



Undergraduate Research Symposium

Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences (AHSS) Poster Evaluation Rubric

Name: _____ Presentation Title: _____ Total: _____/90 Rank: _____

	0-3	4-6	7-9	10	Score
Poster Heading	Several components missing. Title is not provided or does not adequately capture the focus of inquiry. Student(s) names and/or advisor not provided. Institution and/or department are missing.	All components are present. Title only vaguely describes the scholarly inquiry and is somewhat disconnected from the topic presented.	All components are present. Title adequately describes the topic. Language is appropriate for the discipline.	All components are present. Title is engaging and clearly captures the essence of the scholarly inquiry. Language is sophisticated and discipline-appropriate.	
Abstract	No abstract is included and/or is very difficult to identify.	Abstract provides a minimal overview of the inquiry's scope and significance. Abstract lacks clear connection to theoretical framework or methodology.	Abstract provides a reasonable overview of the inquiry's scope, significance, and methodological approach. Abstract aligns with disciplinary conventions.	Abstract provides an eloquent and concise overview that situates the work within its field while clearly articulating its significance and approach.	
Research Question	Research question or thesis is missing or inappropriate for humanistic/social science inquiry. Student presents a topic rather than a focused inquiry.	The research question/thesis is present but unclear. Question/thesis is either too broad or too narrow for meaningful analysis. Shows limited engagement with theoretical frameworks.	Research question/thesis is identifiable and appropriate for the discipline. Shows reasonable engagement with theoretical frameworks and demonstrates some original thinking.	Research question/thesis is sophisticated, clearly articulated, and demonstrates deep engagement with theoretical frameworks. Shows independent critical thinking and scholarly originality.	
Introduction or Background	Does not identify relevant theoretical frameworks or cultural/historical context. Fails to situate the work within broader scholarly conversations.	Attempts to identify theoretical frameworks but connections are unclear. Limited contextualization within broader scholarly conversations.	Adequately identifies theoretical frameworks and reasonably situates work within scholarly conversations. Provides appropriate cultural/historical context.	Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of theoretical frameworks and expertly situates work within scholarly conversations. Provides rich cultural/historical context.	

Methods	Methodological approach or analytical framework not indicated or inappropriate for humanities/social science inquiry.	Approach indicated but unclear or inconsistently applied. Limited explanation of analytical framework.	Approach is appropriate and adequately explained. Analytical framework is reasonably well-developed.	Approach is sophisticated, clearly articulated, and expertly aligned with research questions. Analytical framework is well-developed and thoughtfully applied.	
Results, Findings, or Main Argument	Analysis is inadequate or missing. Interpretations are unsupported or disconnected from evidence.	Analysis is present but superficial. Interpretations show limited engagement with evidence or theoretical frameworks.	Analysis is reasonably developed with supporting evidence. Interpretations show adequate engagement with theoretical frameworks.	Analysis is sophisticated and nuanced. Interpretations are well-supported and demonstrate deep engagement with evidence and theoretical frameworks.	
Conclusion And/or Discussion	Conclusions not indicated or fail to address research question/thesis. No discussion of implications or significance.	Conclusion present but vague. Limited discussion of implications or significance for the field. If applicable: Limited reflection on limitations or future directions.	Conclusion adequately addresses research question/thesis and discusses implications. If applicable: Reasonable reflection on limitations and future directions.	Conclusion demonstrates sophisticated understanding of inquiry's significance and broader implications. If applicable: Thoughtful reflection on limitations and future directions that advance the field.	
References	Sources inadequate or inappropriate for scholarly work. Citation format inappropriate or incorrect.	Some scholarly sources included but over-reliance on non-scholarly materials. Some citation formatting errors.	Mostly scholarly sources appropriate to the discipline. Few citation formatting errors.	Excellent use of scholarly sources demonstrating broad and deep engagement with the field. Citations perfectly formatted in appropriate style.	
Images and Overall Design	Disorganized or hard to follow. Visual elements (if used) detract from content. Significant writing errors. Format inappropriate for discipline.	Adequately organized but somewhat hard to follow. Visual elements neither add nor detract. Some writing errors. Format somewhat appropriate.	Well organized with logical flow. Visual elements support content. Few writing errors. Format appropriate to discipline.	Professional appearance with excellent organization. Visual elements enhance understanding. Error-free writing. Format expertly aligned with disciplinary conventions.	