**GSHP Spring Poster Rubric:**

1. All Posters accepted will be evaluated by the GSHP Education Committee using the rubric below.
2. Posters will be judged on three aspects: abstract, poster, and verbal explanation of poster presentation. Each of these three aspects will be judged based on the rubric below.
	1. Submitted abstracts will be evaluated per rubric by the Education Committee prior to date of meeting. This section is worth 20% of total score.
	2. Members of the Education Committee will evaluate the actual poster and the verbal presentation onsite at the meeting during the poster session. The actual poster is worth 55% of the total score where the verbal presentation is worth 25% of the total score.
		* There will be a separate judging panel evaluating 1) student posters; 2) resident posters; and 3) practitioner posters. The group will come to consensus on which is the best poster in each of the respective categories. Recognition for the top student poster, resident poster and practitioner poster will be given at the meeting.

**Instructions:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title of Poster:****Primary Author and degree:**  **\_\_\_\_ \_ \_\_\_\_ \_ \_\_\_\_ \_ \_\_\_\_ \_** **Poster Category (circle one): Student Resident Practitioner** **Summary: Abstract Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Poster Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Verbal Presentation Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_** **(20%) (55%) (25%)** | **Total score****Abstract****20%** | **Total score****Poster****55%** |
|  |  |  |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Score**  | **Score**  |
| **Significance/Introduction** |
| Objective clearly defined | No objective stated | Objective not related to title of study | Objective stated, but not clear | Objective clearly stated, but not specific | Clear objective that is easily measurable and specific |  |  |
| Sufficient background presented for understanding of the study | No background information presented | Background presented, but does not support project rationale | Supportive background presented, but difficult to understand | Supportive background with adequate detail | Supportive background that is clear and adequate to highlight rationale for study |  |  |
| **Methods** |
| Methods clearly explained | No methods | Methods listed, but difficult to understand | Methods are adequate to understand most of study | Methods are adequate to understand study | Provides clear information to reproduce study results |  |  |
| Outcomes reflective of the objectives | No objectives stated | Important outcomes missing, did not reflect objectives | Pertinent outcomes listed, but not reflective of objectives | Outcomes were appropriate to measure outcomes | Outcomes were specific, appropriate to measure outcomes |  |  |
| **Results** |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Score**  | **Score**  |
| Results clearly stated, statistical and clinical significant indicated as appropriate | Results not stated | Results stated, but unclear | Results stated, but unable to determine statistical and/or clinical significance | Results stated, but difficult to interpret results to determine significance | Results appropriately to determine statistical and/or clinical significance |  |  |
| Reported on items stated to be collected | Failed to report any outcome(s) stated in methods | Reported on some outcome(s), but not all of them | Reported all outcomes, but also highlighted results not in methods | Reported all pertinent outcomes | Reported all outcomes with sufficient detail to understand significance |  |  |
| **Discussion/Conclusion** |
| Conclusion clearly stated | No conclusion stated | Incorrect or improper conclusions based on results | Conclusion stated, but not well defined or over-reached | Conclusion well stated, but may be missing one component (e.g. bias) | Non-biased summary, accurate inferences based on data |  |  |
| Recognition of study limitations | No study limitations discussed | Limitations noted, but no/limited impact on study | Pertinent limitations listed, but not addressed | Addressed pertinent limitations | Adequately addressed all major study limitations |  |  |
| Clinical relevance discussedAppropriate documentation of resources used | No clinical relevance discussed | Discussed, but unsure of impact on pharmacy | Clinical relevance somewhat understood | Understood the clinical relevance of results | Able to understand impact of study results in pharmacy practice |  |  |
| **Formatting/organization** |
| Correct grammar/spelling/ punctuation | >5 mistakes | -- | ≤5 mistakes | -- | 0 mistakes |  |  |
| Graphics, tables, charts easy to read | >5 mistakes | -- | ≤5 mistakes | -- | 0 mistakes |  |  |
| **Total points (out of 55)** |  |  |

 **Verbal Presentation (25%)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Score given** |
| Correct grammar/spelling/punctuation | No eye contact; Inability to articulate project details | Minimum eye contact; Reads from poster heavily | Average eye contact; Clearly states purpose and content of poster but limited scientific analysis | Good eye contact; presents well and articulates details of the project with some clarification needed | Excellent eye contact and confidence; Has clear knowledge of project details; Clearly articulates project detail with minimum clarification needed |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments (list any pros or cons that were noticed, and how the poster may be improved) |
|  |