

Oral Presentation and Poster Competition Guidelines

Department of Horticulture and Crop Science

Graduate Research Retreat

October 12-13, 2017 | Columbus, OH

New This Year!

- Two oral research competitions—5 minute Research Flash Talks and 12-15 minute Research Presentations
- Shortened oral proposal competitions—5 minute Proposal Flash Talks
- Oral competitions will be judged by panels. Each competition category will have a panel of 5-7 judges, all of whom will provide feedback and scores for each competitor. This prevents one competitor from having “harder” judges than another competitor and lets all students get more feedback from more judges.
- Posters will still be judged by three people per poster as in years past.
- Abstracts for all competitions (oral and posters) will account for 20% of competitors' overall score.

Competition Eligibility

- Graduate students must be enrolled (or graduated in spring or summer 2017) in the department of Horticulture and Crop Science and advised by an HCS faculty member.
- Students who participated in previous Graduate Research Retreat competitions are required to report additional or different data.
- Students may submit to more than one category if unique information is reported in each.

Competition Categories

- Proposal Flash Talk – MS (5 min oral presentation, 4 min for questions)
- Proposal Flash Talk – Ph.D. (5 min oral presentation, 4 min for questions)
- Research Flash Talk – MS (5 min oral presentation, 4 min for questions)
- Research Flash Talk – Ph.D. (5 min oral presentation, 4 min for questions)
- Research Presentation – MS (12-15 min oral presentation, 4 min for questions)
- Research Presentation – Ph.D. (12-15 min oral presentation, 4 min for questions)
- Poster Competition – Combined MS/Ph.D.
- Non-competition Poster – open to all post docs, staff, lab groups, and students

If there are 3 or fewer competitors in a given category, MS and Ph.D. students will be combined for that competition format. All affected students and judges will be informed of the change before the retreat.

Monetary awards will be given for the 1st place winner in each category (excluding the non-competition poster category). 2nd and 3rd place prizes may be awarded based on the final number of competition categories and participants.

Rules for all Abstracts in all categories

- All abstracts will be published in the Graduate Research Retreat Program. The program will be given to all participants of the retreat (University affiliates and visitors).
- Abstracts for all categories are limited to 250 words.
- All abstracts must be submitted by **6pm on Friday, September 22nd, 2017.**
- See instructions below for how to submit an abstract.

Directions for Submitting an Abstract

- All abstracts must be submitted as Microsoft Word documents, single spaced with size 12 Arial font.
- Please include your presentation or poster title and your name on your Word document with your abstract. Title and name do not count towards the word count.
- Email the word document hcs.graduateresearchretreat@gmail.com as an attachment. Use the appropriate subject line as listed in the table below.
- If you are submitting abstracts for multiple categories, email each separately.
- There will not be an opportunity to edit abstracts after submission.
- Abstracts are due by **6pm on Friday, September 22nd, 2017.**

Competition Category	Subject Line
Proposal Flash Talk – MS	name.# PROPOSAL FT MS
Proposal Flash Talk – Ph.D.	name.# PROPOSAL FT PhD
Research Flash Talk – MS	name.# RESEARCH FT MS
Research Flash Talk – Ph.D.	name.# RESEARCH FT PhD
Research Presentation – MS	name.# RESEARCH MS
Research Presentation – Ph.D.	name.# RESEARCH PhD
Poster Competition – Combined MS/Ph.D.	name.# POSTER COMP
Non-competition Poster	name.# NONCOMP POSTER

Example: MS Student Brutus Buckeye.1 wishes to compete in the Proposal Flash Talk and uses the subject line buckeye.1 PROPOSAL FT MS

The GRR committee reserves the right to disqualify any abstract that is submitted past the deadline, lacks appropriate formatting, or is not emailed with the correct subject line.

Poster Competition Rules

Category: Poster Competition

- Posters (in PDF format) must be submitted by **6pm on Monday, October 2nd, 2017.** Email PDFs to hcs.graduateresearchretreat@gmail.com with the subject line “name.# poster competition”
- Posters must be available for set up between **9 and 10am on Thursday, October 12th.**
- Student presenters are required to be at their posters during the scheduled poster viewing session on Thursday, October 12th, 2017.

