

Rubric for GMO Project Poster Presentation

Poster critiques are done as a **pod**; use this sheet as a guideline and then record your scores, questions, and comments for the two posters assigned to you **on Survey Monkey at <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/YT5TPBM>**. Please take this seriously and make substantive, constructive comments, just as you hope to receive substantive, constructive comments.

Team whose poster you are evaluating: 20-_____ Team/pod doing review: 20-_____ pod_____

The quality of the review is worth 15 points (for each of two posters) to the team doing the review.

Poster content 25 pts

	Criteria	Excellent	V. good	Marginal	Lacking	Pts
Overall logic behind making this new gene 5 pts.	Is the reason for creating the new gene clearly explained? How will this modification affect the organism in which it is expressed?	Uses diagrams, labels, captions, bullet points effectively to explain logic for new gene and how it will solve a problem. Explains effectively how the modification will affect the organism and why. 4-5 pts.	Needs more information or detail to fully explain logic for new gene. Explains how organisms will be affected, but is not totally clear. 2-3 pts.	Diagrams effective but lacking adequate explanation, or diagrams not useful. Does not explain adequately how the change will affect the organism. 1 pt.	Diagrams or explanation ineffective in explaining point of project. No explanation of how the change affects the target organism. 0 pt.	
Molecular strategies 5 pts.	Are parts of the new gene explained? What is the origin of the genes and promoters? How will they work?	Lists or provides a diagram with clear explanation of the genetic parts needed and overall strategy for creating the new gene. 4-5 pts.	List or diagram is present but it does not completely describe genetic parts and overall strategy for new gene. 2-3 pts.	List or diagram only marginally explains parts of new gene and strategy for making it. 1pt.	Information provided is unclear; readers will not understand features of gene or how made. 0 pt.	
Diagram of novel gene 5 pts.	Are the parts of the new gene logically & accurately labeled?	Diagram of plasmid or DNA molecule is clear & well labeled; diagram clearly relates to logic for making gene. 4-5 pts.	Diagram is mostly clear and well labeled. 2-3 pts.	Diagram is missing key elements or is labeled in confusing way. 1 pt.	Diagram is missing or unclear or unhelpful in understanding gene. 0 pt.	
Phylogenetic relationship 5 pts.	How is the gene of interest related to its paralogs and/or to its orthologs?	Phylogenetic relationship of your gene to other genes is diagrammed or shown as a MSA OR lack of homology to other genes is explained. 4-5 pts.	Phylogenetic relationship (or lack thereof) is mostly clear and explained well. 2-3 pts.	Relevant information on phylogenetic relationships could be significantly improved. 1 pt.	Discussion of phylogenetic relationships is missing, obviously inaccurate or unclear. 0 pt.	

Flow of the story 5 pts.	Does the story flow logically? Is it clear how the new gene will solve a problem or affect the organism?	Poster does excellent job tying together the parts of the story so it flows logically to explain how new gene will change a situation. 4-5 pts.	Individual parts of poster are solid, but the story does not flow as smoothly or logically as it could. 2-3 pts.	Poster needs more work to make the story flow or to explain how the new gene changes anything. 1 pt.	Story presented on poster is disjointed or illogical. 0 pt.	
---	--	---	--	--	---	--

Poster aesthetics 5 pts

	Criteria			Points
Title 1 pt.	Is the title concise, clear, interesting? Is it legible from 6 ft away? Are names of all authors and team #included?	Yes. Title draws people in; all criteria are met. 1 pt.	No; one or more criteria not met. 0pt.	
Organization & layout 2 pts.	Is the poster well organized and easy to read? Does poster layout contribute to its effectiveness? Is the text sufficient to explain graphics? Are the main points clear?	Poster is easy to navigate so reader can follow story easily. Reader can find the message through the combination of graphics and text. 2 pts.	Poster is poorly organized; reader would be confused about order of parts & where to focus, or meaning of some graphics is insufficiently explained. 0-1 pt.	
Figures, images, diagrams 1 pt.	Are graphics interesting, relevant, easy to interpret? Do they illustrate key points? Is technical detail suitable for poster audience?	Each is attractive, easy to understand, well labeled. Graphics and labels are large enough to see details. Use of graphics draws in viewers. No use of "shock" graphics. 1 pt.	One or more of the graphics are not relevant to the poster, not large enough or well labeled, or are intended only to shock viewers. 0 pt.	
Visual appeal & quality 1 pt.	Does the use of color and choice of fonts enhance the poster's impact? Has text been carefully edited to eliminate errors?	Pleasing to look at; good use of color and graphics. No spelling or grammatical errors. 1 pt.	Color scheme or fonts may distract from effectiveness of poster; contains spelling or grammatical errors. 0 pt.	

Oral presentation of poster

20 pts Criteria

points

Explanation of poster and answering of questions 10 pts	Did the pod presenting the poster guide you through the poster confidently and effectively?	Yes. Presenters highlighted main points, explained the approach taken, & could answer questions about proposed work. 7-10 pts.	Somewhat. Presenters did a fair job explaining the project & could answer at least some questions about the proposed work. 3-6 pts.	Presenters struggled to explain the material, appeared to not understand parts of the project, or were unable to answer questions. 0-2 pts.	
Participation by all members 10 pts	Did <i>all</i> members of the subgroup participate in presenting the poster?	Yes. All two or three members were actively involved in explaining the project and answering questions we asked. 7-10 pts.	Somewhat, but not all members were equally involved. One or more didn't seem comfortable answering questions without help. 3-6pts. Name(s) of presenter	No. One or two members dominated the presentation while other members contributed very little. 0-2 pts. Name of presenter who dominated:	

			who could not explain poster or answer questions:		
--	--	--	---	--	--

Comments on content and oral presentation of the poster: To earn 15 pts. per poster critiqued, you must include substantive comments along with the rubric numerical scores in the Survey Monkey form: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/YT5TPBM>. Be sure you have carefully recorded your scores AS A POD on this sheet before you transfer them to the Survey Monkey. Once you begin the survey you must finish your critiques of both posters in one session.