



---

---

# 35<sup>th</sup> Annual Student Research Forum

---

---

## Judge Packet

Monday January 11, 2021

Session 1: 1:00-2:00pm

Session 2: 2:00-3:00pm

Session 3: 4:30-5:30pm

LINK TO JUDGE EVALUATIONS: <https://bit.ly/2L0sviG>

### Research Forum Judge Form

Annual Student Research Forum Judging Instructions

Please refer to the rubric in your packet for full category details. Then enter your choice from the rating scale in the rubric into this survey.

ARE YOU A: \*

- Faculty Judge  
 Phase 1 Student Judge

SESSION: \*

- Session 1: 1:00pm - 2:00pm  
 Session 2: 2:00pm - 3:00pm  
 Session 3: 4:30pm - 5:30pm

POSTER NUMBER: \*

PRIMARY PRESENTER FIRST NAME: \*

Please enter student presenter's first name.

PRIMARY PRESENTER LAST NAME: \*

Please enter student presenter's last name.

JUDGE FIRST NAME: \*

Please enter your first name.

Need Help? Please go to our

faculty zoom link: <https://bit.ly/3hJY6Rq>

### To Evaluate a Poster:

- Go to <https://bit.ly/358IUIM> to the 35th Annual Research Forum Website.
- Find the student project of interest in the table and session provided.
- Click the links to review the poster and abstract.
- Click the zoom link to interact with presenter.
- Go to <https://bit.ly/2L0sviG> to complete a judging form for each presenter.
- Answer each question accurately based on the rubric included in your packet. Please only use the rubric as a guide; enter your evaluation score into the survey directly.
- Complete one electronic evaluation per presenter. Upon completion, if you have another poster to judge, start a new evaluation after you select "Submit." A new form will automatically load. If you do not have any more posters to judge, simply close the window.

## 35<sup>th</sup> Annual Research Forum -- ABRCMS Judging Rubric – Poster & Oral Presentations

Modified from the Annual Biomedical Research Conference for Minority Students (ABRCMS) and American Society of Microbiology (ASM) Judging Handbook. Permission for use of this rubric was obtained from ASM/ABRCMS.

The judging criteria are meant to give all students, no matter their level of experience, an equal opportunity. Also, please add your comments in the comment section of the back page.

<b>Rating Scale: 5 highest score – 1 lowest score</b> For each of the categories below, please circle the appropriate rating. Please make notes in the comments section on back.				
<b>HYPOTHESIS AND/OR STATEMENT OF PROBLEM</b>	<b>METHODS AND CONTROLS/COMPARISON</b>	<b>RESULTS</b>	<b>CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK</b>	<b>DISCLOSURE</b>
<b>5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A logical hypothesis/statement of problem was presented clearly</li> <li>Background information was relevant and summarized well. Connections to previous literature and broader issues were clear</li> <li>Goal of project was stated clearly and concisely; showed clear relevance beyond project</li> </ul>	<b>5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thorough explanation of why particular methods were chosen</li> <li>Clear discussion of controls or comparative groups; all appropriate controls or comparative groups were included</li> </ul>	<b>5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Substantial amounts of high quality data were presented sufficient to address the hypothesis</li> <li>Presentation of data was clear, thorough, and logical</li> </ul>	<b>5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reasonable conclusions were given and strongly supported with evidence</li> <li>Conclusions were compared to hypothesis and their relevance in a wider context was discussed</li> </ul>	<div style="color: red;">                     Side 1 Total _____                      (5-23pts possible)                 </div> <div style="color: red;">                     Side 2 Total _____                      (3-15pts possible)                 </div> <div style="color: red;">                     Grand Total _____                      (8-38pts possible)                 </div>
<b>4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A logical hypothesis/statement of problem was presented</li> <li>Background information was relevant, but connections were not clear</li> <li>Goal of project was stated clearly; showed relevance beyond project</li> </ul>	<b>4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good explanation of choice of methods</li> <li>Clear discussion of controls or comparative groups; most controls or comparative groups were included</li> </ul>	<b>4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sufficient amounts of good data were presented to address the hypothesis</li> <li>Presentation of data was clear and logical</li> </ul>	<b>4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reasonable conclusions were given and supported with evidence</li> <li>Conclusions were compared to hypothesis, but their relevance was not discussed</li> </ul>	<div style="color: red;"> <input type="checkbox"/> No Show                 </div>
<b>3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A questionable hypothesis/statement of problem was presented</li> <li>Background information was relevant, but connections were not made</li> <li>Goal of project was stated understandably</li> </ul>	<b>3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little comment on why the methods were chosen and others not chosen</li> <li>Adequate discussion of controls or comparative groups; some significant controls or comparative groups were lacking</li> </ul>	<b>3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate amounts of reasonably good data were presented to address the hypothesis</li> <li>Presentation of data was not entirely clear</li> </ul>	<b>3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reasonable conclusions were given</li> <li>Conclusions were not compared to the hypothesis and their relevance was not discussed</li> </ul>	<b>3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complete</li> </ul>
<b>2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A questionable hypothesis/statement of problem was presented and was not necessarily supported</li> <li>Some relevant background information was included, but not connected</li> <li>Goal of project was not clear</li> </ul>	<b>2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No discussion of choice of methods</li> <li>Controls or comparative groups not adequately described; some appropriate controls or groups were missing</li> </ul>	<b>2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some data were lacking not fully sufficient to address the hypothesis</li> <li>Presentation of data was included, but unclear or difficult to comprehend</li> </ul>	<b>2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conclusions were given</li> <li>Little connection with the hypothesis was apparent</li> </ul>	<b>2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Present but not complete</li> </ul>
<b>1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The hypothesis/statement of problem was inappropriate or was missing</li> <li>Little or no background information was included or connected</li> <li>Goal of project was not stated</li> </ul>	<b>1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Methods section missing</li> <li>Serious lack of controls or discussion of controls</li> </ul>	<b>1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results are not yet available or reproducible</li> <li>Presentation of data was missing</li> </ul>	<b>1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conclusions were missing</li> <li>There was no connection with the hypothesis</li> </ul>	<b>1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not present</li> </ul>

