

**American Phytopathological Society
Pacific Division**

Student: _____

Paper #: _____

Title: _____

INSTRUCTIONS: Circle the number which best indicates your evaluation. Judge the ABSTRACT and ORAL PRESENTATION sections independently and based on how the work is being presented. All papers are considered related to plant pathology. Finally, indicate the total points for each section. Return your completed forms to the Student Paper Competition chairperson as soon as possible after completing your last evaluation. You will get more separation in scores by assuming each student is 'average' (5) and looking for traits that are above or below average to add or subtract points accordingly. Scores between 3 and 7 are 'average' and should be used to indicate small differences among presentations. Scores on either end of the spectrum should be progressively rare. After judging all talks, rank in order from top to bottom with no ties.

0 = poor 2 = below average 5 = average 8 = above average 10 = excellent

Abstract:

- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1 Organization: Introduction, methods, results, and conclusions clearly defined. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 2 Writing style: Concise with correct grammar, punctuation, and spelling. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 3 Quality, originality, and significance of work. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 4 Does abstract agree with the presentation? Are the results and conclusions the same? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |

Abstract score (out of 40) _____

Presentation

Content and Merit:

- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1 How did the speaker relate their research to prior research? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 2 Was a strong justification for this research clearly communicated? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 3 Quality, originality, and significance of work. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 4 Were hypotheses and objectives clearly stated and supported? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 5 Were the methods appropriate to address the objectives? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 6 Were the controls adequate? Was the experimental design appropriate? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 7 Were the data appropriately summarized and analyzed? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 8 Were conclusions presented? Did they flow logically from the data set? Did the speaker present a future direction for the research? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |

Delivery:

- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1 Was the speaker composed, easy to understand and audible?
<i>(Consideration to be made if English is not the primary language)</i> | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 2 Was the presentation organized and easy to follow? Did the speaker effectively guide the audience through the talk? Would a pathologist unfamiliar with the specific topic readily understand what was done and why? Did the speaker use unnecessary jargon? Was there too much, too little or the right amount of content? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 3 Use of visual aids: Were the text and graphics easy to read and understand? Were they used effectively? Were images clear? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 4 Did the speaker leave time for questions? Were questions answered satisfactorily? <i>(Score = 5 if no questions were asked but the speaker allowed time for questions; score = 0 if no time was left for questions.)</i> | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |

Presentation score (out of 120) _____

Total Score (out of 160) _____

Rank _____