

The grading rubric for poster project. Microfluidics and BioMEMS 2021, Ville Jokinen

	0	1	2	3	4	5
Content 5 points		There are at least 2 papers included that fit the poster topic.		The papers that are chosen are well chosen and their combination gives a good overview of the topic.		The poster is the students own original fusion of the chosen papers that gives an excellent and interesting overview of the topic.
Depth 7 points		The poster is very superficial, no significant results are presented and the matter is poorly connected to the topics learned on course. There are some clear errors.		The poster goes to some depth on the topic OR nicely utilizes the principles learned on the course. There are clear results on the poster. No or only minor errors.		The topic is handled in a level suitable for masters students and utilizes the principles learned on the course. The poster presents several well chosen results. No or only minor errors.
Structure 5 points		The structure of the poster is confusing and makes the content more difficult to understand. A quick glance of the poster does not illuminate the topic beyond reading the title.		Structure of the poster is by-the-book, one topic follows another. It does not confuse the visitor but neither does the structure offer assistance in understanding the topic. A quick glance on the poster gives an understanding of the topic		The structure of the poster guides the visitor to understand the concepts, results and their relations to each other. A quick glance on the poster gives the visitor an understanding of the poster topic and an overview of the content.
Effort 5 points		The poster looks like it was done with minimum effort and looks unfinished and unappealing.		The poster shows that decent effort has went into the poster and as a result the poster looks good.		The student has clearly put in great effort and polish to make the poster look appealing and professional.
Presentation 4 point		The intro presentation is either too casual and brief or too unfocused and long. The poster works poorly with the presentation, pictures are e.g. too small, key information is in wrong place (e.g. bottom corner).		The intro presentation is of suitable length (≈ 2 min – 3 min) and gives a good starting point for discussion. The poster works decently with the presentation. Some topics could have been placed more centrally.		The presentation is of suitable length, easy to follow and informative on the topic and content of the poster. The poster works seamlessly with the presentation.
Capability to discuss the topic 4 points		The student can only discuss the topic by answering some basic questions.		The student can nicely answer most basic questions about the topic , but can only give rudimentary own insight about the topic.		The student can discuss the topic with the visitors at a level of a nice scientific conversation, which includes the students own thoughts as well.