

## ASABE Student Oral/Poster Presentation Competition Rules/Regulations

Approved – 4/23/18

1. Outstanding student presentations (oral and/or poster) will be awarded for each of the following ASABE technical communities: ASE and EOPD (combined), ES and ESH (combined), ITSC, MS, NRES, PAFS, and PRS.
2. The number of awards available to each community is based on the number of student presentations entered into the competition. The Chair of the P-129 Student Oral/Poster Presentation Competition Committee will determine the number of awards available to each community following the AIM registration deadline.
3. The total number of awards given, across all communities, shall not exceed 30.
4. The number of awards given for oral presentations and poster presentations, within each community, shall reflect the percentages of student presentations in each category.
5. Each award will consist of \$250, and each awardee will receive prize money and a certificate to be sent after the Annual International Meeting (AIM).
6. Advertising for the student oral presentation competition will be the responsibility of the Chair of the P-129 Student Oral/Poster Presentation Competition Committee. The Chair of the P-129 Student Oral/Poster Presentation Competition Committee is responsible for sending an e-mail invitation to all Agricultural and Biological Engineering Department Heads/Chairs, asking them to forward to appropriate faculty and students. This announcement must be completed prior to the abstract deadline for the upcoming AIM.
7. To be entered into the competition, students must submit an abstract for presentation at the AIM. Students must indicate that they are either an undergraduate or graduate student through the Abstract Submission Process.
8. Students must be ASABE members, at the time of the AIM, to be eligible for awards.
9. Students in the following communities must submit an Annual Meeting paper to be eligible for awards: ITSC, PAFS, and PRS. **Note: ITSC, PAFS, and PRS representatives stated that their communities desire this requirement. NRES representatives did not desire this requirement. Input from other communities, through the P-129 committee, is required.**
10. Students who graduated during the spring semester, immediately preceding the AIM, may participate in the competition.
11. Student presentations will not be separated based on student classification. No distinction will be made between undergraduate and graduate student presenters.

12. Student presentations will not be split into a separate session, but rather students will present in their assigned session matching their research topic.
13. Students must be the first author of the presentation, meaning they must have made substantial contributions to the work. Presentations are not required to be single author; multiple authors are allowed. Students must present individually and not as a group.
14. For oral presentations, judges will be solicited from audience members watching the presentations, with care taken to avoid conflicts of interest. Technical session moderators can identify potential judges prior to the session. The goal will be to have three (3) judges for each student presentation in a session, but as few as two judges may be used in cases where audience attendance is low.
15. For poster presentations, judges will be identified by the respective P-129 Student Oral/Poster Presentation Competition Committee representatives, prior to AIM, with care taken to avoid conflicts of interest. The goal will be to have two (2) judges for each student poster presentation.
16. The form (rubrics) on the following pages will be used to judge the presentations.
17. All judging forms will be returned to the session moderator and then either given to the appropriate P-129 Student Oral/Poster Presentation Competition Committee representative or to ASABE staff at the registration desk. Judging sheets must be returned by the close of the AIM (Wednesday afternoon). The P-129 Student Oral/Poster Presentation Competition Committee representative, from each technical community, is responsible for compiling scores and reporting winners to the Chair of the P-129 Student Oral/Poster Presentation Competition Committee within one-week of the close of the AIM.
18. The Chair of the P-129 Student Oral/Poster Presentation Competition Committee will report the winners, including name, title of presentation, and presentation type to ASABE's Awards Administrator.
19. The P-129 Student Oral/Poster Presentation Competition Committee representative, from each community, is responsible for scanning and returning the judges sheets to the students within two-weeks of the close of the AIM.
20. Winners will be informed after the AIM by an e-mail from ASABE headquarters. Winners' names, presentation titles, presentation type, and technical communities will be included in an issue of *Inside ASABE* and also posted on the ASABE website.



## 2018 ASABE Oral Presentation Judging Sheet



**Student Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Session #:** \_\_\_\_\_

Oral Evaluation Rubric based on Oklahoma State University Student Water Conference Oral Presentation Rubric and Iowa State University, 2005. Oral Presentation Rubric, <http://www.educ.iastate.edu/elps/rubricoral.htm>, accessed 19 May 2005.

Criteria	Distinguished 25	Proficient 15	Basic 5	Poor 0
<p><b>Organization</b>  (25 Points)</p> <p>Score: _____</p>	<p>Introduces the purpose of the presentation clearly and creatively.</p> <p>Effectively includes smooth, clever transitions in order to connect key points.</p> <p>Student presents information in logical, interesting sequence which audience can follow.</p> <p>Ends with an accurate conclusion showing thoughtful, strong evaluation of the evidence presented.</p>	<p>Introduces the purpose of the presentation clearly.</p> <p>Includes transitions to connect key points but better transitions from idea to idea are needed.</p> <p>Most information presented in logical sequence; A few minor points may be confusing.</p> <p>Ends with a summary of main points showing some evaluation of the evidence presented.</p>	<p>Introduces the purpose of the presentation.</p> <p>Includes some transitions to connect key points but there is difficulty in following presentation.</p> <p>Student jumps around topics. Several points are confusing.</p> <p>Ends with a summary or conclusion; little evidence of evaluating content.</p>	<p>Does not clearly introduce the purpose of the presentation.</p> <p>Uses ineffective transitions that rarely connect points; there is no sequence of information.</p> <p>Presentation is choppy and disjointed; no apparent logical order of presentation.</p> <p>Ends without a summary or conclusion.</p>

Criteria	Distinguished 25	Proficient 15	Basic 5	Poor 0
<p><b>Grammar, Word Choice, Voice</b>  (15 Points)</p> <p>Score: _____</p>	<p>Poised, clear articulation; proper volume; steady rate; enthusiasm; confidence; speaker is clearly comfortable in front of the group.</p> <p>Presentation has no misspellings or grammatical errors.</p>	<p>Clear articulation but not as polished; slightly uncomfortable at times.</p> <p>Presentation has one or two misspellings and/or grammatical errors.</p>	<p>Audience occasionally has trouble hearing the presentation; seems uncomfortable.</p> <p>Presentation has multiple misspellings and/or grammatical errors.</p>	<p>Presenter is obviously anxious and cannot be heard or monotone with little or no expression.</p> <p>Student's presentation has so many errors and/or grammatical errors that it detracts from the presentation.</p>

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Distinguished 25</b>	<b>Proficient 15</b>	<b>Basic 5</b>	<b>Poor 0</b>
<p><b>Visual Aids</b></p> <p><b>(20 Points)</b></p> <p><b>Score: _____</b></p>	<p>Graphics are designed to reinforce presentation and maximize audience understanding; use of graphics is varied and appropriate with not being added simply for the sake of use.</p> <p>Visual aids were colorful and large enough to be seen by all even those in back of the room and easy to understand.</p>	<p>While graphics relate and aid presentation, the graphics are not as varied and not as well connected to presentation.</p> <p>Font size is appropriate for reading, and visual aids are somewhat easy to understand.</p>	<p>Occasional use of graphics that rarely supports presentation; visual aids were not colorful or clear. Choppy, time wasting use of multimedia.</p> <p>Font is too small to be easily seen and visual aids are difficult to interpret.</p>	<p>Student uses superfluous graphics, no graphics, or graphics that are so poorly prepared that they detract from the presentation.</p> <p>Font is too small to be easily seen and presentation aids are not in sufficient quality for audience to interpret their meaning.</p>

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Distinguished 25</b>	<b>Proficient 15</b>	<b>Basic 5</b>	<b>Poor 0</b>
<p><b>Content</b></p> <p><b>(40 Points)</b></p> <p><b>Score: _____</b></p>	<p>Provides an accurate and complete explanation of key concepts and theories, drawing upon relevant literature.</p> <p>Methods were appropriate to answer the research question and advance scientific knowledge relative to the methods used.</p> <p>Combines and evaluates existing ideas to form new insights.</p> <p>Information completely accurate; all names and facts were precise and explicit.</p>	<p>For the most part, explanations of concepts and theories are accurate and complete. Some helpful applications of theory are included.</p> <p>Appropriate methods used to answer the research question, with most methods presented based on accepted standards.</p> <p>Combines existing ideas to form new insights.</p> <p>No significant errors are made; a few inconsistencies or minor errors in information.</p>	<p>Explanations of concepts and/or theories are inaccurate or incomplete. Little attempt is made to tie in theory.</p> <p>Some inappropriate methods used to answer the research question with errors in either method or application of the method.</p> <p>Combines existing ideas.</p> <p>Enough errors are made to distract a knowledgeable listener, but some information is accurate.</p>	<p>No reference is made to literature or theory. Information included does not support research.</p> <p>Methods were inappropriate for answering the research questions. The research methodology lacks scientific credibility.</p> <p>Shows little evidence of the combination of ideas.</p> <p>The listener cannot depend on the presentation as a source of accurate information.</p>

**Total Score:**



## 2018 ASABE Poster Presentation Judging Sheet



**Student Name:**

**Poster #:**

---

Use these criteria to rate the poster presentation (circle the number next to each category)  
**1=Poor; 3=Good; 5=Outstanding**

### **Appearance**

- |  |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Well-organized and easy to follow poster        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Graphics and other visuals enhance presentation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

### **Content**

- |  |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Purpose of research clearly stated        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Methods clearly indicated and appropriate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Analysis is technically sound             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. Conclusions supported by results          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

### **Presentation**

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7. Communication and presentation skill | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Response to questions                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

### **Overall Quality of Research**

- |                            |   |   |   |   |   |
|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9. Research significance   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. Depth of investigation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**Total score:**