

IRB Protocol Rubric

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Feasibility and Relevancy	100 % The proposed study is especially relevant and/or makes a contribution to the field	85 % The proposed study is relevant and/or feasible	75 % Parts of proposed study are not relevant and/or not feasible	0 % Overall, the proposed study is not relevant and not feasible
Completeness	100 % All relevant sections of the IRB protocol are addressed and student may have gone above and beyond in addressing them	85 % All required sections of the IRB protocol are addressed	75 % Most required sections of the IRB protocol are addressed, but a few are missing	0 % ome of the required sections of the IRB protocol are addressed, but the majority are missing
Details and Clarity	100 % The discussion in each section is especially detailed yet easy to follow with no grammatical errors The proposal clearly addresses a general	85 % The discussion in each section provides adequate detail and is easy to follow with no grammatical errors The proposal addresses a general audience	75 % The discussion in each section provides some detail, but some sections could include more information The details may be hard to follow or understand in some	0 % The discussion in most or all sections lacks adequate detail The details may be hard to follow or understand in some sections due to lack of flow or major grammatical

	audience (i.e., does not require expert knowledge in the topic of interest)		sections due to lack of flow or minor grammatical errors The proposal mostly addresses a general audience	errors The proposal fails overall to address a general audience.
Format	100 % Overall layout and presentation is professional and follows the guidelines of the IRB protocol of choice in regards to the section headings and required information.	85 % Overall layout and presentation is professional and follows the guidelines of the IRB protocol of choice in regards to the section headings and required information.	75 % Layout and presentation may demonstrate a few errors in professionalism (including grammatical errors) OR Does not follow IRB guidelines in regards to section headings and required information.	0 % Layout and presentation may demonstrate a few errors in professionalism (including grammatical errors) AND Does not follow IRB guidelines in regards to section headings and required information.
Writing Quality/AMA Citation	100 % Complete references for all articles are included and meet AMA standards without error No grammatical errors.	85 % Complete references for all articles are included and meet AMA standards with a few, minor errors A few grammatical errors may be present.	75 % References for most articles are included but may not be complete or fully meet AMA standards; more than a few, minor errors present Some recurring grammatical errors may be present.	0 % References for a few articles are included but may not be complete or fully meet AMA standards; many recurring errors are present Many recurring grammatical errors may be present.

Abstract Rubric

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Completeness	100 % All elements required by the conference of choice are included Abstract clearly summarizes all elements of the PICO(TS) nutrition question(s), i.e., all elements are represented including a summary of question(s), population, intervention and/or comparison, and key outcomes; An appropriate title, the statistical analysis, results or potential results, and conclusions sections are all included.	85 % All elements required by the conference of choice are included 1 of the key components (i.e., bullets under 'Excellent') are missing, i.e.: Summarizes most elements of the PICO(TS) nutrition question(s); at least 3 of the 4 required PICO elements are represented OR A relevant title is not included OR Statistical analysis are appropriate, but results or potential results and/or conclusions are not complete or do not seem completely appropriate.	75 % 2 of the key components (i.e., bullets under 'Excellent') are missing ,i.e.: All elements required by the conference choice are not included (e.g., abstract is not within the word limit and/or all required headings (if applicable) are not included) AND/OR Summarizes some elements of the PICO(TS) nutrition question(s); at least 2 of the 4 required PICO elements are represented AND/OR A relevant title is not included AND/OR The statistical analysis chosen are inappropriate for the research question(s) of interest AND/OR The results and conclusions are incomplete, and/or do not	0 % 3+ of the key components (i.e., bullets under 'Excellent') are missing, i.e.: All elements required by the conference choice are not included (e.g., abstract is not within the word limit and/or all required headings (if applicable) are not included) AND/OR Few elements of the PICO(TS) nutrition question(s) are summarized; at least 1 of the 4 required PICO elements are represented AND/OR A relevant title is not included AND/OR The statistical analysis chosen are inappropriate for the research question(s) of interest AND/OR The results and conclusions are incomplete, and/or do not

			align with the statistical analyses described.	align with the statistical analyses described
Clarity and Accessibility	100 % Abstract provides a clear, complete, concise, and logical presentation of the PICO(TS) nutrition question(s) The title clearly aligns with the question(s) of interest The abstract is clearly understood on its own and accessible to a wide scope of conference attendees at the conference of choice	85 % Abstract provides a concise and logical presentation of the PICO(TS) nutrition question(s) 1 of the following: The title does not clearly align with the question(s) of interest OR The abstract is clearly understood on its own and accessible to a wide scope of conference attendees at the conference of choice.	75 % Abstract presents the PICO(TS) nutrition question(s) but is missing some required elements which prevents it from being clear and complete AND 1 of the following: The title does not clearly align with the question(s) of interest OR The abstract is clearly understood on its own and accessible to a wide scope of conference attendees at the conference of choice.	0 % Abstract is attempted but does not focus on presenting elements of the PICO(TS) nutrition question(s); missing many required elements which prevents it from being clear, complete, and meaningful AND 1 of the following: Missing a title OR The abstract may not be accessible to a wide scope of conference attendees at the conference of choice as it may be too vague or too technical.
Format	100 % Overall layout and presentation is very professional and follows the guidelines of the student's conference of choice in regards to the	85 % Overall layout and presentation is professional and follows the guidelines of the student's conference of choice in regards to the	75 % Layout and presentation may demonstrate a few errors in professionalism (including grammatical errors), detracting from the purpose of the study or	0 % Layout and presentation may demonstrate more than a few errors in professionalism (including grammatical errors), detracting from the purpose

	section headings and word limit.	section headings and word limit	study proposal OR Does not follow conference guidelines in regards to section headings OR word limit.	of the study or study proposal AND Does not follow conference guidelines in regards to section headings AND word limit.
Writing Quality	100 % Complete references for all articles are included and meet AMA standards without error. No grammatical errors.	85 % Complete references for all articles are included and meet AMA standards with a few, minor errors. A few grammatical errors may be present.	75 % References for most articles are included but may not be complete or fully meet AMA standards; more than a few, minor errors present. Some recurring grammatical errors may be present.	0 % References for a few articles are included but may not be complete or fully meet AMA standards; many recurring errors are present. Many recurring grammatical errors may be present.

Conference Poster and Recording Rubric

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Poster Content: Knowledge	100 % Demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of the research topic with explanation and elaboration throughout All information is presented accurately and in a way all conference attendees can understand.	85 % Demonstrates general knowledge of research topic with some explanation and elaboration throughout Most, if not all, information is presented accurately and in a way all conference attendees can understand.	75 % Demonstrates general knowledge of research topic with limited details throughout Some recurrent errors in accuracy of information may be present or information is presented in a way all conference attendees may not understand.	0 % Demonstrates limited knowledge of topic, missing key details throughout Some recurrent errors in accuracy of information may be present Information is presented in a way that is difficult for all non-expert conference attendees to understand.
Poster Content: Format	100 % All key headings included All key points addressed clearly, concisely, and persuasively Presentation well-structured and presented in logical sequence/flow on	85 % All key headings included Overall, all key points adequately addressed clearly, and persuasively, though points could be more concise Presentation well-structured and presented in logical	75 % 1 key heading missing A few key points addressed incompletely, at too great a length, or are too detailed Poster somewhat structured but may be disjointed or the path the reader should skim it in is unclear	0 % >1 key heading missing Several key points are addressed incompletely, at too great a length, are too detailed, or are missing Verbose, unpersuasive writing Presentation not structured, highly

	poster Meets all format requirements for conference of choice	sequence/flow on poster, though figures or tables may not be placed well Meets all format requirements for conference of choice	Meets all format requirements for conference of choice	disjointed, and hard to follow Meets all format requirements for conference of choice
Poster Overview	100 % Poster is very professional in appearance – i.e., professional background, font, color, and format that support topic are used and does not detract from presentation; loud colors, PowerPoint designs, and distracting animations are excluded Text is legible from a distance and uncluttered Incorporates professional, relevant graphics, where applicable Proper grammar and spelling throughout Sources	85 % Poster generally professional in appearance – i.e., professional background, font, color, and format that support topic and does not significantly detract from presentation; loud colors, PowerPoint designs, and distracting animations are excluded Text is legible from a distance and overall is uncluttered Incorporates graphics that are generally professional and relevant A few minor errors in grammar or spelling Sources	75 % Poster lacking in professional appearance – i.e., background, font, color, format do not support topic and detract from presentation; some loud colors, PowerPoint designs, and/or distracting animations are included Though legible from a distance, the poster contains too much text and appears slightly cluttered Graphics, if incorporated, may not be professional or relevant to topic Some errors in grammar and/or spelling Sources are not all properly cited where applicable	0 % Poster significantly lacking in professional appearance – i.e., background, font, color, and format do not support topic and detract from presentation; loud colors, PowerPoint designs, and/or distracting animations are included Text is not legible from a distance and poster contains too much text Graphics, if incorporated, are not professional or relevant to topic Significant errors in grammar and/or spelling Sources are not all properly cited where applicable

