M, Results, Discussion) but does not develop ideas clearly (4)	Student does present the work using standard format, but shows deficits about why s/ he is doing the study (6)	Student does present the work using standard format, and presents only part of the study clearly-but omits some items (8)	Student does present the work using standard format, shows insight into the Why, How, What of the study (10)
C. Ability to Answer Questions (10)	Could not answer any questions (2)	Could answer SOME questions with assistance from evaluator (4)	Could answer MOST questions confidently with minor assistance from evaluator (6)	Could answer MOST questions with confidence (8)	Ability to answer ALL questions from the evaluator with confidence (10)
D. Presentation Mechanics and Design (5 + 5) A. Platforms B. Poster	Incoherent Poor use of time. Difficult to hear (1) A. Figures and tables not clear, color distracting; errors are common (1) B. Format of the poster is not appropriate, content largely disorganized, obvious spelling or formatting mistakes	Organized talk/presentation, but hesitates, lack of flow, overuse of notes, sometimes imprecise (2) A. Text is too small to read; too much text; lack of photos; mostly laid out properly (2) B. Format of the poster is inconsistent or improper in its lay out and/or the content is disorganized (2)	Organized talk/presentation, reads talk from notes, no eye contact, and/or confident, dull monotone (3) A. Mostly laid out properly, mistakes apparent in figures and/or tables (3) B. Most items laid out properly; several sections of the poster need clarification or use inadequate font size (3)	Organized, clear but rushed, sparing use of notes (4) A. Mostly laid out properly; organized graphs; more photographs could improve presentation (4) B. ALL sections of the poster properly laid out, but they are over-abundant, crowded and sometimes confusing to the reader (4)	Organized, audible, engaging interesting, slow and clear, enthusiastic, good eye contact, good use of pointer (5) A. All PowerPoint slides are properly and clearly labeled; graphs and tables are clear; photographs help to clarify presentation (5) B. ALL sections of the poster are laid out properly, are easy to understand and read (5)