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WEBINAR AGENDA

• Conference Overview
• Overview of Judging Program
• Judging Rubric Explained
• Judging Best Practices Discussion
• Questions & Answers

Questions? Type them in the question box below.

Please note that the slides and a recording of the webinar will be sent by early next week.
ABRC MS is one of the largest, professional conferences for underrepresented minority students, military veterans, and persons with disabilities to pursue advanced training in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM).

2018 ABRC MS - Indianapolis, Indiana
Attendance by Year

*as of October 29
2018 STUDENT PRESENTATIONS

ABSTRACT SUBMISSIONS BY EDUCATION LEVEL

- Senior: 49%
- Junior: 30%
- Sophomore: 10%
- Community College Student: 3%
- Master's Student: 2%
- Postbaccalaureate: 6%
2018 JUDGING PROGRAM

• 2,150 presentations
• 12 scientific disciplines
• 120 oral presentations during two sessions
• 2,000 poster presentations throughout six sessions
• 3 judges per student presentation
  – ~600 judges
  – ~300 presentation awards
JUDGING PURPOSE

• Hands-on experience for students to practice their presentation skills and demonstrate their understanding of their research projects

• Receive feedback that is constructive, positive and specific to improvement

• Encourage each student to continue their education and passion for the sciences
JUDGING LOGISTICS: POSTER SESSIONS

• Every scientific discipline has a Chair, Vice Chair, and Ambassador (see list at end of this presentation)

• Meet Chair 15 minutes in Exhibit Hall prior to each assigned session

• Use blue judging stickers to denote judging completion
  - Please note that previous awardees will have red stickers

• Let Chair know of any issues or concerns during the session
Exhibit Hall
JUDGING LOGISTICS: ORAL SESSIONS

• Arrive 15 minutes prior to the start of the session to check in with the session moderator
  – Some disciplines will be combined
• Remain after your assigned oral session for a brief feedback session with student presenters
• Session moderators will lead feedback session
JUDGING GUIDELINES

