# Assignment 3: Producing and presenting a Scientific Poster
# Marking rubric 2024-25

## Assessment Criteria

The report will be assessed in terms of:

- Content of the poster (has required and relevant material been included?): 20%;

- Structure (is the poster well organised and easy to follow?): 10%;

- Content of the oral presentation (did you give the essential and necessary information): 30%;

- Presentation quality (Are you speaking distinctively, without reading your notes, is the presentation engaging?) 10%;

- Responses to questions (Are you capable to explain your work and talk about what you did?): 30%.

A summary of the rubric used for each of the above criteria is described in turn.

| Content of the poster - 20% | |
|---|---|
| **A1**<br>90-100% | The poster has a very informative title and clear presenter information. There is a very clear and insightful description of the dataset as well as several interesting aspects of the data described which are supported by associated media, such as figures and/or tables. All figures are of a very high quality and legible with clearly labelled axes and informative captions. The conclusions are clearly stated, and future potential avenues of statistical analyses identified. There are little or no grammatical or spelling errors. The size and font of the text is very easy to read from 1m. |
| **A2**<br>80-89% | The poster has an informative title and clear presenter information. There is a generally clear and insightful description of the dataset as well as several interesting aspects of the data which are generally well supported by associated media, such as figures and/or tables. All figures are of high quality and legible with clearly labelled axes and descriptive captions. The conclusions are clearly stated. There are very few grammatical or spelling errors. The size and font of the text is easy to read from 1m. |
| **A3**<br>70-79% | The poster has a reasonably informative title and presenter information is present. There is a mostly clear description of the dataset as well as some interesting aspects of the data which are reasonably well supported by associated media, such as figures and/or tables. All figures are of relatively high quality and legible with clearly labelled axes and captions. The conclusions are generally well stated. There are no major grammatical or spelling errors. The size and font of the text is generally easy to read from 1m. |
| **B**<br>60-69% | The poster has a title that gives a general idea of the content and presenter information in given. There is a general description of the dataset but this is limited in places. The statements made regarding the insight gleaned from the dataset are vague in places or are not fully supported by the associated media, such as figures and/or tables. All figures are reasonably legible with labelled axes and captions. The conclusions are vague and/or unclear. There are a few major grammatical or spelling errors. The size and font of the text is somewhat difficult to read in places from 1m. |
| **C**<br>50-59% | The poster has a title that does not explain the content of the paper well and the presenter information may not be very clear. There is an attempt to provide some description of the dataset but this is limited or unclear. No clear statements are made regarding any interesting aspects of the dataset or the statements are vague or are not fully supported by the associated media, such as figures and/or tables. Figures lack clarity. The conclusions are vague and/or unclear. There are numerous grammatical or spelling errors. The size and font of the text difficult to read from 1m. |
| **D**<br>40-49% | The poster has a uninformative or vague title and the presenter information may be limited or missing. There is little description of the dataset with very little information extracted from the data regarding potential relationships. Limited media are used to display the information, such as figures and/or tables. Figures lack clarity. The conclusions (if any) are poorly stared. There are several major grammatical or spelling errors. The size and font of the text is difficult to read from 1m. |
| **E-H**<br><40% | The poster has a very poor or missing title. Presenter information is difficult to see or missing. There is no useful description of the data. Information extracted from the data is inaccurate or wrong. Limited media are used, such as figures or tables, potentially containing irrelevant or wrong information. Figures are illegible. No conclusions are stated. There are numerous major grammatical or spelling errors. The size and font of the text is very difficult to read from 1m. |

| Structure - 10% | |
|---|---|
| **A1**<br>90-100% | The poster evidences a logical structure and flow that is very clear and easy to follow, emphasising the key scientific points very effectively. Headings/subheadings are informative and help guide the reader throughout the poster. Sections are very well sized and balanced. Figures, tables and other graphical displays are well placed that support the flow of the poster and information transfer to the reader. |
| **A2**<br>80-89% | The poster evidences a logical structure and flow that is generally clear and easy to follow, emphasising the key scientific points well. Headings/subheadings are generally informative and help guide the reader through the poster. Sections are generally well sized and balanced. Figures, tables and other graphical displays are well placed that support the flow of the poster. |
| **A3**<br>70-79% | The poster evidences a logical structure and flow that is generally clear and relatively easy to follow. Headings/subheadings are reasonably informative and help guide the reader through the poster. Sections are generally very well sized. Figures, tables and other graphical displays are reasonably well placed that support the flow of the poster. |
| **B**<br>60-69% | The poster evidences some logical structure and flow but may lack a little bit of clarity in how to follow. Most, but not all, headings/subheadings are informative and help guide the reader through the poster. Sections may be a little unbalanced in places and would benefit from some restructuring. Figures, tables and other graphical displays may detract from the flow of the poster in some places. |
| **C**<br>50-59% | The poster lacks some logical structure in places and it may be difficult to understand the flow. Some headings/subheadings are vague or uninformative and do not aid a clear understanding. Sections are unbalanced and would benefit from restructuring. Figures, tables and other graphical displays are poorly placed and detract from the flow of the poster in places. |
| **D**<br>40-49% | The poster lacks an overall logical structure and it is difficult to understand how to read the poster. Several headings/subheadings are vague or uninformative leading to limited understanding. Sections are very unbalanced and would benefit from some restructuring. Figures, tables and other graphical displays are either missing or poorly placed that detract from the flow or create confusion. |
| **E-H**<br><40% | The poster is confused with a very limited logical structure making it very difficult to understand how to read. Headings/subheadings are incorrect or mismatched to the content of the section. Sections require major restructuring. Figures, tables and other graphical displays are largely missing or misplaced. |

