UND's GRAD 2023
GRAD Judging Rubric

Judge:			Presentation #:	

Poster

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Organization	**8** Topic was <u>immediately</u> evident, <u>entire</u> sequence of Poster was <u>logical</u>, and content was <u>entirely</u> clear.	**6** Topic was <u>evident</u>, <u>most</u> of the Poster 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 sequence was logical, and/or content was <u>somewhat</u> clear.	**2** Topic was <u>hidden</u>, Poster 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.	**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.	**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.	**2** 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.

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 research, 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 research and/or questions were answered with <u>weak</u> supporting evidence.	**2** 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.
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.