OVERALL PRESENTATION & HANDLING QUESTIONS	POSTER BOARD PRESENTATION	IMPACT POSTER + PRESENTATION		COMMENTS
		Faculty Judge	Student Judge	
<b>5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates a very strong knowledge of the research project</li> <li>• Speaks clearly, naturally and with enthusiasm; makes eye contact</li> <li>• Comfortably uses visual aids to enhance presentation</li> <li>• Answers difficult questions clearly and succinctly</li> <li>• Presentation is consistently clear and logical</li> </ul>	<b>5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All expected components are present, clearly laid out, and easy to follow in the absence of presenter</li> <li>• The text is concise, legible, and consistently free of spelling or typographical errors; the background is unobtrusive</li> <li>• The figures and tables are appropriate and consistently labeled correctly</li> <li>• Photographs/tables/graphs improve understanding and enhance the visual appeal</li> </ul>	<b>5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Original idea with frame shifting approach to the field</li> </ul>	<b>5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduced me to new concepts which dramatically changed my conceptual understanding</li> </ul>	Overall Strengths:
<b>4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates a good knowledge of the research project</li> <li>• Speaks clearly and naturally; makes eye contact</li> <li>• Uses visual aids to enhance the presentation</li> <li>• Answers most questions</li> <li>• Presentation is clear for the most part, but not consistently</li> </ul>	<b>4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All expected components are present, but layout is crowded or jumbled and somewhat confusing to follow in the absence of presenter</li> <li>• The text is relatively clear, legible, and mostly free of spelling or typographical errors; the background is unobtrusive</li> <li>• Most of the figures and tables are appropriate and labeled correctly</li> <li>• Photographs/tables/graphs improve understanding</li> </ul>	<b>4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work expands on previous work in the field in new and important directions</li> </ul>	<b>4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduced me to new concepts</li> <li>• Facilitated integration of new concepts into concepts I already had</li> </ul>	
<b>3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some knowledge of the research project</li> <li>• Reads from the poster (slide or script) some of the time</li> <li>• Uses some visual aids to enhance the presentation</li> <li>• Has some difficulty answering challenging questions</li> <li>• Presentation is unclear and inconsistent</li> </ul>	<b>3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of the expected components are present, but layout is confusing to follow in the absence of presenter</li> <li>• The text is relatively clear and legible, but inconsistently free of spelling or typographical errors; the background may be distracting</li> <li>• The figures and tables are not always related to the text, or appropriate, or are labeled incorrectly</li> <li>• Photographs/table/graphs do not improve understanding</li> </ul>	<b>3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expands on previous work in the field</li> <li>• Of moderate importance</li> </ul>	<b>3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased my depth of understanding of a particular field</li> <li>• Introduced me to new concepts</li> </ul>	Overall Weaknesses:
<b>2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates a poor knowledge of the research project</li> <li>• Reads from the poster (slide or script) most of the time</li> <li>• Does not use the available visual aid to enhance presentation effectively</li> <li>• Has difficulty answering questions</li> <li>• Presentation is unclear</li> </ul>	<b>2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the expected components are present, but layout is untidy and confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter</li> <li>• The text is hard to read due to font size or color and inconsistently free of spelling or typographical errors; the background may be distracting</li> <li>• The figures and tables are not related to the text, or are not appropriate, or are poorly labeled</li> <li>• Photographs/tables/graphs are limited and do not improve understanding of the project</li> </ul>	<b>2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replicates previously known work but was a replication that needed to be done</li> </ul>	<b>2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reinforced concepts I was already familiar with</li> </ul>	
<b>1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not demonstrate knowledge of the research project</li> <li>• Reads from the poster (slide or script) all the time</li> <li>• Does not use the available visual aid to enhance presentation</li> <li>• Does not understand questions</li> </ul>	<b>1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the expected components are present, but poorly laid out and confusing to follow in the absence of the presenter.</li> <li>• The text is hard to read, messy and illegible, and contains multiple spelling or typographical errors very poor background</li> <li>• The figures and tables are poorly done; visual aids not used</li> </ul>	<b>1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replication of previously known work in the field</li> <li>• Little impact on the field</li> </ul>	<b>1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did not advance my knowledge</li> </ul>	