

Instructions for Scoring Poster Presentations

Students presenting posters have been assigned a 1-hour, 30-minute period to be available to stand by their poster and respond to questions. During this time, you are to evaluate the quality of the poster as well as the ability of the student to respond to questions from you and others. You are responsible for evaluating only posters to which you have been assigned.

Please identify yourself to the student(s) as an S3 judge. Be sure to give yourself enough time to visit students in each of your assigned posters within the time allotted. Students are expected to stand near their posters and answer questions from judges during the allotted judging time.

Judge Code: You have been assigned a **4 digit (1000-1999)** identification code. Please add this code on the [online scoring system](#) where it says "Judge ID". You will also need to enter your first name where it says "Judge Name". If you do not remember your number, ask the moderator in the session to locate it.

Abstract Number: Every student presentation is assigned a **3 digit (100-999)** abstract number. Please record the abstract number on the online scoring system where it says "Student Abstract #". These numbers identify the specific presentation so it is important that it is recorded so each presentation is properly scored. This number can also be found in the S3 program and will be on the student's badge.

Please use the QR code below to access the [online scoring form](#)



Scoring:

- Presentations are judged on a 5-point scale. Please read the descriptors in each of the categories ahead of time.
- You have received an email with the link to the online scoring system. **Please have this ready to use for scoring prior to getting to your session(s).** (If you do not have a smartphone, tablet, or laptop you can bring to use during the session, please contact us at s3@sdsu.edu as soon as possible. There will be a few laptops available to enter scoring in the judges' green room.
- Select a score (1 through 5) for each of the seven categories. Select the button next to the number score you wish to record. It is extremely important that your evaluations are fair, consistent, and that standards/expectations are appropriate for the academic level (i.e., undergraduate, master's, doctoral). Be very discriminating with awarding a 5, this score should be reserved for only truly exceptional presentations.
- Please remember to provide some qualitative comments that reflect BOTH positive attributes of their research/presentation and suggestions for improvement or future directions of their research. Mentors will be able to share these comments with students and we want this experience to be an opportunity for reflection and growth. Your comments will be anonymous and not identifiable.
- Once you have made your selections for each category, click the submit button at the bottom of the page. Note: All fields must be filled out or selected in order to submit. There will be an error message if all fields/scores are not completed. If this is the case, review the form, supply the missing information and submit. After a slight delay you will get a message that your score has been submitted with the "Submit another response."
- You will then select "Submit another response" to continue onto the next presenter in the session.

Implicit Bias: We are all influenced by implicit bias, or the stereotypes that unconsciously affect our decisions. When judging, our implicit biases negatively impact students who are traditionally marginalized and disenfranchised. Before writing comments or making a decision, please take a moment to reflect on any biases that may impact your decision making process.

Conflicts of Interest: Please note, faculty members cannot judge and score their mentee's poster(s). This presents a conflict of interest and scores from faculty mentors will not be included in the final scoring summary from the other judges.

Co-presenters: In the case that a poster is being presented by two or more co-presenters, the entire presentation will be given one score as a whole (e.g., the first author of the poster). This pertains only to co-presenters, not co-authors.

Scoring Categories: Standards and expectations for the seven categories are described below:

Organization refers to the quality and completeness of information presented. Only the most relevant information should be presented and have a layout/composition that makes an impact. There should be sufficient detail that explains the purpose, analysis or discussion of project elements. All images and/or graphs are labeled and described well.

Originality refers to the research problem or project purpose and to the design or approach. The problem/purpose should be original and imaginative and display independent and/or creative thought. The design/approach should expand on established ideas or introduce new ideas.

Significance refers to the importance or worth of the project. This category addresses the question of whether it was a worthwhile project to conduct and would make a meaningful contribution to the discipline.

Research Methodology refers to the process used to collect information and data for the purpose of understanding the research problem or project. The use of tools, training and techniques should be evaluated. An analysis (including an explanation of the reasoning for the selection of the process or outcomes) should be applied to the problem but a conclusion or solution does not have to be provided.

Delivery refers to the style of the presenter and the quality of the presentation. The presentation should be given in a manner (e.g., voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills) that shows the enthusiasm, skill, and interest of the student. The delivery also considers the quality of slides or other presentation materials, which should enhance the presentation/performance.

Clarity refers to the clearness of the presentation. Is the subject matter presented in a manner that is understood by the reader or listener or observer.

Interaction with the Audience refers to the presenter's effectiveness in communicating the answers to questions posed by audience members. The reasoning used for the answer was clear, concise, and understood.

Judge Questions:

Please consider asking some of the following questions of students:

- Please say more about your research methods. Why did you choose the techniques you did? What ideas or examples informed your work?
- What are some of the ways your research improves knowledge in your discipline?
- How might your research be used for the greater good or highlight social issues?
- What inspired your interest in this topic?
- What did you find challenging about the research process? How did you overcome that challenge?
- What, if anything, do you plan to do next with this research project?

Please also help keep the session Q & A balanced. If you notice that the other questions are primarily about one aspect of the research process or about only one presenter's work, please consider asking a question on another topic or of another presenter. Additionally, please consider the student's academic level (e.g., undergraduate, masters, doctoral) in the context of your scoring.

Methodological Approaches:

You may be asked to judge presentations in fields that are unfamiliar to you. Please remember that goals and methodological approaches vary across disciplines and that all should be valued for the ways they may facilitate student engagement in the research or creative process.

Some things to keep in mind when judging or asking questions about different presentations:

- **Some research may be solely focused on theory testing while other research may be focused on finding solutions for real-life problems.**
- **Some research may be observational, descriptive, or even imaginative in nature.**
- **Still other work may focus on self-reflection, interrogating one's life for the ways it reveals disciplinary concepts.**
- **Work may also be interdisciplinary, combining approaches and ideas from multiple disciplines.**

As judges, we want to recognize that all of these approaches are valid. Further, even within a given approach, students may be in very different stages in their development as researchers. We want to both challenge and encourage them on their journey!