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WEBINAR AGENDA

- Conference Overview
- Review of Judging Rubric
- New for 2019
- Scientific Discipline Chairs, Vice Chairs, and Ambassadors
- 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.
Attendance by Year

- 2016: 4076
- 2017: 4352
- 2018: 4671
- 2019*: 4500

*as of October 28
2019 Education Level of Abstract Submitters

- Community College Student: 81
- Sophomore: 251
- Junior: 770
- Senior: 1439
- Postbaccalaureate: 169
- Master's Student: 74
2019 Scientific Disciplines of Submitted Abstracts

- Biochemistry and Molecular Biology: 13%
- Cancer Biology: 10%
- Cell Biology: 6%
- Chemistry: 7%
- Computational and Systems Biology: 5%
- Developmental Biology and Genetics: 7%
- Engineering, Physics and Mathematics: 8%
- Immunology: 5%
- Microbiology: 10%
- Neuroscience: 12%
- Physiology and Pharmacology: 6%
- Social and Behavioral Sciences and Public Health: 11%
- Immunology: 5%
- Microbiology: 10%
- Neuroscience: 12%
- Physiology and Pharmacology: 6%
- Social and Behavioral Sciences and Public Health: 11%
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 GUIDELINES

• Turn off your cell phone
• 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
Importance of Feedback

- Common complaint from students is that their judge did not provide them with feedback
- Students want feedback on what they did well and how they can improve
- However, this needs to be done effectively by judges. In the past, we do have judges who’ve made students cry
- Suggested feedback model:
  - Tell the student: “This is my feedback…”
  - Give a specific example of something they did well
  - Describe one specific thing they can do to improve
  - Encourage them to continue with their studies in STEM
<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</td>
<td>Methods were not stated</td>
<td>Results were not provided</td>
<td>Conclusions were missing</td>
<td>Does not demonstrate any knowledge of the research project</td>
<td>Not all of the expected components* are presented and the layout is confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypothesis/Objective was not stated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statement about Future Work was not included</td>
<td>Text is hard to read, messy and illegible, or has spelling or typographical errors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Background was not clearly 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</td>
<td>Conclusions were included but little connection was made to the Results</td>
<td>Demonstrates a poor knowledge of the research project</td>
<td>Photographs/tables/graphics are poorly done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypothesis/Objective was not clear or relevant to the project</td>
<td>Data were difficult to comprehend</td>
<td>Statement about Future Work was provided but did not logically follow Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Background was not clear or was incomplete</td>
<td>Methods were appropriately 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</td>
<td>Conclusions were reasonably supported by the Results but the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective was not provided</td>
<td>Demonstrates some knowledge of the research project</td>
<td>The text is relatively clear and legible, but has spelling or typographical errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypothesis/Objective was clear but not appropriately linked to the Background</td>
<td>Data were difficult to comprehend</td>
<td>Statement about Future Work somewhat followed the Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Photographs/tables/graphics are not related to the text or are poorly labeled 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 projects 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</td>
<td>Conclusions were supported by the Results but the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective was unclear or incomplete</td>
<td>Demonstrates good knowledge of the research project</td>
<td>Most of the expected components* are presented, but the layout is confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypothesis/Objective was clear and appropriately linked to the Background</td>
<td>Data were sufficient to comprehend</td>
<td>Statement about Future Work logically followed the Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Photographs/tables/graphics are related to the text, but labeled correctly or do not 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</td>
<td>Results included sufficient amounts of high quality data to address the Hypothesis/Objective</td>
<td>Conclusions were strongly supported by the Results and the relevance to the Hypothesis/Objective</td>
<td>Demonstrates very strong knowledge of the research project</td>
<td>All expected components* are presented and are clearly laid out and easy to follow in the absence of the presenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypothesis/Objective was clear and appropriately linked to the Background</td>
<td>Data were clear, logical, thorough and easy to comprehend</td>
<td>Statement about Future Work logically followed the Results and included next steps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Text is relatively clear, concise, legible, and free of spelling or typographical errors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Components are defined as Title, Authors and Institutional Affiliation, Hypothesis/Objective, Background, Methods, Results, Conclusions, Future Work, Bibliography, and Acknowledgments.
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
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
Importance of Scoring

