

ASCB Poster Competition Judging Handbook

Undergraduate and graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows are participating in this ASCB Poster Competition.

Judging Assignments. You will receive your pre-assigned judging packet when you arrive at the judging session. Please arrive at 3:15 pm if at all possible and proceed to the judging table.

Conflict of Interest: If you have a conflict with any of the presentations assigned to you, please notify ASCB staff immediately. They will find another judge to evaluate the presentation.

Submission of Completed Judging Forms: Immediately after each poster, please return your completed judging form to the ASCB staff member at the judging table.

General Practices: Judges are encouraged to talk with the presenters and give the presenters a positive experience. You should:

- Introduce and identify yourself as a judge
- Provide constructive feedback
- Complete and return your judging form immediately after the conclusion of each poster
- If there is no presenter at the poster board when you approach the area, please continue judging your other presentations and return to that poster board at the end. If the presenter is still not there, please indicate this on the judging form.
- If a presenter is absent from the presentation, but has identified a replacement to give the presentation, do not judge. Only the individual listed on the judging form can present the research.

Please note the following ASCB poster presentation rules:

- Only ONE individual can present an abstract– the person who is listed on the judging form.
- If the presenting author's name listed on the judging form is not the person present at the poster board, do not judge the poster.
- Faculty advisers and mentors are NOT allowed to coach or participate during the presentation.
- Presenters are instructed to be present for the ENTIRE duration of their assigned poster session.

Please indicate in the comments section of the judging form if any of these rules are broken while you are judging a poster presentation.

EXPLANATION OF JUDGING FORM & RUBRIC

Elements of the Judging Form: The judging form contains the following presenter information: name, scientific discipline, poster board number, and session title. Directly below the presenter's information are the six review criteria in which the presenter will be judged. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the strongest, please score each criterion. After all six criteria have been scored; the total score should be tallied and placed in the marked box.

Review Criteria: All poster presentations are evaluated using common criteria and indicators of success. The criteria used to review presenters are based upon competence in:

- Developing a hypothesis and/or statement of problem
- Incorporating methods and controls
- Interpreting results
- Developing a conclusion and predicting future work
- Presenting work orally & handling questions
- Presenting work in writing (poster board appearance)

The indicators of success are arranged in a *rubric* used to evaluate presenters' work objectively. The rubric utilizes a set of indicators (1-5) by which presenters are assessed against the review criteria and assigned a score. For instance, the review criterion for hypothesis lists three indicators (bulleted list); presenters must achieve each of the three indicators satisfactorily at level 4 in order to achieve a score of 4. The review criterion for overall presentation and handling questions lists five indicators, all of which must be achieved successfully in order for presenters to score at a specific level. Presenters' work is evaluated at five levels from 1, indicating weakest, to 5, indicating strongest. The total score is the sum of the individual scores for each review criterion; the maximum possible score is 30.

Implementing the Rubric: When using the rubric, it is best to start from the ***bottom and work upwards***. Presenters need to perform each indicator at a single level (1 through 5) before moving up to the next higher level. For instance, if a presenter has mastered all indicators described at level 1 for hypothesis and/or statement of problem, then you should proceed to the level 2 to determine if he/she has mastered all indicators, and so on. If a presenter has mastered all indicators in level 1, 2 and 3, but not 4, then he/she receives a 3 for hypothesis and/or statement of problem.

Modified from the Annual Biomedical Research Conference for Minority Students (ABRCMS) and American Society of Microbiology (ASM) Judging Handbook. Permission for use was obtained from the ASM/ABRCMS.

