

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.
 - a. Submitted abstract will be evaluated per rubric by the Education Committee Co-Chairs and the Coordinator of Posters prior to date of meeting. This section is worth 20% of total score.
 - b. 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:						Total score	Total score
Primary Author and degree: _____						Abstract 20%	Poster 55%
Poster Category (circle one): Student Resident Practitioner							
Summary: Abstract Score: _____ Poster Score: _____ Verbal Presentation Score: _____							
	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 discussed Appropriate 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)