

Marking rubric for POSTER group deliverable for the STAT 540 final project

Evaluation by:

Title of poster being evaluated:

SEE REVERSE TO GIVE LETTER MARKS IN FOUR AREAS! Circle the mark.

Comments

- thoughtful evaluation of your peers is part of *your* mark!
- be specific; when in doubt, mine the rubric on reverse for criteria to assess
- aim for ≥ 2 comments
- try to find something to praise
- constructive criticism also valuable

Marking rubric for POSTER group deliverable for the STAT 540 final project

Scientific story	Outstanding (A+)	Very good (A)	Adequate (A-)	Needs work (B)	Inadequate (\leq C)
	Basic biological question(s) clear to a non-specialist. Clear why the dataset(s) are relevant. Nature, scale, and complexity of the dataset(s) conveyed well via figures and numbers.		Biological problem statement is rote or unintelligible. Hard to tell what the data “looks like”. How does <i>this</i> data shed light on <i>that</i> question??		
Statistical analysis	Outstanding (A+)	Very good (A)	Adequate (A-)	Needs work (B)	Inadequate (\leq C)
	Clear translation of bio question into a statistical inference problem. Appropriate use of concepts, vocabulary, notation. Appropriate attention to experimental design, variability, large-scale testing issue. Effective use of figures to link data and statistical models/results.		Analysis poorly described/motivated, e.g. as a series of mechanical data manipulations. Statistical results stated as if they are self-explanatory, e.g. “naked p-value”. Unclear if observed effects are big relative to some meaningful measure of background variability. Poor or no use of a compelling performance measure.		
Presentation	Outstanding (A+)	Very good (A)	Adequate (A-)	Needs work (B)	Inadequate (\leq C)
	Organized, logical flow, right level of detail. What joy! Figures well integrated, referenced, and interpreted. English polished, concise, clear. Few/no grammar and spelling mistakes.		Obvious unanswered question, major missing info. Appears to contradict itself. Hard to follow. Reader forced to speculate why figures/tables appear when they do and to determine what they show. Spell-checking????		
Scientific maturity	Outstanding (A+)	Very good (A)	Adequate (A-)	Needs work (B)	Inadequate (\leq C)
	“Take home” message(s) clear. Affirms expected, highlights unexpected. Final product demonstrates thought, care, editing down, curation. Mature discussion of compromises, obstacles, strengths and weaknesses.		Obvious next steps are not explored or even identified. Little/no evidence of perspective, critical thought. Group let something simple hamper them. You sense you’re seeing every single bit of their work. You doubt alternative approaches were ever tried.		