

2019 UTSC Undergraduate Research Forum

Judging Rubric - Students judged on: Content & Comprehension, Aesthetics & Organization, Communication, Engagement (Out of 27 points)

The focus of this year's Undergraduate Research Forum is Knowledge Translation (KT), which refers to the translation of research results into knowledge available to others beyond academia. KT moves research from the laboratory, the research journal, and the academic conference into the hands of people who can put it to practical use.

Board #	Student name:			Judge's name:	Points
Criteria	Novice (1-2 pts)	Proficient (3-4 pts)	Expert (5-6 pts)		
<b>Content and Comprehension</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the presenter clearly outline the nature and aims of research?</li> <li>• Did the presenter clearly indicate what was significant about this research?</li> <li>• Did the presentation help you understand the research?</li> <li>• Does this project fit into one or more of the themes list below?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Content may report information but includes little theory and/or research;</li> <li>• Research question is simplistic, lacks rigor, creativity, and does not relate to the university's thematic research areas*;</li> <li>• Main points are unclear and the significance of the research is poorly explained;</li> <li>• Presenter does not have a clear grasp of their research.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Content contains some theory and/or research;</li> <li>• Research question is somewhat complex, creative, and relates to the university's thematic research areas*;</li> <li>• Some of the main points are unclear; significance of the research not fully explained.</li> <li>• Presenter comprehends their research.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Content contains theory and/or research;</li> <li>• Research question is highly complex, creative and relates directly to the university's thematic research areas*;</li> <li>• Main points have been summarized with clarity; critical engagement with the literature/previous research; significance of the research clearly explained.</li> <li>• Presenter has a clear grasp of their research.</li> </ul>	/6
<b>Visual Information &amp; Organization</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the poster enhance, rather than detract from, their presentation; and was it clear, legible, and concise?</li> <li>• Was the presentation well structured, did it flow?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Text and images clutter the poster; poor image resolution;</li> <li>• Font size, colors and patterns hinder readability;</li> <li>• Selected graphics are inappropriate or do not enhance the text;</li> <li>• Some serious sections missing; poorly structured; poster lacks flow;</li> <li>• Noticeable spelling and grammar mistakes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creative and engaging visuals;</li> <li>• Text and images are somewhat cluttered and of questionable quality;</li> <li>• Font size, colors or patterns detract from readability;</li> <li>• Some selected graphics adequately enhance the text;</li> <li>• All appropriate sections present but lacks flow of ideas;</li> <li>• Minimal spelling and grammar mistakes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very creative and engaging visuals;</li> <li>• Text and images are uncluttered and are of appropriate quality, size and resolution;</li> <li>• Font, colors and patterns enhance the organization of the poster;</li> <li>• Selected graphics engage and enhance the text.</li> <li>• Coherent and well structured poster; appropriate headings and sections are present with consistent flow of ideas;</li> <li>• No spelling and grammar mistakes.</li> </ul>	/6
<b>Communication</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the presenter make sufficient eye contact and have a good vocal range; maintain a steady pace and show confidence?</li> <li>• Was the thesis topic and its significance communicated in language appropriate for a non-specialist audience?</li> <li>• Did the presenter make sure not to trivialize their research?</li> <li>• Did the presenter stay within the allotted 3 minute time limit?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unable to clearly explain the research project;</li> <li>• Poor voice projection and eye contact;</li> <li>• Had difficulty explaining thesis topic &amp; significance to a non-specialist audience, minimized the value of their research;</li> <li>• Went over the time limit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explains the research project well;</li> <li>• Demonstrates adequate voice projection and eye contact;</li> <li>• Experienced some difficulty in explaining the thesis topic &amp; significance to a non-specialist audience;</li> <li>• Was somewhat successful in communicating the importance of the research;</li> <li>• Was able stay close to the time limit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly explains the research project;</li> <li>• Excellent voice projection and eye contact;</li> <li>• The thesis topic &amp; its significance was clearly explained for a non-specific audience. Clearly stipulated the merit of the research;</li> <li>• Stayed within the time limit with ease.</li> </ul>	/6
<b>Engagement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did you want to learn more about the research?</li> <li>• Was the presenter enthusiastic about their work?</li> <li>• Did the presenter capture and maintain your attention?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research did not sound interesting;</li> <li>• Displayed little of no enthusiasm for their work;</li> <li>• Unable to engage visitors in discussion of the research;</li> <li>• Had difficulty maintaining the audience's attention.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Somewhat interested in learning more about the research;</li> <li>• Displayed some enthusiasm for their work, was able to answer questions to some extent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very interesting topic, would be interested in learning more;</li> <li>• Showed enthusiasm during presentation, eager to engage visitors in discussion of the research.</li> </ul>	/6
		Novice (1 pt)	Proficient (2 pts)	Expert (3 pts)	
<b>Citations, References, Context</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of in-text citations and references;</li> <li>• Inappropriate sources and non-scholarly sources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or two errors or inconsistencies with in-text citations and references;</li> <li>• Some inappropriate sources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All in-text citations and references follow an appropriate citation style;</li> <li>• Scholarly books and journal articles utilized.</li> </ul>	/3

\* Seven thematic areas in the University of Toronto's Strategic Research Plan:

**DISCOVER:** Our Understanding of Humanity and the Universe **SUSTAIN:** Societies, the Environment, and Natural Resources **PROMOTE:** Healthy People, Healthy Communities, and a Healthy World **ENGAGE:** Language, Culture, Art, and Values

**ADVANCE:** Governance, Diversity, and Social Justice **INNOVATE:** Technologies for the Future **BUILD:** Community and Livable Societies