17th Arizona Pavements / Materials Conference – Webinar Series
Student Poster Competition
Thursday, November 12, 2020, 9:00 – 11:00 a.m.
<u>Poster Guidelines</u>

IMPORTANT: Elevator Pitch/Poster Submission Deadline <u>Extended until Oct. 23rd, 2020 by 5 PM.</u>

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 Ramadan Salim (rsalim@asu.edu) or Jose Medina (jrmedina@asu.edu). If your file is too large to send via e-mail, contact Jose Medina to arrange for direct file transfer.

1) Since the poster will be virtually presented, the size of the poster should be large enough (at least 44 points) to be able to see it on the computer screen. Submit poster in **<u>Landscape</u> PDF and PPTX formats**.

2) Submit a **90-second elevator pitch** video explaining your poster. Be concise and straight to the major findings of your research. Look at the rubric for judges expectations when preparing your materials. You still need to be present to explain the poster to the audience in the same concise manner.

3) Judging criterion is provided below. Although all poster presenters will allow to briefly present during the live session, the winners will be contacted no later than October 30th and asked to prepare a **5 to 7-minute presentation to showcase their work.** The live webinar session will be held on **Thursday, November 12, 2020**.

Scoring Guidelines Given to Judges
(Adapted from AAPT)

Scoring: Posters are judged on a 5-point scale. Record a score (1 through 5) for each of the six 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 Jose Medina (jrmedina@asu.edu) and Ramadan Salim (rsalim@asu.edu).

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 Conclusions 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.

Elevator Pitch: the authors will provide a recording for the poster competition to make and engaging pitch to the judging panel in 90 seconds or less.

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.	Poor visual presentation, alignment. Numerous errors.	Moderately aesthetically pleasing and balanced. Some errors.	Generally, aesthetically pleasing, and balanced. Few errors.	Exceptional poster. Aesthetically pleasing and balanced.	
Oral Presentation (based on the Elevator Pitch video)	Major flaws and missing information. Failure to deliver in less than 90 seconds.	Missing essential components: content not evident or clear; presentation below standards	Includes essential components: Most components are presented or developed	Well executed: Presentation is clear, most content is covered and research well presented	Outstanding execution: Content is clear, comprehensive, thoughtful, and very well presented.	

Additional Comments: _____