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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Internship Poster Evaluation Rubric** | | | | | | | **Score** |
| Question: How well can the student identify a **core issue**, embed it in the context of their experience and in their academic discipline, and convey what’s at stake to a general, non-expert audience? | | | | | | | |
| **1** | **2** | | **3** | **4** | | **5** |  |
| * Core issue is not clear * Academic context is not clear * What’s at stake is not clear * Visual and verbal components are in a general state of disharmony | | * Core issue is clear * Academic context is clear * What’s at stake is clear * Visual and verbal components are not in a general state of disharmony | | | * Core issue is clear & compelling * Academic context is clear & compelling * What’s at stake is clear & compelling * Visual and verbal components are in harmony, engaging & compelling | |  |
| Question: How well can the student identify an **investigative strategy**, demonstrate evidence in discipline appropriate way, and convey why this strategy is the best one? | | | | | | | |
| **1** | **2** | | **3** | **4** | | **5** |  |
| * Strategy is not clear * Evidence is not discipline appropriate * Cannot convey why strategy is the best option * Visual and verbal components are in a general state of disharmony | | * Strategy is clear * Evidence is discipline appropriate & can be demonstrated * Can convey why strategy is the best option * Visual and verbal components are not in a general state of disharmony | | | * Strategy is clear & compelling * Evidence is discipline appropriate & demonstrated compellingly * Can convey why strategy is the best option & is compelling in the process * Visual and verbal components are in harmony, engaging & compelling | |  |
| Question: How well can the student interpret **outcomes**, link outcomes back to their experiential context and their academic discipline, and draw conclusions for a general, non-expert audience? | | | | | | | |
| **1** | **2** | | **3** | **4** | | **5** |  |
| * Interpretation is not clear * Outcomes not linked back to disciplinary perspective * Conclusions are not clear * Visual and verbal components are in a general state of disharmony | | * Interpretation is clear * Outcomes linked back to disciplinary perspective * Conclusions are clear * Visual and verbal components are not in a general state of disharmony | | | * Interpretation is clear & compelling * Outcomes compellingly linked back to disciplinary perspective * Conclusions are clear & compelling * Visual and verbal components are in harmony, engaging & compelling | |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Total before deductions** |  |
| Deductions (at your discretion) |  |
| **FINAL SCORE** |  |