

**UND's GRAD 2022
GRAD Judging Rubric**

Judge:		Presentation #:		
Poster/Power Point				
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Organization	8 Topic was <u>immediately</u> evident, <u>entire</u> sequence of Poster/PowerPoint was <u>logical</u> , and content was <u>entirely</u> clear.	6 Topic was <u>evident</u> , <u>most</u> of the Poster/PowerPoint sequence was logical, and content was <u>mostly</u> clear.	4 Topic was <u>initially hidden</u> but became evident, <u>some</u> of the Poster/PowerPoint sequence was logical, and/or content was <u>somewhat</u> clear.	2 Topic was <u>hidden</u> , Poster/PowerPoint sequence was <u>illogical</u> , and/or <u>content</u> was unclear.
Formatting	8 <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/PowerPoint.	6 <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/PowerPoint.	4 <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/PowerPoint.	2 Fonts, graphics, colors, headings, and indentations were <u>poorly</u> combined resulting in the PowerPoint being <u>unclear</u> ; Text length and/or visual display of data <u>poorly</u> enhanced the communicative impact of Poster/PowerPoint.
Presentation				
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Communication	8 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.	6 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.	4 <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.	2 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.
Effectiveness	8 Researcher made a <u>fully compelling</u> argument for the significance/ value of the reserach, and questions were answered with <u>strong</u> supporting evidence.	6 Researcher made a <u>moderately compelling</u> argument for the significance/value of the research, and questions were answered with <u>sufficient</u> supporting evidence.	4 Researcher made a <u>partially compelling</u> argument for the significance/value of the reserach and/or questions were answered with <u>weak</u> supporting evidence.	2 Researcher made an argument for the significance/value of the reserach that was <u>not</u> compelling, and/or questions were answered with <u>no</u> supporting evidence.
Professionalism	8 Researcher was <u>fully</u> engaged with a <u>strong</u> awareness of audience and was <u>polished</u> in the delivery.	6 Researcher was <u>moderately</u> engaged with a <u>sufficient</u> awareness of audience and was <u>mostly</u> polished in the delivery.	4 Researcher was <u>partially</u> engaged with a <u>weak</u> awareness of audience and/or was <u>partially</u> polished in the delivery.	2 Researcher was <u>disengaged</u> with <u>no</u> awareness of audience and/or was <u>unpolished</u> in the delivery.