

19th Arizona Pavements / Materials Conference
Student Poster Competition
Wednesday, November 16, 2022, 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.
Poster Guidelines

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 Dr. Ramadan Salim (rsalim@asu.edu). If your file is too large to send via email, contact Dr. Ramadan Salim to arrange for direct file transfer.

- 1) The size of the poster should be large enough (at least 44 points) to be able to see it on the computer screen or printed version. Submit poster in **Landscape PDF and PPTX formats**.
- 2) During the competition, you will have a 5-minute time slot (3 minutes presenting - 2 minutes for questions). Be concise and straight to the major findings of your research. Look at the rubric for judge's expectations when preparing your materials. You can use your poster or a slide presentation as support materials.
- 3) Judging criterion is provided below. All poster presenters will be allowed to briefly present their poster during the live session on **Wednesday, November 16, 2022** between 4:00-6:00pm.
- 4) The winners will be announced on Thursday November 17 at 12:30 pm.

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 Dr. 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 present their work for the poster competition in an engaging pitch to the judging panel in a 3-minute presentation plus 2 minutes for answering any questions for a total of 5 minutes.

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	Major flaws and missing information. Failure to deliver in less than 3 minutes.	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: _____