

STUDENT PRESENTATION AWARD GUIDELINES

I. ELIGIBILITY

- A. The Student must be a member of the South Dakota Academy of Science (SDAS) during the year in which they compete.

Membership information can be found at:

<http://www.sdaos.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/membership-form-SDAS.pdf>

- B. Entry is limited to one poster *or* one oral presentation but *not* both.
- C. Student presentations in a symposium are not eligible to compete for the oral presentation award.
- D. An abstract must be submitted by the abstract deadline to be considered in the competition, and a student must indicate on the registration form that they want their presentation included in the competition.
- E. The presentation must represent a completed body of independent or joint research in which the student's contribution has been substantial. If co-authored, the student must be first author.
- F. There may be only one presenter for each poster or oral presentation.
- G. Previous first-prize winners of the Student Presentation award during past SDAS meetings are not eligible within the same category (i.e., oral or poster categories). However, runner-ups (second- and third-prize winners) are eligible, and past poster winners (first-prize winners) may compete in the oral competition and vice versa.
- H. No entries for competition will be accepted after the abstract submission deadline.

II. MEETING HOST OR PROGRAM ORGANIZERS

- A. The Meeting Host and/or Program Organizers must provide the Judges with a list of student registrants taking part in the student competition
- B. The Program Organizers and/or Meeting Host should also indicate which presentations are part of the student competition in the meeting program.

III. AWARD CATEGORIES

- A. The student competition will be subdivided into the Oral presentation and Poster presentation categories. The first-prize, second-prize, and third-prize winners in each category will receive an award.

- B. If the student is planning to present both an oral and a poster presentation, the student competitor must *choose one category* for which they wish to be judged. **Students may NOT enter both the oral and poster presentation competitions at the same meeting!**

IV. JUDGES

- A. Two head judges are required, one for the oral presentations, and one for the poster presentations. The head judges are responsible for assembling a panel of a minimum of three judges for the oral presentations and a minimum of three judges for the poster presentations.
- B. To avoid bias or conflict of interest, judges should not have competing students or, if unavoidable, should abstain from voting on their own students.
- C. The head judges must provide one score sheet per student competitor for all judges. Judges can opt to use the score sheets or use other criteria for judging presentations.
- D. Judges should meet beforehand to review guidelines and afterwards to vote, with at least one hour between the last eligible presentation and the award announcement.

V. EVALUATION

Judges should rate presentations as “Outstanding, Good, Adequate, or Poor” based on the criteria listed below. In co-authored presentations, the judges will carefully evaluate the student’s contribution to the presented research. In case of a tie or very close ranking, the judges may decide on a joint award.

VI. CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES FOR A GOOD PRESENTATION

A. Scientific Criteria

1. Introduction:

- a. Was the research problem clearly introduced? Was the importance of the research question explained? Why was the work done? Did the presenter provide background and context for the research? What was the state of the field prior to this study?
- b. Was a clear statement of the hypothesis(es) provided or, in studies that did not test hypotheses, were the objectives and importance of the research clearly stated?

2. Methods:

- a. Were techniques appropriate and clearly explained?
- b. How creative was the work? If the work employed common techniques, were they used to approach novel issues or novel questions?

3. Results:

- a. Were the results a valuable contribution to the field?
- b. Was the significance clearly demonstrated?

4. Discussion & Conclusions:

- a. Were the results well-summarized and related to the introduction?
- b. Were the conclusions warranted by the data?
- c. Did the results provide a valuable contribution to our knowledge of science or did they merely provide details about a phenomenon that is already largely understood?
- d. Was the research sufficiently independent, unique, or creative?
- e. Were the conclusions placed in a broader context?

B. Presentation Style and Logistics:

- 1. Were the graphics lucid? Were figures intelligible with clearly labeled axes? Were tables legible and intelligible? Were the graphics designed to be as self-explanatory and informative as possible?
- 2. Was specialist jargon minimized so that non-specialists could understand?
- 3. How well did the speaker respond to questions? (if applicable)
- 4. Did the student project a professional demeanor? Did s/he avoid inappropriate references, private jokes, and making excuses for poor graphics?
- 5. (oral) Was the speaker clear and logical or confused and disorganized? Was eye contact made with the audience, or was the presentation simply read from notes or the screen?
- 6. (oral) Was the presentation “timed” correctly? Was the presentation too long or excessively short?
- 7. (poster) Was the poster clearly organized and well planned? Was the poster clearly arranged with the minimal text for maximal effect? Were the visuals used appropriate for the point being made? Was the font large enough to be easily read from a distance? Was the poster visually appealing and not overly busy? Did the student try to cram too much information on the poster?

8. (poster) Was the oral presentation to the judge succinct, clear, and focused? (if applicable)

SCORE SHEET

Name of Student and co-authors: _____

Title: _____

OVERALL RATING ____/60 total.

Rank as 1 (poor); 2 (adequate); 3(good); 4 (outstanding).

Abstract:

1. ____ Good summary, especially results.

Introduction:

2. ____ Broader conceptual framework & overview of previous work.

3. ____ Hypothesis(es), goals, or predictions clearly stated.

Methods:

4. ____ Clearly presented, appropriate to question.

5. ____ New or new use of techniques; novel research.

Results:

6. ____ Clearly presented.

7. ____ Valuable, significant contribution.

Discussion:

8. ____ Conclusions well supported.

9. ____ Work extended beyond advisor's other projects vs. minor increment to work.

10. ____ Placed in broader context.

Presentation style (oral or poster):

11. ____ Clear, well organized, eye contact.

12. ____ Lucid graphics (meaningful, clearly labeled; legible tables).

13. _____ Minimal jargon, no verbal “ticks,” no inappropriate humor, not read.

14. _____ Responded well to questions.

15. _____ Met time limits [talk] or minimal text for maximal effect [poster].

Notes and comments: