

AFS Best Student Paper/Poster Symposium Extended Abstract Review Rubric

Abstract Criteria	High Quality	Moderate Quality	Low Quality	Total Points Possible	Total Points Awarded
Background	Brief, but informative introduction to the topic provided. Adequately describes the problem or question being addressed in the study. (4)	Introduction is provided, but one more or more segments of a “high quality” response are missing. (2)	Introduction not provided or provided in a manner that does not provide useful information to the reader; background information does not support the question being addressed in the research. (0)	4	
Methods	A brief, but relevant analytical techniques review included. Correct scientific terminology used, and solid experimental design demonstrated. (4)	Techniques were partially incomplete, used inappropriate terminology, and/or encompasses too large of a proportion of the overall abstract. (2)	Techniques are absent or not relevant to the experiment. (0)	4	
Results	All important descriptive results are given with appropriate context. Results are final and not preliminary. (5)	Results section is mostly complete, but some relevant results are omitted, or incorrect units or significant figures are used. Results are not final. (3)	Section is absent, more than half incomplete, or not relevant to the experiment. Results presented are fully preliminary or anticipated. (0)	5	
Tables and/or Figures	Tables and/or figures presented are of high visual quality, are easily readable, and convey important information relevant to the research. (4)	Tables and/or figures presented are readable but the visual presentation could be improved. Tables and/or figures could be altered in minor ways to convey information more clearly. (2)	Tables and/or figures are absent, are of poor visual quality, or don’t convey information that is relevant to the research. (0)	4	
Discussion	Conclusions are made based on the results, demonstrate insight, and fully answer problem statement or hypothesis. Discussion thoroughly describes the most significant research finding and/or how the research advances fisheries science. (5)	Conclusion section is mostly complete, but some relevant conclusions are omitted, may not fully or appropriately answer problem statement or hypothesis. Discussion of the most relevant finding or the contribution of this research to the larger context is limited. (3)	Conclusion section is absent or not relevant to the experiment. No mention is made regarding the most significant finding of the research or the contribution of the research to fisheries science. (0)	5	
References	Reference list demonstrates the student’s breadth of knowledge on the central theme of the research. (4)	Reference list is limited in breadth or is missing at least one critical citation that is relevant to the research question. (2)	Reference list is absent or not relevant to the research question. (0)	4	
Stage of Completion	The research appears to be complete or nearly completed (i.e., at a stage that is ready for presentation). (4)	The research appears to be at a stage where some additional work is still needed in order to answer the research question. (2)	The research appears to be in a preliminary or proposal stage and not ready for presentation. (0)	5	
Overall Abstract Presentation	The abstract is presented in high visual quality, is easily readable, and is free of spelling and grammatical errors. (4)	The abstract visual quality is adequate, but some improvements could be made in terms of readability. A few spelling and grammatical errors were detected. (2)	The visual quality of the abstract was poor, and the abstract was difficult to read. Many spelling and grammatical errors were detected. (0)	4	
<b>TOTALS</b>				<b>35</b>	