

ABRCMS Judging Rubric – Poster, Oral & ePoster Presentations

(Copyright © 2023, American Society for Microbiology/ABRCMS, All Rights Reserved)

SCORE	BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS OR OBJECTIVE	METHODS (Study Participants, Research Design, Procedures)	RESULTS	CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background was not stated Hypothesis/Objective was not stated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methods were not stated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results were not provided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions were missing Statement about Future Work was not included
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background was either unclear or lacked a proper connection to the Hypothesis/Objective Hypothesis/Objective was not clear or relevant to the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methods were unclear or not directly relevant to Hypothesis/Objective 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results were presented; however, they lacked sufficient data to address the Hypothesis/Objective effectively Data were difficult to comprehend 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions were included but little connection was made to the Results Statement about Future Work was provided but did not logically follow from Results
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background was unclear or incomplete Hypothesis/Objective was clear but not appropriately linked to the Background 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methods were appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective however, they lacked sufficient relevant information to fully understand the procedures followed in the study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results included sufficient data to address the Hypothesis/Objective Data were difficult to comprehend 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions drawn from Results were reasonably supported but did not explicitly establish relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective Statement about Future Work somewhat followed the Results
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background was clear and relevant to the Hypothesis/Objective but included information that went beyond the scope of the project Hypothesis/Objective was clear and appropriately linked to the Background 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methods were clear, appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective and provided sufficient details to understand the procedures carried out in the study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results included sufficient data to effectively address the Hypothesis/Objective Data were comprehensive and easily understandable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions were supported by the Results but the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective was unclear or not fully explained Statement about Future Work logically followed from the presented Results
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background provided a clear and relevant overview of previous research that informed the project's hypothesis/objective Hypothesis/Objective was clear and appropriately linked to the Background 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methods were clear, effectively linked to the Hypothesis/Objective and accompanied by a clear rationale. They provided comprehensive details that enable a full understanding of the procedures conducted in the study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results included sufficient high-quality data to successfully address the Hypothesis/Objective Data were clear, logical, thorough, and easy to comprehend allowing for a comprehensive understanding of the findings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions drawn from Results were strongly supported and the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective was clearly demonstrated Statement about Future Work logically followed the Results and included clear next steps

SCORE	OVERALL PRESENTATION AND HANDLING QUESTIONS	QUALITY OF THE POSTER OR ORAL PRESENTATION
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacks knowledge about the research project and does not demonstrate understanding • Relies on reading directly from text (slide, script, or poster) throughout the entire presentation • Does not understand questions • Presentation is confusing and difficult to follow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the expected components* are missing and the layout is confusing and difficult to follow • Text in the poster/slides is hard to read, messy and illegible, or has spelling or typographical errors • The background of the poster/slides is very poor • Photographs/tables/graphs are poorly done and fail to effectively convey communication
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibits weak understanding of the research project • Relies on reading directly from text (slide, script, or poster) most of the time • Struggles to provide satisfactory answers to questions • Presentation is generally unclear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not all the expected components* are present and the layout is untidy and confusing to follow • Text in the poster/slides is hard to read due to font size or color, or has spelling or typographical errors • The background of the poster/slides is distracting • Photographs/tables/graphs are not related to the text or are poorly labeled or do not improve understanding of the project
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a partial understanding of the research project • Has some difficulty answering challenging questions • Presentation is somewhat unclear and contains inconsistencies in the delivery of information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the expected components* are present, but the layout is confusing • Text is relatively clear and legible, but has spelling or typographical errors • The background of the poster/slides is distracting • Photographs/tables/graphs are not related to the text, or labeled correctly or do not improve understanding of the project
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates good understanding of the research project • Communicates clearly and naturally • Capably addresses most of the questions raised • Presentation is clear for the most part, but contains inconsistencies in the delivery of information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All expected components* are presented, but layout is crowded or jumbled making it confusing to follow • Text is relatively clear, legible, and mostly free of spelling or typographical errors • The background of the Poster/slides is unobtrusive • Most photographs/tables/graphs are appropriate and labeled correctly, which improve understanding of the project
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates strong understanding of the research project • Communicates clearly, naturally and with enthusiasm • Provides clear and concise responses to challenging questions • Presentation is logical, effective, and clearly conveys information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All expected components* are presented and are clearly laid out and easy to follow in the absence of presenter • Text is concise, legible, and free of spelling or typographical errors • The background of the Poster/slides is unobtrusive • All photographs/tables/graphs are appropriate and labeled correctly, which improve understanding of the project and enhance the poster/slides' visual appeal <p><i>*Components are defined as Title, Authors and Institutional Affiliation, Hypothesis/Objective, Background, Methods, Results, Conclusions, Future Work, Bibliography, and Acknowledgments</i></p>