- Turn off your cell phone
- Introduce yourself as a judge
- Do not recruit students while judging
- Limit time with each presenter to 15 minutes
- If running late, instruct the last presenter to stay until you arrive
- Provide verbal feedback that is constructive, positive and specific to improvement
# JUDGING RUBRIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS OR OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>METHODS (Study Participants, Research Design, Procedures)</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK</th>
<th>OVERALL PRESENTATION AND HANDLING QUESTIONS</th>
<th>QUALITY OF THE POSTER OR ORAL PRESENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Background was not stated or incomplete</td>
<td>Methods were not stated</td>
<td>Results were not provided</td>
<td>Conclusions were missing, Statement about Future Work was not included</td>
<td>Does not demonstrate any knowledge of the research project. Reads from the poster (slide or script) all the time. Does not understand questions. Presentation is very confusing.</td>
<td>Not all of the expected components are presented and the layout is confusing to follow. In the absence of the presenter. The text is not correct, legible, or free of spelling or typographical errors. Posters/slides' background is very poor. Photographs/tables/graphs are poorly done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Background was not clear or appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective</td>
<td>Methods were not clear or relevant to Hypothesis/Objective</td>
<td>Results were provided but lacked sufficient data to address the Hypothesis/Objective. Data were difficult to comprehend</td>
<td>Conclusions were included but little connection was made to the Results. Statement about Future Work was provided but did not logically follow Results</td>
<td>Demonstrates a poor knowledge of the research project. Reads from the poster (slide or script) most of the time. Has difficulty answering questions. Presentation is generally unclear.</td>
<td>Not all of the expected components are presented and the layout is confusing to follow. In the absence of the presenter. The text is not correct, legible, or free of spelling or typographical errors. Posters/slides' background is distracting. Photographs/tables/graphs are not related to the text or are poorly labeled or do not improve understanding of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Background was not clear or was incomplete but appropriately linked to the Background</td>
<td>Methods were appropriate linked to the Hypothesis/Objective but lack relevant information to fully understand what was done</td>
<td>Results included sufficient data to address the Hypothesis/Objective. Data were difficult to comprehend</td>
<td>Conclusions were reasonably supported by the Results but the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective was not provided. Statement about Future Work somewhat followed the Results</td>
<td>Demonstrates some knowledge of the research project. Has some difficulty answering challenging questions. Presentation is somewhat unclear and has inconsistencies.</td>
<td>Most of the expected components are presented, but the layout is confusing to follow. In the absence of the presenter. The text is not correct, legible, or free of spelling or typographical errors. Posters/slides' background is distracting. Photographs/tables/graphs are not related to the text, or labeled incorrectly or do not improve understanding of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Background was clear and relevant to the Hypothesis/Objective but included relevance beyond project's scope</td>
<td>Methods were clear and appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective with sufficient details to understand what was done</td>
<td>Results included sufficient data to address the Hypothesis/Objective. Data were sufficient to comprehend</td>
<td>Conclusions were supported by the Results but the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective was unclear or incomplete. Statement about Future Work logically followed the Results</td>
<td>Demonstrates good knowledge of the research project. Speaks clearly, naturally and with enthusiasm; makes eye contact. Answers most questions. Presentation is clear for the most part, but has a few inconsistencies.</td>
<td>All expected components are presented, but layout is crowded or jumbled making it confusing to follow. In the absence of the presenter. The text is not correct, legible, or free of spelling or typographical errors. Posters/slides' background is unobtrusive. Most photographs/tables/graphs are appropriate and labeled correctly, which improve understanding of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Background was clear and provided a relevant and concise overview of previous research that informed the project's Hypothesis/Objective</td>
<td>Methods were clear and appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective with a clear rationale and comprehensive details to fully understand what was done</td>
<td>Results included sufficient amounts of high quality data to address the Hypothesis/Objective. Data were clear, logical, thorough and easy to comprehend</td>
<td>Conclusions were strongly supported by the Results and the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective. Statement about Future Work logically followed the Results and included next steps</td>
<td>All expected components are presented and are clearly laid out and easy to follow. In the absence of the presenter. The text is concise, legible, and free of spelling or typographical errors. Posters/slides' background is unobtrusive. All photographs/tables/graphs are appropriate and labeled correctly, which improve understanding of the project and enhance the poster/slides' visual appeal.</td>
<td>*Components are defined as Title, Authors and Institutional Affiliation, Hypothesis/Objective, Background, Methods, Results, Conclusions, Future Work, Bibliography, and Acknowledgments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Score = 1; Highest = 5.
JUDGING CRITERIA

- Hypothesis/Objectives, Background
- Methods (Study Participants, Research Design, Procedures)
- Results
- Conclusions and Future Work
- Overall Presentation and Handling Questions
- Quality of Poster or Oral Presentation
JUDGING CRITERIA

• **Hypothesis/Objective:**
  – Goal(s) of the research and/or question(s) the research is seeking to address

• **Background:**
  – Provide a brief context for the research
  – Indicate why it is important
JUDGING CRITERIA

- **Research Methods:**
  - Study design used in the research
  - If appropriate, the population or group(s) studied
  - Study procedures used to carry out the research
  - Measurement techniques used in the research
  - Information on the data analytic technique(s)

- **Results:**
  - Main findings or results found

- **Conclusions and Future Work:**
  - What the results mean and their impact on the field of research; Next steps
Scoring Each Criterion

• Start with a score of 1 and work upward to 5
  – 1 = weakest; 5 = strongest

• Students need to perform each indicator at a single level before moving up to the next level
  – Example: Mastered all indicators in levels 1, 2, 3, but not 4, then a score of 3 should be entered
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | • Hypothesis/Objective was not stated  
   • Background was not stated |
| 2 | • Background was not clear or appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective  
   • Hypothesis/Objective was not clear or relevant to the project |
| 3 | • Background was not clear or was incomplete  
   • Hypothesis/Objective was clear but not appropriately linked to the Background |
## BACKGROUND & HYPOTHESIS/OBJECTIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4     | - Background was clear and relevant to the Hypothesis/Objective but included relevance beyond project’s scope  
       | - Hypothesis/Objective was clear and appropriately linked to the Background |
| 5     | - Background was clear and provided a relevant and concise overview of previous research that informed the project’s Hypothesis/Objective  
<pre><code>   | - Hypothesis/Objective was clear and appropriately linked to the Background |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Methods were not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Methods were not clear or relevant to Hypothesis/Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Methods were appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective but lack relevant information to fully understand what was done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Methods were clear and appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective with sufficient details to understand what was done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Methods were clear and appropriately linked to the Hypothesis/Objective with a clear rationale and comprehensive details to fully understand what was done</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RESULTS