| Content of the oral presentation - 30% | |
|---|---|
| **A1**<br>90-100% | The presentation clearly shows the important points. There is a very clear and insightful description of the dataset as well as several interesting aspects of the data studied which are supported by associated media, such as figures and/or tables. All important figures are appropriately described. The conclusions are clearly stated, and future potential avenues of statistical analyses identified. |
| **A2**<br>80-89% | The presentation shows the important points. There is a generally clear and insightful description of the dataset as well as several interesting aspects of the data studied which are supported by associated media, such as figures and/or tables. Most of the important figures are appropriately described. The conclusions are is somewhat clear and insightful on future works and limitations. |
| **A3**<br>70-79% | The presentation reasonable tackles the important points. There is a generally decent description of the dataset as well as some interesting aspects of the data studied which are supported by associated media, such as figures and/or tables. The description of the figures lacks some details. The conclusions is silent on some points. |
| **B**<br>60-69% | The presentation shows the important points. There is a description of the dataset as well as several interesting aspects of the data studied which are supported by associated media, such as figures and/or tables. Most of the important figures are appropriately described. The conclusions are is somewhat clear and insightful on future works and limitations. |
| **C**<br>50-59% | The information in the presentation is not very clear. There is an attempt to provide some description of the dataset but this is limited or unclear. No clear statements are made regarding any interesting aspects of the dataset or the statements are vague or are not fully supported by the associated media, such as figures and/or tables. Figures lack clear description. The conclusions are vague and/or unclear. |
| **D**<br>40-49% | The presentation is unclear, lacks content. There is little description of the dataset with very little information extracted from the data regarding potential relationships. Media and tables are almost ignored by the presentation. The conclusions (if any) are poorly stated. |
| **E-H**<br><40% | The poster has a very poor content, or the content is misleading. There is no useful description of the data. Information extracted from the data is inaccurate or wrong. The figure comments are unrelated with the data. No conclusions are stated. |

| Presentation quality - 10% | |
|---|---|
| **A1**<br>90-100% | You are speaking intelligibly, your presentation is ear-catching and attractive while remaining professional, you manage to convey important informations in a natural way, and your presentation focuses on the main points. You are not reading your notes and you seem to know what you are talking about. |
| **A2**<br>80-89% | You are speaking intelligibly, your presentation is ear-catching and attractive while remaining professional, you manage to convey most important informations in a natural way, and your presentation focuses on the main points. You are seldom reading your notes and you seem to know what you are talking about. |
| **A3**<br>70-79% | You are speaking correctly, your presentation lacks catchiness while remaining professional, you manage to convey some important informations but seem a little artificial, and your presentation leave some main points aside. You are seldom reading your notes and you seem to know what you are talking about. |
| **B**<br>60-69% | You are speaking correctly, your presentation lacks catchiness while remaining professional, you manage to convey some important informations but seem a little artificial, and your presentation doesn't seem to show the most important points compared to your report. You are == reading your notes and you seem to know what you are talking about. |
| **C**<br>50-59% | Your speaking skills are decent, your presentation lacks catchiness while remaining professional, you manage to convey some important informations but seem a little artificial, and your presentation doesn't seem to show the most important points compared to your report. You are reading your notes and do not seem to know where you're going with your presentation. |
| **D**<br>40-49% | Your presentation is not attractive while remaining professional, some information are present but they are not clearly presented. The presentation lacks organisation, and your presentation doesn't seem to show the most important points compared to your report. You are reading your notes and do not seem to know where you're going with your presentation. |
| **E-H**<br><40% | Your presentation is not attractive and non professional, information is absent or unintelligible. The presentation lacks organisation, and your presentation doesn't seem to show the most important points compared to your report. You are reading your notes and do not seem to know where you're going with your presentation. |

| Response to questions - 30% | |
|---|---|
| **A1** 90-100% | You can give precise responses to the questions on every subject: methodology, results, data analysis, model assumption. You don't hesitate to say if you don't know the answer but give information that could be useful in some way. You show that you thought about your work and its implications. Your responses are natural, and invite to discussion. |
| **A2** 80-89% | You can give precise responses to most of the questions on most subject: methodology, results, data analysis, model assumption. You don't hesitate to say if you don't know the answer but give information that could be useful in some way. You show that you thought about your work and its implications. Your responses are natural, and invite to discussion. |
| **A3** 70-79% | You can give decent responses to most of the questions on most subject: methodology, results, data analysis, model assumption. You don't hesitate to say if you don't know the answer but lack perspective on the questions. You show that you thought about your work and its implications. Your responses are somewhat showing your interest on the problem. |
| **B** 60-69% | You can give some responses to most of the questions on some subject: methodology, results, data analysis, model assumption. You have problem understanding some of the questions on your work. You lack perspective on the limitations of your work. |
| **C** 50-59% | You can give a few responses to most of the questions on some subject: methodology, results, data analysis, model assumption but lack essential details about some of these. You have problem understanding some of the questions on your work. You lack perspective on the limitations of your work. |
| **D** 40-49% | You painfully give responses to most of the questions on some subject: methodology, results, data analysis, model assumption but lack essential details about some of these. You have problem understanding some of the questions on your work. You show little interest to the problem. |
| **E-H** <40% | You give misleading or false responses to the questions and lack essential details about some of the main elements of your work. You have problem understanding some of the questions on your work. You show little interest to the problem. |