Student Poster Competition Criteria

2024 UTeach STEM Educators Conference

Strands

Strand 1: Research

Posters focused on a research project conducted for a UTeach course.

Strand 2: Course Exposition

Posters focused on an essential idea of a UTeach course. *Examples: lesson plans or units, class projects, explorations of course concepts, etc.*

Strand 3: Program Exposition

Posters focused on an essential element of the UTeach program. *Examples: student organizations, internships, portfolios, student-led recruitment, peer advising, community space, etc.*

Criteria for each competitive category

Research

- Novelty and innovation
- Relevance to STEM education and/or UTeach model
- Quality of research design
- Clarity of poster content and poster design
- Verbal explanation of the poster

Course Exposition

- Completeness: Degree to which poster addresses course as a whole
- Poster highlights student learning, including examples of student work and/or activities from that course
- Clarity of poster content and poster design
- Verbal explanation of the poster

Program Exposition

- Completeness: Degree to which poster addresses program essential element as a whole
- Poster highlights student engagement in a program element
- Clarity of poster content and poster design
- Verbal explanation of the poster

All Categories

	Clarity of poster content and design	Verbal explanations about the poster
5	 Poster is clearly laid out and easy to follow in the absence of the presenter. Text is concise and free of spelling or typographical errors. Background is unobtrusive. Figures, tables, graphs, and/or photos are appropriate, labeled correctly, improve understanding, and/or enhance visual appeal. 	 Answers difficult questions clearly and succinctly. Comfortably references the poster when answering questions and explaining the topic. Demonstrates a very strong knowledge of the subject and is enthusiastic about it.
4	 > Layout is crowded and/or confusing in absence of presenter. > Text is relatively clear and mostly free of spelling and typographical errors. > Background is unobtrusive. > Most figures, tables, graphs, and/or photos are appropriate, labeled correctly, and/or improve understanding. 	 Answers most questions easily. References the poster only when explaining, but not while answering questions. Demonstrates good knowledge of the subject and seems interested.
3	 > Layout is confusing in the absence of the presenter. > Text is relatively clear, but there are some spelling and typographical errors. > Background may be distracting. > Figures, tables, graphs, and/or photos are not always related to text, are not appropriate, are poorly labeled, are limited, and/or do not improve understanding. 	 Answers most questions, but some with difficulty. Does not refer to poster when answering questions or explaining the topic. Demonstrates some knowledge of the subject and seems interested.
2	 > Layout is untidy and confusing in the absence of the presenter. > Text is hard to read due to font size or color, and there are some spelling and typographical errors. > Background may be distracting. > Figures, tables, graphs, and/or photos are not related to text, are not appropriate, are poorly labeled, are limited, and/or do not improve understanding. 	 Has difficulty answering most questions. Does not reference the poster and seems unfamiliar with it. Demonstrates little knowledge of the subject and seems only somewhat interested.
1	 Poster is poorly laid out and confusing in the absence of the presenter. Text is hard to read, messy, and contains multiple spelling and typographical errors. Very poor background. Visual aids are poorly done or not used. 	 Cannot answer most questions. Does not reference the poster and seems unfamiliar with it. Demonstrates no knowledge of the subject and does not seem interested.

Research

	Relevance to STEM education and/or UTeach model	Quality of research design	Novelty and innovation
5	 Excellent connections to the teaching and learning of STEM disciplines. Methods, activities, and/or content are strongly related to STEM education and/or the UTeach model. 	 Excellent choice of experimental methods to address hypothesis or project goal. Clear discussion of controls or comparative groups; all appropriate controls or comparative groups were included. 	> Excellent original and imaginative thinking. Incorporates insight and addresses unforeseen developments.
4	 Very good connections to the teaching and learning of STEM disciplines. Methods, activities, and/or content are related to STEM education and/or the UTeach model. 	 Very good choice of experimental methods to address hypothesis or project goal. Clear discussion of controls or comparative groups; most controls or comparative groups were included. 	> Very good original thinking. Incorporates some insight.
3	 Good connections to the teaching and learning of STEM disciplines. Methods, activities, and/or content are somewhat related to STEM education and/or the UTeach model. 	 Good choice of experimental methods to address hypothesis or project goal. Adequate discussion of controls or comparative groups; some significant controls or comparative groups were lacking. 	> Good original thinking.
2	 Poor connections to the teaching and learning of STEM disciplines. Methods, activities, and/or content are poorly related to STEM education and/or the UTeach model. 	 Method not appropriate to address hypothesis or project goal. Controls or comparative groups not adequately described; some controls or comparative groups missing. 	> Very little original thinking.
1	 No connections to the teaching and learning of STEM disciplines. Methods, activities, and/or content are not related to STEM education and/or the UTeach model. 	 Methods section missing. Serious lack of controls or discussion of controls. 	> No original thinking.

Course Exposition

	Completeness: Poster addresses course as a whole	Poster highlights student learning, including student work/activities
5	Excellent explanation of the course essential idea. Details provide significant information to understand the implementation of the course essential idea.	 Highlights a variety of excellent student work samples, products, or formative/summative assessments. Student learning clearly indicates a 5E/inquiry framework.
4	 Very good explanation of the course essential idea. Details provide sufficient information to understand the implementation of the course essential idea. 	 Highlights a variety of excellent student work samples, products, or formative/summative assessments. Student learning indicates a 5E/inquiry framework.
3	Sood explanation of the course essential idea. Details provide minimal information for understanding the implementation of the course essential idea.	Highlights one good student work sample, product, or formative/summative assessment. Student learning suggests a 5E/inquiry framework.
2	Acceptable explanation of the course essential idea. Details provide insufficient information for understanding of the implementation of the course essential idea.	 Insufficient work sample, product, or formative/ summative assessment. Student learning does not suggest a 5E/inquiry framework.
1	> Unacceptable or incorrect explanation.	 Poster does not highlight student work sample, product, or formative/summative assessment. Student learning does not suggest a 5E/inquiry framework.

Program Exposition

	Completeness: Poster highlights the program essential element	Poster highlights student engagement in a program element
5	 Excellent explanation of the program essential element. Details provide significant information for understanding the implementation of the program essential element. 	> Program essential element is highlighted with a variety of excellent examples/products and clearly demonstrates student engagement.
4	 Very good explanation of the program essential element. Details provide sufficient information for understanding the implementation of the program essential element. 	> Program essential element is highlighted with a variety of good examples/products and clearly demonstrates student engagement.
3	 > Good explanation of the program essential element. > Details provide minimal information for understanding the implementation of the program essential element. 	> Program essential element is highlighted with a good example/product and demonstrates some student engagement.
2	 Acceptable explanation of the program essential element. Details provide insufficient information for understanding the implementation of the program essential element. 	> Program essential element is highlighted with a poor example/product and demonstrates little student engagement.
1	> Unacceptable or incorrect explanation.	> Program essential element is highlighted with a poor example/product and demonstrates no student engagement.