



## RxTechDay2021 Poster Contest Rubric

Score	2 (fully meets)	1 (partially meets)	0 (does not meet)
<b>Topic</b> Score: _____	Topic is dynamic, explained well and relevant to pharmacy practice	Topic is explained, more relevance would be beneficial or pharmacy practice is limited	Topic is not explored in detail, relationship to pharmacy practice is limited
<b>Content</b> Score: _____	Poster covers topic, background, methods, results and conclusion in depth and is easily understood	Poster covers most topics in depth but may not be easily understood	Poster does not contain enough information and is not easily understood
<b>Graphics</b> Score: _____	Graphics are used appropriately and relevant to information provided	Graphics are not used appropriately or are not relevant to the information	Graphics are not included or are not relevant to topic
<b>Organization</b> Score: _____	Poster information flowed, was clear, research was evident	More research or organization was required, or information	Presentation or organization was hard to follow or wasn't long enough
<b>Results</b> Score: _____	Results are explained in detail including 'what' 'how' and 'why' and lessons learned are included	Results are somewhat explained or areas of 'what' 'how' and 'why' are missing, lessons learned are included	Results are not explained in detail or lessons learned are not included
<b>Conclusion</b> Score: _____	Accomplishments, challenges and failures are explained, details are provided on sustainability of outcomes	Accomplishments, challenges and failures are somewhat explained, details may or may not be provided on sustainability of outcomes	Accomplishments, challenges and failures are not explained, details on sustainability of outcomes is not provided
<b>Overall presentation</b> Score: _____	Poster design is thorough, learning is relevant to pharmacy practice, and can be duplicated by others. Authors are included	Poster is designed well, learning could be developed more and can be duplicated by others. Authors are included.	Poster is difficult to interpret, learning could be more developed and duplication by others is questionable. Authors are not included.