

## GRADUATE STUDENT PRESENTATION AWARD

The award consists of an inscribed plaque, \$1,000 for travel to a scientific meeting (by the end of the year after receiving the award), as well as membership to both APS and the Northeastern Division. Awardee also has the honor of representing the Division by giving a presentation about their research in the “Plant Pathologists of the Future Showcase” at the APS Annual Meeting.

### **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 through 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 presentations to be considered for the award. The following criteria will be used: 50% Content and Merit, and 50% Delivery. See the rating form below for further details of the evaluation.



# 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

<b>Content and Merit</b>		
1	How well did the speaker relate his/her research to prior research on this topic? Did the speaker explain justification for this research?	
2	Was there a <i>clearly</i> stated set of hypotheses and objectives?	
3	Was methodology appropriate to address the hypotheses? Were there adequate controls? Was experimental design appropriate?	
4	Were data appropriately summarized and analyzed?	
5	Did conclusions flow logically from the interpretation of the data? Was the need for future research addressed?	
<b>Delivery</b>		
1	Was the speaker composed? Easy to understand? Audible? (Consideration to be made if English is not primary language)	
2	Was presentation organized to fit within the allotted time? Was there too much or too little content?	
3	Did speaker effectively lead the audience through the talk? Could a pathologist unfamiliar with this topic readily understand what was done and why?	
4	Were visual aids easy to understand and effectively used?	
5	Were questions answered satisfactorily?	
	<b>Total Score (100 possible)</b>	