ASCB Judging Rubric – Poster Evaluation

SCORE	HYPOTHESIS AND/OR STATEMENT OF PROBLEM	METHODS AND CONTROLS/COMPARISON	RESULTS	RESULTS, CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A logical hypothesis/statement of problem was presented. Background information was relevant and summarized well. Connections to previous literature and broader issues were clear. Goal of project was stated clearly and concisely; showed clear relevance beyond project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thorough explanation of why particular methods were chosen. Clear discussion of controls or comparative groups; all appropriate controls or comparative groups were included. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation of data was clear, thorough, and logical. All necessary statistical analysis was present. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasonable conclusions were given and strongly supported with evidence. Conclusions were compared to hypothesis and their relevance in a wider context was discussed. Project has significant impact on the field.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A logical hypothesis/statement of problem was presented. Background information was relevant, but connections were not clear. Goal of project was stated clearly; showed relevance beyond project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good explanation of choice of methods Clear discussion of controls or comparative groups; most controls or comparative groups were included. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation of data was clear and logical. Some statistics were missing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasonable conclusions were given and supported with evidence. Conclusions were compared to hypothesis, but their relevance was not discussed.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A questionable hypothesis or statement of problem was presented. Background information was relevant, but connections were not made. Goal of project was stated understandably. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little comment on why the methods were chosen and others not chosen. Adequate discussion of controls or comparative groups; some significant controls or comparative groups were lacking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation of data was not entirely clear. Statistical analysis was missing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasonable conclusions were given. Conclusions were not compared to the hypothesis and their relevance was not discussed.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A questionable hypothesis/ statement of problem was presented. Some relevant background information was included, but not connected. Goal of project was not clear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No discussion of choice of methods. Controls or comparative groups not adequately described; some appropriate controls or groups were missing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation of data was included, but unclear or difficult to comprehend. Statistics were missing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions were given. Little connection with the hypothesis was apparent.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The hypothesis/statement of problem was inappropriate or was missing. Little or no background information was included or connected. Goal of project was not stated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methods section missing. Serious lack of controls or discussion of controls. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation of data was missing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions were missing. There was no connection with the hypothesis

Modified from the Annual Biomedical Research Conference for Minority Students (ABRCMS) and American Society of Microbiology (ASM) Judging Handbook. Permission for use of this rubric was obtained from the ASM/ABRCMS.

SCORE	OVERALL PRESENTATION & HANDLING QUESTIONS	POSTER BOARD
5	<p>Presenter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a very strong knowledge of the research project • Speaks clearly, naturally and with enthusiasm; makes eye contact • Comfortably uses visual aids to enhance presentation • Answers difficult questions clearly and succinctly • Presentation is consistently clear and logical 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All expected components are present, clearly laid out, and easy to follow in the absence of presenter • The text is concise and consistently free of spelling or typographical errors; the background is unobtrusive • The figures and tables are appropriate and consistently labeled correctly • Photographs/tables/graphs improve understanding and enhance the visual appeal
4	<p>Presenter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a good knowledge of the research project • Speaks clearly and naturally; makes eye contact • Uses visual aids to enhance the presentation • Answers most questions • Presentation is clear for the most part, but not consistently 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All expected components are present, but layout is crowded or jumbled and somewhat confusing to follow in the absence of presenter • The text is relatively clear and mostly free of spelling or typographical errors; the background is unobtrusive • Most of the figures and tables are appropriate and labeled correctly • Photographs/tables/graphs improve understanding
3	<p>Presenter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some knowledge of the research project • Reads from the poster (or script) some of the time • Uses some visual aids to enhance the presentation • Has some difficulty answering challenging questions • Presentation is generally unclear and inconsistent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the expected components are present, but layout is confusing to follow in the absence of presenter • The text is relatively legible, but there are some typographical errors; the background may be distracting • The figures and tables are not always related to the text, or appropriate, or are labeled incorrectly • Photographs/table/graphs do not improve understanding
2	<p>Presenter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a poor knowledge of the research project • Reads from the poster (or script) most of the time • Does not use the available visual aid to enhance presentation effectively • Has difficulty answering questions • Presentation is unclear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the expected components are present, but layout is untidy and confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter • The text is hard to read due to font size or color and inconsistently free of typographical errors; the background may be distracting • The figures and tables are not related to the text, or are not appropriate, or are poorly labeled • Photographs/tables/graphs do not improve understanding of the project
1	<p>Presenter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not demonstrate any knowledge of the project • Reads from the poster (or script) all the time • Does not use the available visual aid to enhance presentation; Presentation is very confusing • Does not understand questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the expected components are present, but poorly laid out and confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter. • The text is hard to read and contains multiple typographical errors; There is a very poor background • The figures and tables are poorly done or are missing