- Scores determine which students receive presentation awards & help evaluate Judges Program
- In 2018, **96.6%** of presenters received three scores
- Common reasons students did not receive three scores:
  - Judge did not enter scores during assigned session
    - If you cannot attend your session, let Scientific Discipline Leader know ASAP
    - If you are covering another judge’s assignment, still need to enter in score
  - Judge was a no-show judge or last minute cancellation
  - Judge forgot to enter 3rd score
- Strongly encourage to enter scores immediately following judging session.
NEW in 2019

- **Refocus the purpose of the Mandatory Judges Meeting**
  - Goal of meeting is to make sure all students have three judges
- **Attendance taken during the 15 minute meeting prior to session**
  - Table will be placed by your discipline where Scientific Discipline Leaders will be stationed
- **Put initials on stickers**
- **Check out with Scientific Discipline Chairs at end of session**
- **Poster numbers are color-coded based on discipline**
  - This year’s layout of poster numbers may be challenging. To help clarify where posters are located, the mobile app has the poster numbers labelled in Exhibit Hall
Download the ABRCMS Mobile app to see where specific poster numbers are located and to read your assigned students’ abstracts.
Scientific Discipline Chairs, Vice Chairs, Ambassadors

- Every scientific discipline has a Chair, Vice Chair, and Ambassador
- On-site point of contact
- Two at every poster session
- Stationed by tables near discipline
- Identified by teal lanyards
- Let them know of any issues or concerns
Scientific Discipline Leaders

**Engineering, Physics and Mathematics**

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

**Vice Chair**
Angela Alexander-Bryant, Ph.D.
Clemson University
AngelaA@clemson.edu

**Ambassador**
Abiraman Srinivasan, Ph.D.
Community College of Allegheny County
asrinivasan@ccac.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 Ovevemey, Ph.D.
San Jose State University
cleber.ouvevemey@sju.edu

**Microbiology**

**Chair**
Alfredo Torres, Ph.D.
University of Texas Medical Branch
altorres@utmb.edu

**Vice Chair**
Michael Johnson, Ph.D.
University of Arizona
mdljohnson@email.arizona.edu

**Ambassador**
Danielle Graham, Ph.D.
Fayetteville State University
degraham@uncfsu.edu

**Neuroscience**

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

**Vice Chair**
Ramesh Raghupathi, Ph.D.
Drexel University
rr79@drexel.edu

**Ambassador**
Michael Burton, Ph.D.
University of Texas at Dallas
michael.burton@utdallas.edu

**Physiology**

**Chair**
Latanya Hammonds-Odie, Ph.D.
Georgia Gwinnett College
lhammond@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
tgwathme@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**
Karen Singer-Freeman, Ph.D.
University of North Carolina, Charlotte
ksingerf@uncc.edu

**Ambassador**
David Cordova, Ph.D.
University of Michigan
cordova@umich.edu
Next Steps: On-Site

• **Pick up your judging assignments**
  – Judges Lounge *(room 207 AB)* on Wednesday from 12 pm – 6 pm
  – After Wednesday pick up at Thursday’s Judges Meeting
  – Otherwise, contact Leah to pick up upon arrival

• **Attend Judges Meeting**
  – Thursday, Nov. 14 at 8:15 am
Oral Sessions

• Limited number of returning judges will serve as oral judges
• Oral judges will be emailed prior to the conference with instructions
• If time permits, we encourage you to attend an oral presentation
  – Goal to have all oral presentations, including Saturday morning, well attended
Questions?

Please type in the Q&A box below
Judging Best Practice

Case Study and Discussion
Scenario One

The new poster policy states that students can only have scientific images printed or adhered to their poster board (with the exception of their university or funding logo). As you walk up to begin judging your assigned student’s presentation, you notice a large state flag printed on the student’s poster.

What should your next step be?

a) Tell the student they are ineligible
b) Skip judging this presentation and move on to the next student
c) Tell your Scientific Discipline Leader about the violation
Questions?

Please type in the Q&A box below