1. Results were not provided

2. Results were provided but lacked sufficient data to address the Hypothesis/Objective
   - Data were difficult to comprehend

3. Results included sufficient data to address the Hypothesis/Objective
   - Data were difficult to comprehend

4. Results included sufficient data to address the Hypothesis/Objective
   - Data were sufficient to comprehend

5. Results included sufficient amounts of high quality data to address the Hypothesis/Objective
   - Data were clear, logical, thorough and easy to comprehend
### CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1** | • Conclusions were missing  
|   | • Statement about Future Work was not included |
| **2** | • Conclusions were included but little connection was made to the Results  
|   | • Statement about Future Work was provided but did not logically follow Results |
| **3** | • Conclusions were reasonably supported by the Results but the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective was not provided  
|   | • Statement about Future Work somewhat followed the Results |
CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

4. Conclusions were supported by the Results but the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective was unclear or incomplete.
   Statement about Future Work logically followed the Results.

5. Conclusions were strongly supported by the Results and the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective and larger body of literature were clearly stated.
   Statement about Future Work logically followed the Results and included realistic next steps.
OVERALL PRESENTATION AND HANDLING QUESTIONS

1
- Does not demonstrate any knowledge of the research project
- Reads from the poster (slide or script) all the time
- Does not understand questions
- Presentation is very confusing

2
- Demonstrates a poor knowledge of the research project
- Reads from the poster (slide or script) most of the time
- Has difficulty answering questions
- Presentation is generally unclear

3
- Demonstrates some knowledge of the research project
- Has some difficulty answering challenging questions
- Presentation is somewhat unclear and has inconsistencies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4     | - Demonstrates good knowledge of the research project  
    - Speaks clearly and naturally; makes eye contact  
    - Answers most questions  
    - Presentation is clear for the most part, but has a few inconsistencies |
| 5     | - Demonstrates very strong knowledge of the research project  
    - Speaks clearly, naturally and with enthusiasm; makes eye contact  
    - Answers difficult questions clearly and succinctly  
    - Presentation is logical and very clear |
## Quality of Poster or Oral Presentation

### 1
- Not all of the expected components* are presented and the layout is confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter
- Text is hard to read, messy and illegible, or has spelling or typographical errors
- Poster/slides’ background is very poor
- Photographs/tables/graphs are poorly done

### 2
- Not all of the expected components* are presented and the layout is untidy and confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter
- Text is hard to read due to font size or color, or has spelling or typographical errors
- Poster/slides’ background is distracting
- Photographs/tables/graphs are not related to the text or are poorly labeled or do not improve understanding of the project

*Components are defined as Title, Authors and Institutional Affiliation, Hypothesis/Objective, Background/Introduction, Methods, Results, Conclusions, Future Work, Bibliography, and Acknowledgments
QUALITY OF POSTER OR ORAL PRESENTATION

3
- Most of the expected components* are presented, but the layout is confusing to follow in the absence of presenter
- Text is relatively clear and legible, but has spelling or typographical errors
- Poster/slides' background is distracting
- Photographs/tables/graphs are not related to the text, or labeled correctly or do not improve understanding of the project

4
- All expected components* are presented, but layout is crowded or jumbled making it confusing to follow in the absence of presenter
- Text is relatively clear, legible, and mostly free of spelling or typographical errors
- Poster/slides' background is unobtrusive
- Most photographs/tables/graphs are appropriate and labeled correctly, which improve understanding of the project
QUALITY OF POSTER OR POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

- All expected components* are presented and are clearly laid out and easy to follow in the absence of presenter
- Text is concise, legible, and free of spelling or typographical errors
- Poster/slide background is unobtrusive
- All photographs/tables/graphs are appropriate and labeled correctly, which improve understanding of the project and enhance the poster/slides’ visual appeal
JUDGES’ SCORES

• Scores will be averaged
• Students will not receive written scores or comments
• Provide verbal feedback that is constructive, positive and specific to improvement
• Scores must be entered online by 12:00 pm on Saturday, November 17
  – URL will be provided on-site
  – Can also enter scores in Mobile App
Need to Know

- **ABRCMS Judges Website**
  - [abrcms.org/abrcms-judge](http://abrcms.org/abrcms-judge)
  - Handbook, links, FAQs, and more available on this site

- **Updated Mobile App**
  - Available at the beginning of November
  - Updated to more easily search for abstracts

- **Judges Lounge located next to registration area and the exhibit hall (Room 141)**
  - Computers for entering scores
  - Staff to answer questions

- **Ribbons for Scientific Disciplines**
  - In addition to Judge ribbons, there will be uniquely colored ribbons to denote each discipline
NEXT STEPS: UPON ARRIVAL

• Check-in at registration to pick up your conference badge and materials
  – Indiana Convention Center

• Pick up your judging assignments
  – Judges Lounge (Wednesday only)
  – After Wednesday pick up at Thursday’s Judges Mandatory Meeting
  – Otherwise, contact Leah to pick up in the Judges Lounge
NEXT STEPS: JUDGES’ RESPONSIBILITIES

• Attend on-site Judges Mandatory Meeting
  – Session on Thursday, November 15 at 8:00 am
  – Determine conflicts, last minute announcements, meet your Chair, Vice Chair, and Ambassador

• Arrive 15 minutes before each judging assignment

• Enter scores by 12 pm on Saturday, November 17
Questions?

Please type in the Q&A box below
Judging Best Practices
Case Studies and Discussion
Scenario One

Frequently raised questions have to do with scoring the Hypothesis/Objective section of the posters:

- What if the word ‘hypothesis’ is not used in the poster? How would you score this?
- What if the hypothesis is not clearly stated on the poster, but the student does clearly state it during the poster presentation to the judge? How would you score this?
Scenario Two

When scoring each student’s research poster or oral presentation do you vary or weigh the score in each research category based on the student’s: level of education (e.g., sophomore vs. junior vs. senior), length of the research experience (e.g., a single summer vs. a year-long training), or type of institution he/she attends (e.g., community college vs. a Research I institution)?

– How might you take these factors into account based on the Judging Rubric?
In addition to serving as a judge, your role in attending the ABCRMS 2018 conference is to recruit highly qualified students to your University’s graduate program, with a possible goal of encouraging them to join your research lab. While reviewing abstracts of the students you are assigned to judge, one abstract stands out to you as cutting edge, scientifically, strong, and well written. You are familiar with the student’s research mentor. Her students are always well trained, high academic achievers, and most go on to pursue advanced research training. Given your schedule you realize that the only opportunity that you will have to speak with the student is during the poster session in which you will be judging her poster.

- What is your main responsibility in this situation?
- What is the best way to handle this situation?
Scenario Four

(Part One)

As a judge in a poster session with only 15 minutes remaining in the session, you have only one student left to judge. You have tried three times previously to meet with the student, but each time, he has been surrounded by fellow students who are clearly interested in hearing about his research or he was meeting with other judges. As you approach the student’s poster, once again, he has a group of interested students listening to his poster presentation. What should do?
Scenario Four

(Part Two)

1. Do you stand back and quietly listen to the remainder of presentation that is already in progress and score the student based on this presentation?

2. Do you interrupt and identify yourself as his judge then respectfully dismiss the other students?

3. Although time is running out, do you allow him time to complete his presentation with the other students before identifying yourself as his judge and asking him to discuss his poster with you?
Scenario Five

A common concern is one of time management, both on the part of students and judges:

– What is the best way to move the presentation along if a student is giving an overly lengthy poster presentation?
Scientific Discipline Leaders

