American Phytopathological Society
Northeastern Division

GRADUATE STUDENT PRESENTATION AWARD 2016

The award consists of an inscribed plaque, a $1,000 award for travel to a scientific meeting in 2016-2017, a one-year on-line or print subscription to one APS journal, as well as a free membership to both APS and the Northeast Division.

Eligibility Rules:

1. The senior (first) author must have been registered as a graduate student during the time that the research covered by the presentation was performed. Each student is limited to **one** first place award per degree sought.

2. The presentation must be made prior to or not more than one year after receipt of the degree for which the research was performed.

3. The senior author must make the presentation.

4. An abstract of the presentation must be submitted though APS via the on-line submission procedure before the deadline established for receipt of abstracts. Check the box indicating that the presentation is for the Student Competition.

The recipient of the award will be selected by a Panel of Judges who will evaluate all papers to be considered for the award. The following criteria will be used: Content and Merit, 50%, and Delivery 50%. See the rating form below for further details of the evaluation.

American Phytopathological Society
Northeastern Division

NED-APS Graduate Student Award Judging Sheet
SAMPLE OF SPEAKER RATING FORM

Speaker: _____

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: 50%

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**		_	
2.	Was there a <u>clearly</u> stated set of hypotheses and objectives?	**10**	**7**	**5**	**2**	**0**
3.	Was the methodology appropriate to address the hypotheses? Were the controls adequate? Was the experimental design appropriate?	**10**	**7**	**5**	**2**	**0**
4.	Were the data appropriately summarized and analyzed?	**10**	**7**	**5**	**2**	**0**
5.	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: 50%

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 to fit within the allotted time? Was there too much, too little or the right amount of content?	**10**	**7**	**5**	**2**	**0**
3.	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?	**10**	**7**	**5**	**2**	**0**
4.	Were the visual aids easy to read/understand and effectively used?	**10**	**7**	**5**	**2**	**0**
5.	Were questions answered satisfactorily?	**10**	**7**	**5**	**2**	**0**

Total Score (Based on 100) : _____