Southeast Regional Fruit and Vegetable Conference

Student Poster Competition – Judging Rubric

Evaluation Overview

Category	Weight
1. Scientific Quality	**50%**
2. Presentation and Communication	**30%**
3. Poster Design and Visual Appeal	**20%**
TOTAL	**100%**

Each criterion is scored on a **1–10 scale**, with performance levels described below.

1. SCIENTIFIC QUALITY – 50%

Criteria	Excellent (9–10 pts)	Good (7–8 pts)	Fair (5–6 pts)	Needs Improvement (1–4 pts)
Experimental Design and Methodology	Research design is robust, appropriate, and well-controlled with clear replication and statistical rigor.	Design is sound with minor weaknesses or missing details.	Some flaws in design or analysis that limit conclusions.	Weak or inappropriate design; lacks replication or controls.
Objectives and Relevance	Objectives are clearly defined, relevant, and aligned with fruit/vegetable science goals.	Objectives mostly clear and relevant.	Objectives somewhat vague or incomplete.	Objectives unclear, inconsistent, or not relevant.
Depth and Thoroughness of Research	Demonstrates exceptional effort, creativity, and depth of investigation.	Good effort and understanding shown.	Limited exploration or shallow analysis.	Minimal effort or superficial understanding.
Conclusions and Interpretation	Conclusions logically supported by data; analysis is sound and critical.	Conclusions mostly supported; minor reasoning issues.	Some unsupported or overstated conclusions.	Weak or missing conclusions; poor interpretation of data.
Contribution and Real-World Application	Provides meaningful contribution to the field with clear application to fruit and vegetable production.	Demonstrates moderate practical relevance.	Limited or indirect contribution to real-world application.	No clear link to practical use or scientific advancement.

2. PRESENTATION AND COMMUNICATION – 30%

Criteria	Excellent (9–10 pts)	Good (7–8 pts)	Fair (5–6 pts)	Needs Improvement (1–4 pts)
Organization and Clarity	Presentation is logical, smooth, and easy to follow; transitions are clear and professional.	Well-organized with minor issues in flow.	Some disorganization or missing elements.	Disorganized or confusing; difficult to follow.
Delivery and Professionalism	Presenter speaks clearly, confidently, and with enthusiasm; maintains strong audience engagement.	Generally clear and professional with minor hesitation.	Uneven delivery or lack of confidence.	Unclear, monotone, or unprepared presentation.
Response to Questions	Answers confidently, thoughtfully, and accurately; demonstrates critical thinking.	Answers most questions adequately.	Responses incomplete or uncertain.	Unable to answer or responds inaccurately.

3. POSTER DESIGN AND VISUAL APPEAL – 20%

Criteria	Excellent (9–10 pts)	Good (7–8 pts)	Fair (5–6 pts)	Needs Improvement (1–4 pts)
Graphics and Figures	High-quality visuals enhance comprehension; all figures and tables are well-labeled and relevant.	Visuals are appropriate but could be more refined or better integrated.	Some visuals unclear or mismatched with text.	Missing, low-quality, or irrelevant visuals.
Overall Impact and Creativity	Poster is professional, engaging, and effectively communicates the research story	Strong overall impression with good visual appeal.	Average impact; lacks creativity or visual balance.	Weak visual impact; unprofessional or confusing design.

SCORING SUMMARY

Category	Maximum Points	Points
Scientific Quality	50 pts	___ / 50
Presentation and Communication	30 pts	___ / 30
Poster Design and Visual Appeal	20 pts	___ / 20
Total	100 pts	**___ / 100**

Judge's Comments:
(Provide constructive feedback on strengths, clarity, and suggested improvements.)