- 80% of the total score will be based on the poster. The remaining 20% of points will be based on the abstract (submitted via email by September 22nd). For more scoring information, see the abstract and poster rubrics.

Flash Talk Competition Rules

Categories: Proposal Flash Talk MS, Proposal Flash Talk Ph.D., Research Flash Talk MS, Research Flash Talk Ph.D.

- Presentation will consist of a 5 minute oral presentation followed by up to 4 minutes of questions, both of which will be judged (see rubrics for more information).
- Slide shows or other visual aids are permitted but not required. If you plan on using a visual aid other than a slide show that requires electricity, a table, or other resources, please contact hcs.graduateresearchretreat@gmail.com so that we can make accommodations.
- 80% of the total score will be based on the oral presentation. The remaining 20% of points will be based on the abstract (submitted via email by September 22nd). For more scoring information, see the abstract and presentation rubrics.

Research Presentation Rules

Categories: Research Presentation MS, Research Presentation Ph.D.

- Presentation will consist of a 12-15 minute oral presentation followed by up to 4 minutes of questions (see rubrics for more information).
- Slide shows or other visual aids are permitted but not required. If you plan on using a visual aid other than a slide show that requires electricity, a table, or other resources, please contact hcs.graduateresearchretreat@gmail.com so that we can make accommodations.
- 80% of the total score will be based on the oral presentation. The remaining 20% of points will be based on the abstract (submitted via email by September 22nd). For more scoring information, see the abstract and presentation rubrics.

Non-competition Poster Rules

Category: Non-competition poster

We also encourage any Post Doctorate, staff member, visiting scholar, or lab group to present any of their research which they are able to share.

- Cash prizes will NOT be awarded for this category.
- Posters must be available for set up by **10am on Thursday, October 12th, 2017.**
- Presenters should, if able, stand at their posters during the poster viewing session on Thursday, October 12th, 2017.

Research Abstract Evaluations

Student Name: _____

Categories: Poster Competition—MS/Ph.D., Research Flash Talk—MS, Research Flash Talk—Ph.D., Research Presentation—MS, Research Presentation—Ph.D.

Category	Excellent (4pts)	Satisfactory (2-3pts)	Poor (0-1pts)	Score
<i>Purpose of Study</i>	The study has a clear goal and objectives and/or hypothesis are directly related to that goal.	The study has a goal and objectives and/or hypothesis.	Goal is unclear. Objectives are missing or non-obvious.	(0-4pts possible)
<i>Design and Methods</i>	The research methods are appropriate for the field of study and will provide data to evaluate the hypothesis and accomplish objectives. The theoretical foundation for these methods is robust and well thought out.	The research methods will provide useful data related to the objectives. The reasoning behind the chosen methods was unclear or missing.	Judges cannot evaluate the appropriateness of methods because the abstract lacks details.	(0-4pts possible)
<i>Results and Conclusions</i>	Data interpretation is easy to understand and reasonable. Results are clearly stated and accurately reflected the data collected.	The link between data collected and conclusions presented is unclear.	Results and conclusions are not clearly stated.	(0-4pts possible)
<i>Implications and Significance</i>	This research is valid and advances the body of knowledge in the given subject area.	This research is valid but does not contribute significantly to the field of study.	This research is not likely to be useful to others working in this field.	(0-4pts possible)
<i>Overall Quality</i>	The abstract is well written and professional. The grammar and spelling are consistently excellent. The depth and details are appropriate given the word limit and subject area.	Writing neither adds to nor detracts from the clarity of the abstract.	Writing has little structure. Abstract contains grammar and spelling errors.	(0-4pts possible)

Additional Comments (use back if necessary):

Abstracts account for 20% of the competitor's overall score. Abstracts are limited to a maximum of 250 words. Any competitors that exceed this word count will face a 5-point deduction when final scores are tallied.

Proposal Abstract Evaluations

Student Name: _____

Categories: Proposal Flash Talk—MS, Proposal Flash Talk—Ph.D.

Category	Excellent (4-5pts)	Satisfactory (2-3pts)	Poor (0-1pts)	Score
<i>Purpose of Study</i>	The study has a clear goal and objectives and/or hypothesis are directly related to that goal.	The study has a goal and objectives and/or hypothesis.	Goal is unclear. Objectives are missing or non-obvious.	(0-5pts possible)
<i>Design and Methods</i>	The research methods are appropriate for the field of study and will provide data to evaluate the hypothesis and accomplish objectives. The theoretical foundation for these methods is robust and well thought out.	The research methods will provide useful data related to the objectives. The reasoning behind the chosen methods was unclear or missing.	Judges cannot evaluate the appropriateness of methods because the abstract lacks details.	(0-5pts possible)
<i>Implications and Significance</i>	Proposal identifies a research gap in a particular field of study. The proposed research would advance the body of knowledge in the given subject area.	Proposal identifies a gap in current knowledge, but the proposal's objectives or methods would likely not fill in this research gap in a meaningful way.	The research proposed would not add to the field of study due its lack of originality or depth.	(0-5pts possible)
<i>Overall Quality</i>	The abstract is well written and professional. The grammar and spelling are consistently excellent. The depth and details are appropriate given the word limit and subject area.	Writing neither adds to nor detracts from the clarity of the abstract.	Writing has little structure. Abstract contains grammar and spelling errors.	(0-5pts possible)

Additional Comments (use back if necessary):

Abstracts account for 20% of the competitor's overall score. Abstracts are limited to a maximum of 250 words. Any competitors that exceed this word count will face a 5-point deduction when final scores are tallied.

Poster Evaluations

Student Name: _____

Categories: Poster Competition—MS/Ph.D.

Category	Excellent (4-5pts)	Satisfactory (2-3pts)	Poor (0-1pts)	Score
<i>Written Content</i>	Poster contains relevant background information, objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. Tables and figures are clear and helpful. All areas are covered to an appropriate depth without being too wordy.	Poster contains relevant background information, objectives and/or hypothesis, methods, results, conclusions, and appropriate supplements like tables, figures, and citations.	The poster is missing important information. Alternatively, poster was overly detailed and text was used where tables or figures would have been more appropriate.	(0-5pts possible)
<i>Project Merit</i>	Project was well-conceived and properly executed. The findings will advance research in the area of study.	The conclusions are reasonable given the methods and results. The objectives are related to a knowledge gap in the area of study.	The project was poorly planned and/or executed and the findings are unlikely to be useful to others in the field.	(0-5pts possible)
<i>Presentation Skills</i>	Presentation demonstrated excellent knowledge of how and why the research was conducted, and how research findings will be used by others. Student provided conversational, engaging answers to questions from judges.	Student understood their project and could present methods and findings. They could effectively answer questions from judges.	Presentation and answers to questions lacked appropriate details and did not engage judges.	(0-5pts possible)
<i>Overall Appearance</i>	The poster is well written and professional. The grammar and spelling are consistently excellent. The depth and details are appropriate given the word limit and subject area. Poster could be read from 3-4' away.	Color, text, and layout are used efficiently. Poster could be read from 3-4' away.	Poster is difficult to read. Appearance detracts from the clarity of the content.	(0-5pts possible)

Additional Comments (use back if necessary):

Proposal Flash Talk Evaluations

Student Name: _____

Categories: Proposal Flash Talk—MS, Proposal Flash Talk—Ph.D.

Category	Excellent (4-5pts)	Satisfactory (2-3pts)	Poor (0-1pts)	Score
<i>Content and Organization</i>	Presentation contained relevant background information, objectives, and proposed methods to a suitable depth. The organization of the presentation added clarity to the content.	Presentation contained relevant background information, objectives and/or hypothesis, and proposed methods. All areas were covered to a suitable depth.	The presentation was missing important information or was disorganized and hard to follow.	(0-5pts possible)
<i>Project Merit</i>	The study has a clear goal and objectives and/or hypothesis are directly related to that goal. This research is valid and advances the body of knowledge in the given subject area.	The study has a goal and objectives and/or hypothesis. This research is valid but does not contribute significantly to the field of study.	Goal is unclear. Objectives are missing or non-obvious. This research is not likely to be useful to others working in this field.	(0-5pts possible)
<i>Presentation Skills</i>	The student used visual aids and eye contact effectively. They provided conversational, engaging answers to questions from judges and audience members.	Student referenced visual aids and looked up from notes. They could answer audience questions.	Student read from notes and struggled to answer questions.	(0-5pts possible)
<i>Overall Quality</i>	The student presented relevant information and demonstrated depth of knowledge on the topic. They spoke clearly and held the audience's attention. They were well prepared and seemed comfortable with the material.	Student seemed knowledgeable and spoke clearly.	Student didn't seem prepared for the presentation.	(0-5pts possible)

Additional Comments (use back if necessary):

Research Flash Talk Evaluations

Student Name: _____

Categories: Research Flash Talk—MS, Research Flash Talk—Ph.D.

Category	Excellent (4-5pts)	Satisfactory (2-3pts)	Poor (0-1pts)	Score
<i>Content and Organization</i>	Presentation contained relevant background information, objectives, methods, results, and conclusions to a suitable depth. The organization of the presentation added clarity to the content.	Presentation contained relevant background information, objectives and/or hypothesis, methods, results, and conclusions. All areas were covered to a suitable depth.	The presentation was missing important information or was disorganized and hard to follow.	(0-5pts possible)
<i>Project Merit</i>	The study has a clear goal and objectives and/or hypothesis are directly related to that goal. This research is valid and advances the body of knowledge in the given subject area.	The study has a goal and objectives and/or hypothesis. This research is valid but does not contribute significantly to the field of study.	Goal is unclear. Objectives are missing or non-obvious. This research is not likely to be useful to others working in this field.	(0-5pts possible)
<i>Presentation Skills</i>	The student used visual aids and eye contact effectively. They provided conversational, engaging answers to questions from judges and audience members.	Student referenced visual aids and looked up from notes. They could answer audience questions.	Student read from notes and struggled to answer questions.	(0-5pts possible)
<i>Overall Quality</i>	The student presented relevant information and demonstrated depth of knowledge on the topic. They spoke clearly and held the audience's attention. They were well prepared and seemed comfortable with the material.	Student seemed knowledgeable and spoke clearly.	Student didn't seem prepared for the presentation.	(0-5pts possible)

Additional Comments (use back if necessary):

Research Presentation Evaluations

Student Name: _____

Categories: Research Presentation—MS, Research Presentation—Ph.D.

Category	Excellent (4pts)	Satisfactory (2-3pts)	Poor (0-1pts)	Score
<i>Project Significance</i>	The study has a clear goal and objectives and/or hypothesis are directly related to that goal. This research is valid and advances the body of knowledge in the given subject area.	The study has a goal and objectives and/or hypothesis. This research is valid but does not contribute significantly to the field of study.	Goal is unclear. Objectives are missing or non-obvious. This research is not likely to be useful to others working in this field.	(0-4pts possible)
<i>Design and Methods</i>	Objectives fill a knowledge gap in the field of study. Methods are well thought out and will provide useful data. Data analysis is appropriate. The research was well executed.	Objectives fill a knowledge gap in the field of study. Methods are appropriate.	The project was poorly planned and/or executed.	(0-4pts possible)
<i>Results and Conclusions</i>	Results are clearly stated and accurately reflected the data collected. Conclusions were well-synthesized and will provide value to others in the field.	The link between data collected and conclusions presented is unclear.	Results and conclusions are not clearly stated.	(0-4pts possible)
<i>Presentation Skills</i>	The student used visual aids and eye contact effectively. They provided conversational, engaging answers to questions from judges and audience members.	Student referenced visual aids and looked up from notes. They could answer audience questions.	Student read from notes and struggled to answer questions.	(0-4pts possible)
<i>Overall Quality</i>	The student presented relevant information and demonstrated depth of knowledge on the topic. They spoke clearly and held the audience's attention. They were well prepared and seemed comfortable with the material.	Student seemed knowledgeable and spoke clearly.	Student didn't seem prepared for the presentation.	(0-4pts possible)

Additional Comments (use back if necessary):