**VIRTUAL RESEARCH POSTER**

**Secondary Division**

**Judges Rating Sheet**

***New York State 2020-2021 Virtual Conference***

*Items required for state conference: pdf copy of Research Poster*

*How to submit: Uploaded to Tallo per guidelines from National HOSA*

*Deadline to Submit: March 31, 2021*

*Description: For the New York State Virtual State Conference, competitors will upload a pdf copy of the research poster to Tallo.*

*Copy of Poster Uploaded\*: Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_*

*\*If the materials are not uploaded, please note that applicable items on the rubric below cannot be judged.*

Section # \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Competitor Name & ID # \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Division: \_\_\_\_\_ SS Judge’s Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A. Overview** | **Excellent**  **10 points** | **Good**  **8 points** | **Average**  **6 points** | **Fair**  **4 points** | **Poor**  **0 points** | **JUDGE SCORE** |
| **1. Research Question** | The Research Question posed is health-related, specific, and reflects a deep understanding of an issue that needs addressing in the competitor’s local community. It is evident the competitor was thorough in developing the question. | The Research Question is health-related but could benefit from being more specific and more action-oriented. There is some detail lacking to make it stand out. | The Research Question sufficiently addresses a health topic, but leaves the judges wanting more clarification or information to fully understand the question posed. | The Research Question is confusing, not fully thought out, and/or not a good representation of a health issue. | The Research Question is drastically lacking substance or is not included at all. |  |
| **B. Poster Content** | **Excellent**  **5 points** | **Good**  **4 points** | **Average**  **3 points** | **Fair**  **2 points** | **Poor**  **0 points** | **JUDGE SCORE** |
| **1.Title** | A title is included and the poster contains:  competitor’s name, Division, Chapter #, School Name, and State/  Association. | N/A | N/A | N/A | Poster not submitted OR  Title is missing or all requirements are not met |  |
| **B. Poster Content** | **Excellent**  **5 points** | **Good**  **4 points** | **Average**  **3 points** | **Fair**  **2 points** | **Poor**  **0 points** | **JUDGE SCORE** |
| **2.References** | At least one reference is included on the poster. | NA | NA | NA | Poster not submitted OR  No references are included on the poster. |  |
| **3.Acknowledge-ments** | At least one person or community organization is acknowledged on the poster. | N/A | N/A | N/A | Poster not submitted OR    No acknowledgements are made on the poster |  |
| **B. Poster Content** | **Excellent**  **15 points** | **Good**  **12 points** | **Average**  **9 points** | **Fair**  **6 points** | **Poor**  **0 points** | **JUDGE SCORE** |
| **4.Abstract** | The Abstract does an excellent job summarizing the research. It clearly describes the purpose of the research, the overall methods, major findings, and a succinct summary of the conclusions. The abstract leaves the judges excited about learning more! | The Abstract included sufficient details to the purpose of the research, some of the methods, some findings, and is a good summary of the conclusions. The judges are curious about learning more. | The information provided in the Abstract to summarize the purpose, methods, findings, and conclusions is limited and/or some of these components are missing. | Some information was provided in the Abstract but was mostly surface-level and key points were missing. | Poster not submitted OR  The Abstract is missing or did not describe all key items. |  |
| **5. Methods** | The research methods are explicitly explained, including:  1) target population 2) how data was collected  3) how data was analyzed  4) how data was shared  5) A review of possible errors and biases is also included. | The research methods were explained. Some supporting points needed more detail, but all 5 items were covered. | Some of the research methods were explained but included only 4 of the 5 requirements. | The research methods explanation was limited and only included 2 or 3 of the 5 requirements. | Poster not submitted OR  The research methods were not explained or included and/or left the judges with more questions than answers. |  |
| **B. Poster Content** | **Excellent**  **15 points** | **Good**  **12 points** | **Average**  **9 points** | **Fair**  **6 points** | **Poor**  **0 points** | **JUDGE SCORE** |