	properly cited where appropriate.	properly cited where appropriate		
30-45 second Poster Presentation: Delivery	100 % Presents in a clear, easy to understand voice; speaks with ease Speaks at proper pace Correct, precise pronunciation Demonstrates certainty Highlights graphs and/or tables (if included) Presents information beyond reading poster Devotes appropriate time to each part of the presentation (i.e., highly efficient use of time) Does not exceed time limit (30-45 sec)	85 % Presents in a clear, easy to understand voice Speaking pace could be slightly slowed or slightly faster Minor uncertainties evident Correct pronunciation for most terminology Highlights graphs and/or tables (if included) Presents information with some reliance on reading poster Good use of time Devotes adequate time to each part of the presentation Stays within time limit (30-45 sec)	75 % Presents in a manner that is sometimes difficult to follow Speaks too fast or too slow Seems uncertain about important elements of presentation Some errors in pronunciation Does not highlight all graphs and/or tables (if included) Presents information with reliance on reading poster Time not focused on important parts of the presentation; devotes too much time to one important part at the expense of another important part; and/or spends some time discussing unimportant material Slightly over (45-60 sec) or under (<30 sec) time limit	0 % Presents in a manner that is very difficult to understand and follow Speaks too fast or too slow Significant errors in pronunciation Does not highlight graphs and/or tables (if included) Presents information with full reliance on reading poster Time not managed well, with limited time spent discussing important parts of presentation and/or too much time spent discussing unimportant material Significantly over (>60 sec) or under (<20 sec) time limit

Oral Presentation Rubric

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Content Knowledge	100 % Demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of the topic with explanation and elaboration throughout. All information is presented accurately and in an evidence-based manner.	85 % Demonstrates general knowledge of topic with some explanation and elaboration throughout. Most, if not all, information is presented accurately and in an evidence-based manner.	75 % Demonstrates general knowledge of topic with limited explanation and elaboration throughout. Some recurrent errors in accuracy of information may be present.	0 % Demonstrates limited knowledge of topic with no explanation and elaboration throughout. Some recurrent errors in accuracy of information may be present.
Presentation Organization	100 % All key points addressed clearly, concisely, persuasively. Presentation well-structured and presented in logical sequence.	85 % Adequately addresses key points. Generally clear, concise, and persuasive. Presentation in general well-structured and logical.	75 % Key points addressed incompletely, at too great a length or their details were confused or confusing. Presentation somewhat structured but may be disjointed at points.	0 % Several key points missing. Verbose, unpersuasive manner. Presentation not structured and highly disjointed.

Presentation Delivery	100 % Presents in a clear, easy to understand voice; speaks with ease. Correct, precise pronunciation. Demonstrates certainty. Presents information beyond reading slides/notes.	85 % Presents in a clear, easy to understand voice. Minor uncertainties evident. Correct pronunciation for most terminology. Presents information with some reliance on reading slides/notes.	75 % Presents in a manner that is sometimes difficult to follow. Seems uncertain about important elements of presentation. Some errors in pronunciation. Presents information with reliance on reading slides/notes.	0 % Presents in a manner that is very difficult to understand and follow. Significant errors in pronunciation. Presents information with full reliance on reading slides/notes.
Presentation Format	100 % Poster is very professional in appearance – i.e., professional background, font, color, and format that support topic are used and does not detract from presentation; loud colors, PowerPoint designs, and distracting animations are excluded Text is legible from a distance and uncluttered Incorporates professional, relevant graphics, where	85 % Poster generally professional in appearance – i.e., professional background, font, color, and format that support topic and does not significantly detract from presentation; loud colors, PowerPoint designs, and distracting animations are excluded Text is legible from a distance and overall is uncluttered Incorporates graphics that are generally professional and relevant	75 % Poster lacking in professional appearance – i.e., background, font, color, format do not support topic and detract from presentation; some loud colors, PowerPoint designs, and/or distracting animations are included Though legible from a distance, the poster contains too much text and appears slightly cluttered Graphics, if incorporated, may not be professional or relevant to topic Some	0 % Poster significantly lacking in professional appearance – i.e., background, font, color, and format do not support topic and detract from presentation; loud colors, PowerPoint designs, and/or distracting animations are included Text is not legible from a distance and poster contains too much text Graphics, if incorporated, are not professional or relevant to topic Significant errors in grammar and/or spelling Sources are not all properly cited where applicable

	applicable Proper grammar and spelling throughout Sources properly cited where appropriate.	A few minor errors in grammar or spelling Sources properly cited where appropriate	errors in grammar and/or spelling Sources are not all properly cited where applicable	
Presentation Time Management	100 % Highly efficient use of time. Devotes appropriate time to each part of the presentation. Speaks clearly and at proper pace. Does not exceed time limit for conference of choice.	85 % Good use of time. Devotes adequate time to each part of the presentation. Speaks clearly but speaking pace could be slightly slowed or slightly faster. Slightly exceeds time limit (by <1 min) or goes under time limit (by >30 sec).	75 % Some time spent discussing unimportant material. Time not focused on important parts of the presentation, or devotes too much time to one important part at the expense of another important part. Speaks unclearly (e.g., mumbles, keeps restarting sentences), too fast, or too slow. Exceeds or goes under in time limit (>1 min).	0 % Too much time spent discussing unimportant material. Time not managed well with limited time spent discussing important parts of presentation. Speaks unclearly, too fast, or too slow. Exceeds or goes under in time limit (by >1 min).