



Expo Poster Rubrics

Updated as of 6/11/2026



Scoring Rubric

Score	Rating	Description
1	No Attempt	No presentation given or effort evident; criteria not addressed.
2	Developing	Some effort shown; mastery of criteria is developing but lacks clarity, depth, or structure.
3	Proficient	Demonstrates solid understanding and competency of criteria; work is organized and complete but not yet exceptional.
4	Advanced	Strong display of criteria; goes beyond basic proficiency with notable quality.
5	Exemplary	Outstanding mastery of criteria- -innovative,thorough, and highly impactful; exceptional and original demonstration.

Poster Presentations

- **Poster Presentations (In Person or Online)**
 - A 5-10 minute presentation walking through the different sections of the poster followed by questions from the judge.

Each category is assigned one of the following rubrics:

- **All Subjects Presentation Rubric:**
 - Biological and Life Sciences
 - Business, Finance, and International Studies
 - Education
 - Engineering
 - Health Sciences and Health Professions
 - Physical and Applied Sciences
 - Social and Behavioral Sciences
- **Arts and Humanities Rubric:**
 - Arts and Humanities
- **Service-Learning Rubric:**
 - Service-Learning
- **Works in Progress Rubric:**
 - Works in Progress
 - Works In Progress – Class Project

Qualitative Questions

- **Qualitative Questions**

- An opportunity for judges to provide comments regarding student presentation. Responses will be shared with students at a later date.

1. Was the presenter asked a question about their research?

2. What do you think this student has done well and what could they improve?

Additional Comments:

All Subjects Presentation Rubric

Study rationale and Methodology

1. Presenter identified gaps in knowledge
2. Presenter has well-explained rationale/justification for the study
3. Presenter clearly stated questions or hypotheses/goals being addressed
4. Presenter makes clear connection between methodology selected (qualitative) or hypothesis/goals used
5. Presenter explains the methodology clearly

Analysis/Results

1. Presenter explains the findings and analysis clearly and accurately

Conclusion/Discussion

1. Presenter addresses the results by placing them into a broader framework
2. Presenter draws sufficient conclusions supported by the results

Presentation Overall

1. Flow of information is logical and clear
2. Presenter summarized study clearly
3. Presenter answered questions well
4. The length of the initial summary was appropriate for the topic presented
5. Study is innovative and has potential to contribute to the field
6. The presentation was visually appealing (e.g., appropriate use of text, graphics, figures, and tables)

Arts and Humanities Rubric

Purpose of Project

1. Presenter identified gaps in knowledge
2. Presenter has well-explained rationale/justification for the study
3. Presenter clearly stated questions or thesis being addressed
4. Presenter makes clear connection between thesis and methods used
5. Presenter explains the methodology clearly

Poster or Performance/Artistic Statement

1. Presenter clearly and accurately described the findings using a logical flow

Content

1. Content is complex (e.g., multiple layers, well thought out)
2. Content is original and creative

Presentation Overall

1. Flow of information is logical and clear
2. Presenter summarized study clearly
3. Presenter answered questions well
4. The length of the initial summary was appropriate for the topic presented
5. Study is innovative and has potential to contribute to the field
6. The presentation was visually appealing (e.g., appropriate use of text, graphics, figures, and tables)

Service-Learning Rubric

Community

1. Presenter clearly states the need being addressed
2. Presenter coordinated with the community partner
3. Presenter makes a clear connection between a specific need and the project
4. Presenter describes the scope of the community partner's work

Academic

1. Presenter makes connections to scholarship and field experience
2. Presenter clearly explains preparation, tasks, and conclusions of the project--including follow-up needs of the community partner

Critical Reflection and Empathy

1. Presenter clearly reflected upon their involvement in the project
2. Presenter connects observed experiences from the project and personal understanding of social issues
3. Presenter conveys their own emotional development during project

Presentation Overall

1. Flow of information is logical and clear
2. Presenter summarized project clearly
3. Presenter answered questions well
4. The length of the initial summary was appropriate for the topic presented
5. The presentation was visually appealing (e.g., appropriate use of text, graphics, figures, and tables)

Works in Progress Rubrics

Study Rationale

1. Presenter has well-explained rationale/justification for the study
2. Presenter clearly stated question or hypothesis being addressed

Clarity

1. Clear explanation of methodology used (*what the student did for the project*)
2. Clear justification of methodology used (*why they did it*)

Future Goals

1. Presenter was well-informed on future goals and it was clearly stated in presentation
2. Presenter gave an anticipated timeline to meet future goals
3. Presenter discussed implications of the project pertaining to the subject area
4. Presenter discussed recommendations for future works in the field

Presentation Overall

1. Presenter summarized study clearly
2. Presenter answered questions well
3. The length of the initial summary was appropriate for the topic presented
4. Study is innovative and has potential to contribute to the field
5. Presenter spoke clearly and confidently and flow of information was logical
6. The presentation was visually appealing (e.g., appropriate use of text, graphics, figures, and tables)