

## UND's GRAD 2024 GRAD Judging Rubric

<b>Judge:</b>		<b>Presentation #:</b>		
<b>Poster</b>				
	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>
<b>Organization</b>	<b>8</b> Topic was <u>immediately</u> evident, <u>entire</u> sequence of Poster was <u>logical</u> , and content was <u>entirely</u> clear.	<b>6</b> Topic was <u>evident</u> , <u>most</u> of the Poster sequence was logical, and content was <u>mostly</u> clear.	<b>4</b> Topic was <u>initially hidden</u> but became evident, <u>some</u> of the Poster sequence was logical, and/or content was <u>somewhat</u> clear.	<b>2</b> Topic was <u>hidden</u> , Poster sequence was <u>illogical</u> , and/or <u>content</u> was unclear.
<b>Formatting</b>	<b>8</b> <u>All</u> fonts, graphics, colors, headings, and indentations were <u>effectively</u> combined to enhance clarity;  Text length and visual display of data <u>effectively</u> enhanced communicative impact of Poster.	<b>6</b> <u>Most</u> fonts, graphics, colors, headings, and indentations were <u>acceptably</u> combined to enhance clarity;  Text length and visual display of data <u>acceptably</u> enhanced communicative impact of Poster.	<b>4</b> <u>Some</u> fonts, graphics, colors, headings, and indentations were <u>adequately</u> combined to enhance clarity;  Text length and visual display of data <u>acceptably</u> enhanced communicative impact of Poster.	<b>2</b> Fonts, graphics, colors, headings, and indentations were <u>poorly</u> combined resulting in the Poster being <u>unclear</u> ;  Text length and/or visual display of data <u>poorly</u> enhanced the communicative impact of Poster.
<b>Presentation</b>				
	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>
<b>Communication</b>	<b>8</b> Research components were explained in a concise, clear manner that was <u>fully</u> understandable to an external audience and was within the time limit.	<b>6</b> Research components were explained in a concise, clear manner that was <u>moderately</u> understandable to an external audience and was within the time limit.	<b>4</b> <u>Some</u> of the research components were explained in a concise, clear manner that was <u>partially</u> understandable to an external audience and/or was not within the time limit.	<b>2</b> Research components were <u>not</u> explained in a concise, clear manner, thus it was <u>not</u> understandable to an external audience and/or was <u>not</u> within the time limit.
<b>Effectiveness</b>	<b>8</b> Researcher made a <u>fully</u> <u>compelling</u> argument for the significance/ value of the research, and questions were answered with <u>strong</u> supporting evidence.	<b>6</b> Researcher made a <u>moderately</u> <u>compelling</u> argument for the significance/value of the research, and questions were answered with <u>sufficient</u> supporting evidence.	<b>4</b> Researcher made a <u>partially</u> <u>compelling</u> argument for the significance/value of the research and/or questions were answered with <u>weak</u> supporting evidence.	<b>2</b> Researcher made an argument for the significance/value of the research that was <u>not</u> compelling, and/or questions were answered with <u>no</u> supporting evidence.
<b>Professionalism</b>	<b>8</b> Researcher was <u>fully</u> engaged with a <u>strong</u> awareness of audience and was <u>polished</u> in the delivery.	<b>6</b> Researcher was <u>moderately</u> engaged with a <u>sufficient</u> awareness of audience and was <u>mostly</u> polished in the delivery.	<b>4</b> Researcher was <u>partially</u> engaged with a <u>weak</u> awareness of audience and/or was <u>partially</u> polished in the delivery.	<b>2</b> Researcher was <u>disengaged</u> with <u>no</u> awareness of audience and/or was <u>unpolished</u> in the delivery.