CODE Student Symposium 2027 - Judging Rubric for Poster Presentation of CODE Research

Score	9 - 10 (Excellent)	7 - 8 (Very Good)	5 - 6 (Good)	3 - 4 (Fair)	1 - 2 (Poor)
Hypothesis / Goals and Background	- Background information was relevant and summarized well. Connections to previous literature and broader issues were clear. - Project had a goal or a logical hypothesis that was stated clearly and concisely; showed clear relevance. - Broader impacts beyond the project were clearly stated.	- Background information was relevant, but connections were not clear. - A project goal or a logical hypothesis was presented and was reasonably clear and concise - Broader impacts beyond project were present.	- Background information was relevant, but connections were not made. - Questionable project goal or hypothesis was presented. - Broader impacts beyond project were unclear.	- Little background information was included or connected. - Questionable hypothesis was presented and was not well supported, or the goal of the project was unclear. - Broader impacts beyond project were absent.	- Background information was absent. - Hypothesis or goal was inappropriate or not stated. - Broader impacts beyond project were absent.
Appropriateness of Methodology	- Methodology and design for exploring the central purpose clearly stated. - Presented logical steps and/or appropriate information that clearly addressed the central purpose of the research with adequate detail provided - Excellent choice of methods to address hypothesis of project goals.	- Methodology and design for exploring the central purpose stated - Presented logical steps and/or appropriate information that address the central purpose of the research with adequate detail provided - Very good choice of methods to address hypothesis of project goals.	- Some methodology and design for exploring the central purpose stated - Some logical steps and/or information that address the central purpose of the research is provided with some details - The choice of methods to address hypothesis of project goals is good.	- Methodology and design for exploring the central purpose are not appropriate - Very few logical steps and/or information that address the central purpose of the research are included or with very little details - Choice of methods to address hypothesis of project goals is not appropriate	- Methodology and design for exploring the central purpose are missing - Steps to address the central purpose of the research are not included - No methods are described.
Results	- Substantial amounts of high-quality data were presented sufficient to address hypothesis or project goals - Presentation of data was clear, thorough, and logical.	- Substantial amounts of good data were presented sufficient to address hypothesis or project goals - Presentation of data was clear and logical.	- Adequate amounts of reasonably good data were presented to address hypothesis or project goals. - Presentation of data was not entirely clear.	- Some data were lacking or not fully sufficient to address hypothesis or project goals. - Presentation of data was included, but unclear or difficult to comprehend.	- Results were not described - Presentation of data was missing.
Conclusions and Future Work	- Reasonable conclusions were given and were strongly supported with evidence. - Conclusions were connected to project goals or hypothesis and their relevance in a wider context was discussed.	- Reasonable conclusions were given and were supported with evidence. - Conclusions were connected to project goals or hypothesis, but their relevance was not discussed.	- Reasonable conclusions were given - Conclusions were not compared to project goals or hypothesis and their relevance was not discussed.	- Conclusions were given. - Little connection of conclusions to project goals or hypothesis was apparent.	- Conclusions were missing - Conclusions were not connected to the project goals or hypothesis.
Poster	- All expected components are present, clearly laid out, and easy to follow in absence of presenter. - Text is concise, free of spelling or typographical errors; background is unobtrusive. - Figures and tables are appropriate and labeled correctly - Photographs/tables/graphs improve understanding and enhance visual appeal.	- All expected components are present, but layout is crowded or confusing to follow in absence of presenter. - Text is relatively clear, mostly free of spelling and typographical errors; background is unobtrusive. - Most figures and tables are appropriate and labeled correctly. - Photographs/tables/graphs improve understanding	- Most expected components are present, but layout is confusing to follow in absence of presenter - Text is relatively clear, but some spelling and typographical errors are present; background may be distracting - Figures and tables are not always related to text, or are not appropriate, and/or are poorly labeled. - Photographs/tables/graphs do little to improve	- Some expected components are present, but layout is untidy and confusing to follow in absence of presenter - Text is hard to read due to font size or color, some spelling and typographical errors; background may be distracting. - Figures and tables do not relate to text, or are not appropriate, and/or are poorly labeled. - Photographs/tables/graphs	- Some expected components are present, but poorly laid out and confusing to follow in absence of presenter - Text is hard to read, messy and contains multiple spelling and typographical errors, very poor background - Figures and tables are poorly done - Visual aids not used.

Score	9 - 10 (Excellent)	7 - 8 (Very Good)	5 - 6 (Good)	3 - 4 (Fair)	1 - 2 (Poor)
			understanding	limited and do not improve understanding.	
Knowledge of Project: Ability to Answer Questions	- Presenter clearly states what is to be discussed. - Entire talk is organized around defined goals and has smooth transition between sections. - Concluding portion of talk reemphasizes the goals and what was learned. - Presenter answers difficult questions clearly and succinctly. -**The talk is not too long! 2-5 minutes maximum.**	- Presenter clearly states what is to be discussed. - Entire talk is organized around defined goals and has smooth transition between sections. - Concluding portion of talk reemphasizes the goals and what was learned. - Presenter answers most questions. - The talk has to much detail.	- Overall goals are not clear to the listener. - Some sections of the talk are not clearly related and/or somewhat choppy transitions. - Concluding portion of talk reemphasizes the goals and what was learned. - Presenter has some difficulty answering challenging questions. - The talk is longer than necessary.	- Overall goals are not apparent to the listener. - Presentation moves off topic in a way that is not relevant or valuable. - It was not possible to explain what was learned. - Presenter has difficulty answering challenging questions. - The talk is much longer than necessary.	- Overall goals are not apparent to the listener. - Presentation moves off topic in a way that is not relevant or valuable. - It was not possible to explain what was learned. - Presenter does not understand questions. - The presenter talked for too long.

Adapted from the rubric developed by the American Society for Microbiology and the Committee for the Annual Biomedical Research Conference for Minority Students