| **6. Results** | The results of the research are presented and explained in a way that makes sense and can be easily understood. It is clear what was discovered and an additional explanation about why the results matter is included. | The results of the research are presented and explained but some questions remain. It is clear what was discovered but additional explanation about why the results matter is needed. | The results of the research are presented but the explanation is not clear. There seems to be important information that should have been included. Minimal explanation about why results matter. | The results of the research are limited and significant gaps are evident. No explanation of why the results matter. | Poster not submitted OR  The results of the research are not included and no description given of why they matter. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **B. Poster Content** | **Excellent**  **15 points** | **Good**  **12 points** | **Average**  **9 points** | **Fair**  **6 points** | **Poor**  **0 points** | **JUDGE SCORE** |
| **7. Conclusions** | The conclusion provides a short and solid justification of the research question, explains the relevance of findings to the community and/or world, and explains why the results are conclusive. | The conclusion is mostly concise and does a good job of summarizing the justification of the research question, the relevance of the results, and why they are conclusive. More information is needed. | The conclusion provides minimal justification of the research question. Questions remain as to how the results can be used or why the results are conclusive. | There is not a solid justification of the research question nor how results are relevant nor if they are conclusive. | Poster not submitted OR  The competitor failed to include conclusions or the conclusions drawn were out of scope. |  |
| **8. Images** | 2-5 images (graphs, tables, illustrations, photos, logos, etc.) are included. Images used add excellent value to the overall poster, complimenting the text, illustrating the findings, and reflecting key research. They stand out above others. | 2-5 images are included and they do a good job of adding overall value to the poster and accurately representing the details of the research and process. They however, lack the special ‘wow factor” | 2-5 images are included that adequately connect to the research. They do not enhance nor distract from the poster. | 2-5 images are included but their connection to the research and process is only fair. They distract from the overall appeal of the poster and/or do not accurately reflect the research project. | Poster not submitted OR  0-1, or more than 5 images are included |  |
| **C. Poster Design** | **Excellent**  **5 points** | **Good**  **4 points** | **Average**  **3 points** | **Fair**  **2 points** | **Poor**  **0 points** | **JUDGE SCORE** |
| **1. Poster Size** | Poster is 48” x 36” landscape orientation | N/A | N/A | N/A | Poster not submitted OR  Poster is not 48” x 36” and/or landscape orientation |  |
| **C. Poster Design** | **Excellent**  **10 points** | **Good**  **8 points** | **Average**  **6 points** | **Fair**  **4 points** | **Poor**  **0 points** | **JUDGE SCORE** |
| **2. Artistic Design** | The artistic quality is exceptional. The design is vibrant, balanced, visually pleasing and pushes the boundaries of artistic expression. The design choices take the poster to the next level and has that “wow factor” | The artistic quality is good; the design stands out. The design elements seem to be well-thought out and comprehensive. | The poster incorporates balanced design choices, showcasing some artistic features. Some of the poster lacks artistic details that took away from the overall visual of the poster. | Basic levels of artistic design are incorporated into the poster. Better design/color choices should be incorporated to assure the design of the poster is pleasing to the eye. | Poster not submitted OR  The design is simplistic and not visually appealing. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **C. Poster Design** | **Excellent**  **15 points** | **Good**  **12 points** | **Average**  **8 points** | **Fair**  **4 points** | **Poor**  **0 points** |  |
| **3. Appearance / Organization** | The poster is exceptionally neat, organized, and error-free. Information is clearly displayed and easy to understand and follow. Content is strategically placed to enhance the research and the poster can easily be seen from 3 feet away. | Poster is neat and organized. The content has a logical flow with only minimal errors and does a good job enhancing the research process. | The poster was basic and could use more organization and thought to be understood. | The poster lacked organization and/or contained several spelling errors. The flow of information seemed to be out of order and it was difficult to read the poster from 3 feet away. | Poster not submitted OR  The poster is either too busy or lacks enough detail to support the content. |  |
| **TOTAL POINTS (130)** | | | | | |  |