

2015 Arizona Pavement Materials Conference
Student Poster Competition
November 17, 2015
4:30 – 6:00 p.m.
Poster Guidelines

IMPORTANT: Poster Submission Deadline is November 12, 2015 by 8:00 AM.

Note: If you miss the deadline, you can still participate in the poster session but you will not be eligible for the awards. Email posters to Jose Medina (JRMEDINA@asu.edu). If your file are too large to send, contact Jose to arrange direct file transfer.

- 1) Final poster size shall be **30” (height) x 40” (width)** provided in **PDF and PPTX format**. Please zoom in on your PDF and check that all logos, etc are clear and easily readable. File names should include your “surname”.
- 2) Students are responsible for bringing their own a 30” x 40” foam board which can be found at any office supply store for about \$5-6. Easels will be provided at the conference.
- 3) Mounting shall be in a professional manner (no large paper clips, etc). *Note that appearance is one of the judging categories.*
- 4) Posters can be printed at ASU if you send them to Jose Medina before the deadline (November 12th at 8 am). Local students should be present when their poster is being printed.
- 5) Use of color is definitely encouraged. However, **do not** shade the entire poster background as this significantly increases print time and ink usage.
- 6) Judging criterion is provided below. You will not be required to give an oral presentation. Judges will score your posters and your responses to any of their questions regarding your work.
- 7) You are responsible for getting your own poster to the conference.
- 8) Dress appropriately as you are representing your University at the conference. Remember, you are always on a job interview.

Winners will be announced at the end of the welcome reception

Instructions for Using Poster Presentation Rubric (Adapted from AAPT)

Scoring: Posters are judged on a 5-point scale. Record a score (1 through 5) for each of the five categories. You can assign scores **ONLY** in **full or half-point increments**. Any score of less than a half-point increment will be given the next lowest half-point score.

Scoring Guidance: It is extremely important that your evaluations are fair and consistent. Be very discriminating with awarding a 5. This score should be reserved for only truly exceptional posters.

Please add constructive comments in the designated box following each poster. Scoring sheets will be returned to students after the meeting to help them with future posters.

When evaluations are completed please return them to the registration table.

Scoring Categories: Standards and expectations for the six rubric categories are described below:

Introduction should *briefly* place the study within the context of the literature. It should include a strong rationale for the project and a clear and focused purpose.

Methods / Approach refers to the design/approach and the methods/procedures. The poster should *briefly* list/describe the following (if applicable): materials, experimental design/approach, methods/procedures, apparatus, and statistical analysis.

Results / Outcomes should *briefly* present pertinent findings/outcomes of the project in an appropriate manner. This may be in text, tables, and/or figures. Tables and figures should be clear, appropriately labeled, and include a legend.

Discussion and Conclusion is a *brief* summary of the findings, the experiential process or outcomes of the project. It should focus on the project and explain the reasoning for the selection of the process or outcomes. It should also describe the process/outcomes in the context of past findings or performance(s) or works and be accurate and thought-provoking. Recommended future work may also be included.

Appearance refers to the style and neatness of the poster. It should be aesthetically pleasing with a balanced alignment of elements. There should be no grammatical or spelling errors, and all text should be able to be read from at least 6 ft away.

Judges Questions the authors will have to answer any questions regarding the poster or research topic.

Title:

Presenter:

	1	2	3	4	5	Score
Introduction	Failed to convey project in context of literature. No rationale. Purpose was unfocused and unclear	Vaguely conveyed project in context of literature. Weak rationale. Purpose was poorly focused and not sufficiently clear	Project moderately conveyed in context of literature. Moderately clear rationale. Purpose was somewhat focused and clear.	Conveyed project in context of literature. Moderately strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused.	Clearly conveyed project in context of literature. Strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused.	
Methods/ Approach	Little or no description of materials, methods/procedures	Inadequate description of materials, methods/procedures	Moderate or excessive description of materials, methods/procedures	Most/slightly excessive detail included in description of materials, methods/procedures	Appropriate detail in description of materials, methods/procedures	
Results/ Outcomes	Absence of pertinent results, tables/figures unlabeled or no legend	Few pertinent results, tables/figures inappropriate or poor labels or legend	Some pertinent results not reported, results presented in clear, concise manner. Tables/ figures generally labeled	Most pertinent results reported in fairly clear, concise manner. Tables/ figures labeled	All pertinent results reported in clear, concise manner. Tables/ figures labeled	
Discussion and Summary	Little or no discussion of project findings, conclusions unsupported. Displayed poor grasp of understanding.	Major topics inaccurately described, conclusions not entirely supported.	Discussion too brief/excessive. Several inaccuracies/ Omissions. Conclusion generally based on findings	Sufficient discussion with few errors, though not particularly thought provoking. Conclusions based on findings and appropriate.	Brief and concise discussion of major findings. Was superior, accurate, thought provoking. Conclusions clearly based on findings.	
Appearance	Aesthetically displeasing, unbalanced, many errors, text cannot be read from 6 ft.	Poor visual presentation, alignment. Numerous errors, most text easily read from 6 ft.	Moderately aesthetically pleasing and balanced. Some errors, generally text easily read from 6 ft.	Generally aesthetically pleasing and balanced. Few errors, text easily read from 6 ft	Exceptional poster. Aesthetically pleasing and balanced. No errors, text easily read from 6 ft	
Judges Questions	Not prepared, no eye contact.	Not very smooth or polished, little eye contact, not a good job answering questions.	Reasonably answers questions, students understand topic, but hesitate, not good eye contact	Good answers, but could be more polished and engaging. Eye contact good.	Answers are smooth and engaging. Articulate description clearly demonstrates understanding. Great eye contact.	

Additional Comments: