SJDM Annual Meeting
Student poster rating dimensions

Dimensions are judged on a 7-point scale
Dimensions are equally weighted in computing composite score

Visual presentation and organization

Clearly labeled abstract/introduction, methods, results, discussion/conclusions. Visual appeal, appropriate use of figures and tables, clarity of presentation, decent font sizes.

Methodological quality

Are the methods appropriate for the topics, in terms of research design and proper use of statistical analyses?

Appropriateness of interpretation

Abstract appropriately written, results don't over-interpret or misinterpret, conclusions and discussion don't generalize inappropriately. Conclusion addresses purpose of study as described in introduction.

Significance / Theoretical importance of contribution

Does the poster address an important issue? Does the study advance knowledge?

Originality

Is the topic treated in a substantially new way? Does the design elaborate or improve on the standard paradigm? Do the results allow for new interpretations or provide a novel source of evidence?

SJDM Annual Meeting
Judging protocol notes

Although each individual is free to assess the quality of a student's work in his/her own way, below are some notes that have been helpful in years past.

The main point of departure from a single protocol has been the degree to which judges interact with presenters in determining ratings. I simply ask that, if you are going to interact with presenters, please do so consistently (i.e., try not to give one presenter 20 minutes while asking nothing of another). This may be difficult especially if a presenter is not at their poster, and due to time constraints.

There is also an *optional* electronic grading option. This requires all students who wish to be eligible to submit their posters about a week prior to the conference. Therefore, *if you wish*, you can complete any or all of your judging prior to the poster sessions at the conference site; you are also free to completely disregard the electronic submissions, if you choose.

Granted, there is a great deal of flexibility and thus variability when it comes to judging protocol. Composite scores are standardized within-judge, so as long as you are consistent then procedural differences across judges should not be a primary concern. Use your best judgment to do the judging that you feel is fair and is most convenient for you; for reference, some possible methods include:

a.   Interact equally with all presenters and include these interactions in your ratings of the five categories. Use the "Tilt" if you want to adjust the score based on dimensions not captured well by the five rating categories.

b.   First, rate the poster itself (not the presenter) on each of the five categories. Then, interact with the presenter, such as by asking questions for clarification, obtaining a "walk-through," etc.; and use this elaboration to adjust the overall score using the "Tilt."

c.   Avoid interaction with all presenters and rate the written material only, on each of the five categories. Use the "Tilt" if you want to adjust the score based on dimensions not captured well by the five rating categories.

Again, consistency in your method is the key! If you do interact with presenters, remember that our only goal is to judge the quality of the work, not the personality of the presenter.

Note that options (**b**) and (**c**) are very easily implemented using the electronically-submitted posters. You may also, for example, wholly judge the electronic submission, and then use the "Tilt" option on-site to adjust the score based on any revisions that are present in the printed poster.