



GRADUATE STUDENT PRESENTATION AWARDS

Each award will consist of an inscribed plaque, plus a cash award (\$250 for First Place, \$150 for Second Place, and \$100 for Third Place). Each participant must submit the attached form.

Eligibility Rules:

- The senior (first) author must have been registered as a graduate student during the period of time when the research was conducted.
- The presentation must be made prior to, or not more than one year after, receipt of the degree for which the research was performed.
- The senior author must make the presentation.
- An abstract of the presentation must be submitted before the deadline established for receipt of abstracts.
- The completed "Graduate Student Presentation Award Designation Form", plus a copy of the abstract for each presentation, must be faxed to Forrest W. Nutter, Jr. (fax 515-294-9420), APS North Central Division President, no later than May 25, 2009.
- The recipients of these awards will be selected by two panels of judges (one panel will evaluate oral presentations, and a second will evaluate poster presentations).

The program committee will attempt to schedule oral papers for consideration so that only one of these papers is presented at any given time. Papers to be considered for oral and poster presentation awards will not be specifically designated, nor will they be treated differently in any respect from papers that are not part of the competitions. Thus, only the Program Committee, the Award Committee, and the Panel of Judges will know which presentations are under consideration.

Fax this form and a copy of the abstract to: Dr. Forrest W. Nutter, Jr. fax: 515-294-9420

GRADUATE STUDENT PRESENTATION AWARD DESIGNATION FORM

The presentation covered by the attached abstract shall be considered for a 2009 North Central Division Graduate Student Presentation Award. Please fill out **two** (separate) forms if you are entering **both** competitions.

Award sought: (check one) _____ Oral _____ Poster

Title: _____

Author(s): _____

_____ Date _____ Senior Author

I certify that the research described by this abstract was conducted while the senior author was registered for the _____ degree at _____ Institution.
This degree was or is expected to be conferred _____ (date).

_____ Date _____ Department Head or Chair

Instructions. Circle the number with your evaluation of the speaker's performance. The coded ratings are:

- 10 = Excellent
- 7 = Good
- 5 = Average
- 2 = Poor
- 0 = Deficient

Content and Merit: 60%

1.	How did the speaker relate his/her research to prior research on the topic? Did the speaker explain why this research was conducted?	10	7	5	2	0
2.	Was a strong justification for this research clearly communicated?	10	7	5	2	0
3.	Was there a clearly stated set of hypotheses and objectives?	10	7	5	2	0
4.	Was the methodology appropriate to address the hypotheses? Were the controls adequate? Was the experimental design appropriate?	10	7	5	2	0
5.	Were the data appropriately summarized and analyzed?	10	7	5	2	0
6.	Was there a set of conclusions? Did the conclusions flow logically from the data set? What are the needs for future research, if any?	10	7	5	2	0

Delivery: 40%

1.	Was the speaker composed? Easy to understand and audible? (Consideration to be made if English is not the primary language)	10	7	5	2	0
2.	Was the presentation organized? Did the speaker effectively lead the audience through the talk? Could a pathologist unfamiliar with the specific topic readily understand what was done and why? Was there too much, too little or the right amount of content?	10	7	5	2	0
3.	Were the PowerPoint text and graphics easy to read and understand; were they used effectively?	10	7	5	2	0
4.	Was there time for questions, and were questions answered satisfactorily?	10	7	5	2	0

Total Score (Based on 100) _____

Judging Criteria and Guidelines for Posters

Quickly review all assigned posters to get a feel for the quality of content and presentation. Use triage and classify them, using a scheme like “pretty poor”, “OK but not memorable”, “Very good/exceptionally good” - that is, a scheme that does not admit fine shades of gray. If you are highly quantitative, use an easy (1-3) numerical scoring, and award only integer scores.

Spend your time on the “very good” and “exceptional” posters.

Talk to the other judges. Team up for the “Best of Session” and “Best of Conference” judging.

Each poster will be judged on 8 categories. Each category has a point spread assigned. Your opinion of the paper’s relative worth in each category will be shown by the points you assign. We will use the total score as the primary means of selecting the best poster awards.

Judging Categories (based on 150 points)

Poster Content (80 points)	Score
Importance (Significance and Usefulness) (30 points) Are the data, interpretations, and concepts useful and significant to real problems in plant pathology? How broad are the applications, or how significant is the impact of this information? How long will you remember this presentation?	
Substance (30 points) Are data presented adequate, appropriate, and supportive of scientific conclusions? Are extraneous or irrelevant data presented? Would you defend the data in a conference with your peers? Were data collected and processed with sufficient care?	
Originality (20 points) Are new concepts, methods, or interpretations presented in the paper? Are they really new, or are they new only to you? If the paper reports only on new data, does the ability to gather those data represent originality in advancing technology?	

Poster Presentation (70 points)	Score
Effectiveness of Communication (20 points) Does the poster effectively communicate its message? Is it logically organized and presented? Does it flow clearly, from a statement of the problem, to solution, to conclusion? Do the visual aids and other graphics presented help to clarify the hypothesis and conclusion? Do you readily understand the problem, solution, and conclusion of the presentation?	
Legibility (15 points) Are titles, figure captions, photos, graphs, text, diagrams, data, etc. clear, adequate, and appropriate to the topic and supportive of the conclusions? Are all titles and graphics effectively displayed? Is there too much, enough, or too little text?	
Attractiveness (15 points) Is the display neatly presented? Are colors, maps, photos, images, and diagrams used effectively? Does the poster attract your attention? Is it too crowded, well spaced, or too sparse? NOTE: Professional art departments are not needed to make an attractive poster.	
Title and Abstract (10 points) Does the title reflect the theme of the presentation? Is the abstract pertinent and informative? Does the abstract summarize the results and does it relate to the presentation?	
Conclusions (10 points) Are real, scientifically-valid conclusions reached? Are they clearly stated? Given the same data, could (would) you have reached the same conclusions? Are the conclusions supported in the presentation?	

Total Score (based on 150 points)	
--	--