Biochemistry and Molecular Biology

**Chair**
Charles Bevins, M.D., Ph.D.
University of California, Davis
clbevins@ucdavis.edu

**Vice Chair**
Candice Etson, Ph.D.
Wesleyan University
cetson@wesleyan.edu

**Ambassador**
Gustavo Silva, Ph.D.
Duke University
gustavo.silva@duke.edu

Cancer Biology

**Chair**
Juanita Merchant, M.D., Ph.D.
University of Arizona
jmerchant@deptofmed.arizona.edu

**Vice Chair**
Emil Bogenmann, Ph.D., Ed.D.
Children's Hospital of Los Angeles
bogenman@usc.edu

**Ambassador**
Luisel Ricks-Santi, Ph.D.
Hampton University
luisel.rickssanti@hamptonu.edu

Cell Biology

**Chair**
Tracy Johnson, Ph.D.
University of California, Los Angeles
tjohnson@ucla.edu

**Vice Chair**
Brent Berwin, Ph.D.
Dartmouth Medical School
benwin@dartmouth.edu

**Ambassador**
Gustavo Arrizabalaga, Ph.D.
Indiana University School of Medicine
garrizab@iu.edu

Chemistry

**Chair**
Squire Booker, Ph.D.
Penn State University
sib14@psu.edu

**Vice Chair**
Claudio Ortiz, Ph.D.
Colgate Palmolive (retired)
claudio048@verizon.net

**Ambassador**
Ibrahim Katampe, Ph.D.
Central State University
ikatampe@centralstate.edu

Computational and Systems Biology

**Chair**
Jeanette Papp, Ph.D.
University of California, Los Angeles
jcpapp@ucla.edu

**Vice Chair**
Bolaji Thomas, Ph.D.
Rochester Institute of Technology
bolaji.thomas@rit.edu

**Ambassador**
Dana Crawford, Ph.D.
Case Western Reserve University
dana.crawford@case.edu

Developmental Biology and Genetics

**Chair**
Marlene De La Cruz, Ph.D.
University of California, Irvine
marlene@uci.edu

**Vice Chair**
Anita Corbett, Ph.D.
Emory University
acorbe2@emory.edu

**Ambassador**
Cristian Aguilar, Ph.D.
Azusa Pacific University
caguilar@apu.edu
Scientific Discipline Leaders

Engineering, Physics and Mathematics

Chair
Michael Ayewoh, Ph.D.
Community College of Allegheny County
mikevindo@comcast.net

Vice Chair
Rafael Diaz-Escamilla, Ph.D.
California State University, Sacramento
rdiaz@csus.edu

Ambassador
Angela Alexander-Bryant, Ph.D.
Clemson University
AngelaA@clemson.edu

Immunology

Chair
Cherie Butts, Ph.D.
Biogen
cherie.butts@biogen.com

Vice Chair
Harlan Jones, Ph.D.
University of North Texas
Harlan.Jones@unthsc.edu

Ambassador
Cleber Ovemey, Ph.D.
San Jose State University
cleber.ovemey@sju.edu

Microbiology

Chair
David Weiss, Ph.D.
University of Iowa
david-weiss@uiowa.edu

Vice Chair
Patricia Baynham, Ph.D.
St. Edward's University
patricib@stedwards.edu

Ambassador
Michael Johnson, Ph.D.
University of Arizona
mdljohnson@email.arizona.edu

Neuroscience

Chair
Crystal Watkins, M.D., Ph.D.
Johns Hopkins University SOM
cwatkins@jhmi.edu

Vice Chair
Peter O'Day, Ph.D.
University of Oregon
oday@uoregon.edu

Ambassador
Ramesh Raghupathi, Ph.D.
Drexel University
r79@drexel.edu

Physiology

Chair
Latanya Hammonds-Odie, Ph.D.
Georgia Gwinnett College
hammond@ggc.edu

Vice Chair
Amanda Marie James, Ph.D.
Emory University
amandamariejames@emory.edu

Ambassador
Tan'Ya Gwathmey, Ph.D.
Wake Forest School of Medicine
tg swathme@wakehealth.edu

Social and Behavioral Sciences and Public Health

Chair
Cherrie Boyer, Ph.D.
University of California, San Francisco
Cherrie.Boyer@ucsf.edu

Vice Chair
Roland Thorpe, Ph.D.
Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health
rthorpe@jhu.edu

Ambassador
Karen Singer-Freeman, Ph.D.
Purchase College
karen.singer-freeman@purchase.edu
Questions?

Please type in the Q&A box below