American Phytopathological Society Northeastern Division

GRADUATE STUDENT PRESENTATION AWARD 2013

The award consists of an inscribed plaque, a \$1,000 award for travel to a scientific meeting in 2013-2014, 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. <u>An abstract of the presentation must be submitted though APS via the on-line submission procedure before the deadline established for receipt of abstracts.</u>

To be considered for the award, the completed "Graduate Student Presentation Award Designation Form" along with a copy of the abstract must be emailed to Frank Ferrandino, francis.ferrandino@ct.gov, NED-APS Secretary-Treasurer by **September 16, 2013 by 5 PM**.

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%.

The Program Committee will attempt to schedule papers for consideration so that only one of these papers is presented at any given time. Papers to be considered for the award will not be specifically designated or treated differently in any respect from other papers that are not to be considered for the award. Thus, only the Program Committee, the Award Committee, and the Panel of Judges will be aware of those papers under consideration.

GRADUATE STUDENT PRESENTATION AWARD DESIGNATION FORM

American Phytopathological Society - Northeastern Division

The presentation covered by the attached abstract shall be considered for the 2013 Northeastern Division Graduate Student Presentation Award:

| Title: | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | | |
| Author(s): | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Date | Senior Author | |
| I certify that the research | ch described by this abstract was conducted while | e the senior author was |
| registered for the | (MS/PhD) degree at | |
| (Institution). This degree | ee was or is expected to be conferred | (date) and the |
| abstract has been subm | itted on-line though APS via the on-line submiss. | ion form. |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Date | Department Head or Chair | Signature |

Send this form as an attachment with the abstract to: Frank Ferrandino, francis.ferrandino@ct.gov.



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

| Spea | ıker: | | | | | |
|------|--|---------|----|---|---|---|
| | ructions: le the number with your evaluation of the speaker's performance. The coded ratio | ngs are | e: | | | |
| | 10 = Excellent 7 = Good 5 = Average 2 = Poor 0 = Deficient | | | | | |
| Con | tent 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 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| 2. | Was there a <u>clearly</u> stated set of hypotheses and objectives? | 10 | 7 | 5 | 2 | (|
| 3. | Was the methodology appropriate to address the hypotheses? Were the controls adequate? Was the experimental design appropriate? | 10 | 7 | 5 | 2 | (|
| 4. | Were the data appropriately summarized and analyzed? | 10 | 7 | 5 | 2 | (|
| 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? | | 7 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| Deli | very: 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 |
| Tota | d Score (Based on 100) : | | | | | |