

## SWAAG Student Poster Competition Guidelines

1. The SWAAG Treasurer will appoint a panel of judges. Judges will be responsible for critical evaluation of extended abstracts as well as judging oral presentations.
2. Each student who wishes to enter the student poster competition must submit both a regular 100 word abstract (required for all poster submissions) **and** an extended abstract to the SWAAG Program Committee. The extended abstract should be roughly **500** words in length. Both the regular and the extended abstracts are due on the program deadline date of September 29<sup>th</sup>. **LATE ABSTRACTS WILL NOT BE ELIGIBLE FOR THE STUDENT POSTER COMPETITION.**
3. A copy of the extended abstract should also be sent to both the Conference Coordinator [jeffa@uca.edu](mailto:jeffa@uca.edu) and to the SWAAG Treasurer at [DPURCELL@OU.EDU](mailto:DPURCELL@OU.EDU) .
4. In the subject of the email put: SWAAG Abst. + “your name”, in the opening of the Word document put your full name, academic affiliation, address, email, phone number, paper or poster, then the paper title and 3 or 4 highlighted key words and a 500 word abstract.
5. Posters co-authored by faculty members will **not** be eligible for student poster awards.
6. The SWAAG treasurer will distribute the abstracts to the judges. Each judge will have ten days to review the abstracts and convey his or her ranking of the papers to the SWAAG Treasurer. Based on the rankings of the judges (an average based on the cumulative ranking of the judges), the SWAAG Treasurer will identify up to ten entries as finalists. As soon as possible the SWAAG Treasurer will convey this decision to the SWAAG Program Committee. Judges must not evaluate entries from their own departments. Rankings for those students will be averaged out of 5 judges rather than 6.
7. Students who are not selected as finalists will present their papers in regular sessions, based upon topic and session themes, either Thursday or Friday.
8. Students who are selected as finalists will present their papers in consecutive sessions on Thursday, October 29<sup>th</sup>. Judges will attend the presentations.
9. The poster judges will evaluate the posters using the criteria below. Following the poster session, the judges will convene to determine the winners of the student poster awards using the criteria form below.
10. Awards for student posters will be announced and presented at the SWAAG banquet on Friday evening, October 30<sup>th</sup>.

## ABCs of Poster Production (after Hay 1996)

Attention getting: first good impression? Grab attention of viewer? Achieved through good layout, use of color, title, and other graphic devices.

Brevity: makes points quickly through good visual/word balance.

Coherence: logical unified statement requiring no further explanation, Capable of standing alone; intellectually accessible to audience.

Direction: simplicity, focus, easy to follow from point to point.

Evidence: argument must be supported by evidence, referenced well and accurate.

### Assessment

*(Column on left represents ideal; right column the opposite. Think of it as a continuum.)*

#### **Quality of Argument**

| High (5)  | Low (1)  |
|---|--|
| Clear statement of research question or relationship being investigated | Ambiguous or unclear statement or purpose                                      |
| Poster “stands alone” requiring no additional explanation               | Poster is difficult or impossible to comprehend without additional information |
| Logical and thorough explanation of the research question               | Illogical or inadequate explanation  |
| All components in presentation given appropriate level of attention     | Insufficient treatment of components   |
| Adequate consultation of sources; sources cited correctly               | Inadequate literature review; sources not cited correctly                      |
| Research objectives outlined precisely                                  | Research objectives not stated or unclear.                                     |
| Appropriate research methodology selected and explained effectively.    | Inappropriate research methodology or unclear methods                          |
| Significance of findings made clear.                                    | No significance identified   |

#### **Quality of Evidence**

| High (5)  | Low (1)  |
|---|--|
| Argument well supported by extensive primary research, evidence, and examples | Inadequate or no primary research, evidence, or examples |
| Accurate presentation of evidence and examples                                | Incomplete or questionable evidence and examples         |

***Use of Graphic Material***

High (5)

Low (1)

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Effective use of figures, tables, illustrations, maps and other illustrative material | Little illustrative material or used ineffectively            |
| Illustrations correctly cited, presented well   | Poorly presented, incorrect citations                         |
| Visual material well integrated into the evidence of the argument                     | Visual material used to illustrate, not argue or as evidence. |

***Poster Appearance***

High (5)

Low (1)

|                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Poster carefully produced            | Sloppy presentation                        |
| All text legible from 4 feet away    | Much text illegible from moderate distance |
| Material presented is well organized | Poor organization of material              |