38th Annual CSULB Student Research Competition
Rubric / Scoring Criteria and Definitions
Friday, February 27, 2026

Scoring Criteria	Accomplished	Developing	Beginning
1. Clarity of Purpose (0-10 pts)	Clearly stated central purpose, research question or central premise is clear & readily apparent to the audience. (10 to 8 pts)	Central purpose fairly clear, research question or central premise is not clear or specific enough. (7 to 4 pts)	There is not an identifiable central purpose to the research. (3 to 0 pts)
2. Appropriateness of Methodology (0-20 pts)	Methodology and design for exploring the central purpose clearly stated; presented logical steps and/or appropriate information that clearly addresses the central purpose of the research with adequate detail provided. (20 to 16 pts)	Methodology and design were discussed, but there was some difficulty understanding them; methodology lacked some detail; did not clearly address the central purpose of the research. (15 to 8 pts)	The method and or/design did not address the central purpose, hypothesis or research question. Methodology was not clear or was lacking altogether. (7 to 0 pts)
3. Quality of Analysis and/or Interpretation (0-20 pts)	Appropriate information or data were collected, clearly described, and interpreted with a demonstrable understanding and clear link to the purpose of the research; shows a thoughtful, in-depth analysis that provides the audience with insights. (20 to 16 pts)	Appropriate information or data were collected, described and linked to the purpose of the research; more in-depth analysis was needed to provide the audience with deeper or more complex insights. (15 to 8 pts)	Very limited to no interpretation of results and a vague link to the central purpose hypothesis or research question. (7 to 0 pts)
4. Ability to Present the Research or Creative Activity (0 to 10 pts)	Demonstrated ability to make complex ideas understandable using appropriate language and examples for audience members both in and outside the discipline. (10 to 8 pts)	Demonstrated ability to discuss research, but not always clearly; seemed able to discuss some aspects of the research more cogently than others. (7 to 4 pts)	Had difficulty discussing the research project. (3 to 0 pts)
5. Organization of the Presented Materials (0 to 10 pts)	Clear, logical, interesting, and easy for the audience to follow; includes an appropriate introduction and conclusion; completed the presentation within the time limits. (10 to 8 pts)	Reasonably organized, understandable presentation with an appropriate introduction and conclusion; inadequate time management (significantly shorter than the allotted time or rushed to finish. (7 to 4 pts)	Difficult for the audience to understand the presentation; lack of an organizational structure and/or not completed within the time limits. (3 to 0 pts)
6. Ability to Handle Questions (0 to 10 pts)	Answered each question thoroughly and precisely. (10 to 8 pts)	Answered some of the questions well. (7 to 4 pts)	Had difficulty answering questions. (3 to 0 pts)
7. Value of Research or Creative Activity to the Discipline (0 to 20 pts)	Value of the research is persuasively argued within the established background and limitations of the research topic. The results are original and have significant contribution to the discipline. (20 to 16 pts)	Value of the research is mentioned; insufficient discussion of the background and scope to be able to determine the value of this research. Research lacks originality or significance to discipline. (15 to 8 pts)	There is no discussion or very limited discussion of the value of the research. Research is not original nor significant to the discipline. (7 to 0 pts)