



2020 GPSA Research Exposition Abstract Evaluation Rubric

Eligibility Criteria ¹	Does not meet criteria
Abstract is submitted by WSU Pullman fee-paying graduate and professional students.	
All work must have been completed at or for WSU (no external student internships).	
Only one abstract per primary or presenting author.	
Abstract meets the 250-word limit.	
Abstract demonstrates scientific, scholarly, or creative significance.	

¹The abstracts go through an initial screening for eligibility in most (but not all) of the above categories. However, the reviewer may discover things that have been missed in the initial screening. If any of the above boxes are checked) then the abstract should be marked as “ineligible.”

Abstract Content	4	3	2	1	Score
Format/Grammar	Meets all formatting guidelines. No spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors.	Meets most formatting guidelines. No spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors.	Meets some formatting guidelines. Have spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors.	Did not follow formatting guidelines: Not organized, no headings, Have multiple spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors.	
Clarity of Objective and Title	Objective of work is communicated clearly with purposeful language and is well justified.	Objective is generally clear, but not consistently.	Objective is generally unclear and inconsistent.	Objective is not stated or underdeveloped nor justified.	
Methods	Methodology is well presented and displays a clear progression toward the objectives.	Methodology is generally clear, but not consistent and/or unclear.	Methodology is unclear and inconsistent with the objectives.	Logical errors in methods. Appropriate methodology is unclear.	
Results and Interpretation	Results presented are clear and related to the objectives.	Results support the objective but lack clarity.	Results are preliminary and poorly represent objectives.	Results are not sufficient to support the objectives of the work.	
Implications/Contribution	Abstract communicates how research is clear, substantial, novel, current, or cutting-edge in participant’s field and/or beyond.	Work highlights a limited impact in presenter’s field and/or community, but is still relevant.	Impact of work is unclear, loosely related to the field, not completely current, or poorly presented.	The original contribution or appropriateness to the field is not presented or loosely justified.	
Communication to the General Audience²	Well understandable even for people from different fields of the present study.	Understandable but is not written appropriately to use minimum technical terms.	Reaching minimum understanding and isn’t compelling to the general audience.	Very vague writing to general audience.	
Total score					