

MSACL Poster Contest Procedure

1. This is a student competition. You are eligible if it has been less than one year since you completed your training. Reasonable exceptions may apply.
2. Participants should confirm their interest and then upload a PDF version of the poster they will present via msacl.org > Abstracts > **Manage Abstract**. For assistance, contact chris.herold@msacl.org.
DEADLINE: January 18, 2017
3. The Organizing Committee will divide the candidate posters into groups (of 3-5 ideally, but no more than 10) based on topic. Some topics may be combined or split to achieve appropriate group sizes.
4. Two or three Scientific Evaluators (volunteer judges), of relevant scientific expertise, will be assigned to each group of posters.
5. Scientific Evaluators will screen the posters according to the judging rubric on the following page. This screening will involve evaluating the electronic versions of the posters prior to or during the conference and/or evaluating the physical poster(s) displayed during the first day of the conference (Tuesday). This primary screening does not involve interaction with the presenter.
6. Each judge group will meet no later than Wednesday to compare notes and select the top two posters in their groups to move on as finalists. The finalist names will be submitted to the organizing committee by 1 pm on Wednesday. All participants will be notified by Wednesday evening of their status.
7. A Finalist Judging Committee will be assembled, comprising one judge from each topic group.
8. Finalists will attend their posters at the final poster session on Thursday from 10:00-11:00 AM, where the Judging Committee will evaluate the posters based on the rubric below AND the quality of the oral presentation. Finalists may be no more than 5 minutes with the judges..
9. The winning posters (1st, 2nd, and 3rd place) will be submitted to the organizing committee by the start of the plenary session at 11:00 AM Thursday.
10. Winners will be announced immediately following the plenary session.
11. One or more judges will lead a Grand Rounds tour of the winning posters from 12:00 -12:45 PM.

Judging Rubric

	9-10 Outstanding	8-6 Good	3-5 Average	0-2 Poor
<i>Clinical Application (maximum 10 points)</i>	Addresses a current and pressing clinical issue. Exhibits high clinical relevance, and potential for direct clinical application.	Addresses a current clinical issue. Exhibits potential for clinical application with limited modification.	Exhibits low to moderate clinical relevance, requires some modification for clinical application.	Irrelevant to the clinic, or impractical for clinical application without substantial modification.
<i>Scientific Value/Content (maximum 10 points)</i>	Exhibits substantially high degree of originality and/or novelty. Novel application of known technique. New technique or approach to address the clinical issue. Clear and detailed description of how data were obtained.	Exhibits originality and/or novelty. Novel application of known technique. New technique or approach to address the clinical issue. Clear description of how data were obtained.	Exhibits limited originality and/or novelty. Novel application of known technique. New technique or approach to address the clinical issue. Description of how data were obtained could be improved.	Lacks originality and/or novelty. Methods for obtaining data are missing, vague, or unclear.
<i>Quality of Work (maximum 10 points)</i>	Well-written, free of grammatical errors. Very well-organized and communicates ideas clearly. Details and figures provided clearly capture the important information about the topic and increase the audience's understanding.	Well-written, minor grammatical errors. Well-organized and communicates ideas clearly. Details and figures provide important information about the topic and assist audience's understanding.	Adequately written, containing some grammatical errors. Some or most ideas communicated clearly. Details and figures provide important information about the topic, but may require verbal clarification or description.	Poorly written or contains multiple grammatical errors. Poorly organized or unclear. Details and figures provided are confusing.
<i>Oral Presentation (maximum 10 points)</i>	Presenter can summarize poster thoroughly and succinctly. Shows exceptional and thorough command of subject matter. Answers questions briefly but clearly and thoroughly.	Presenter can summarize poster thoroughly and succinctly. Shows clear understanding of subject matter. Answers questions thoroughly with limited need for clarification.	Presenter can summarize poster. Shows moderate understanding of subject matter and purpose. Answers to questions require some clarification.	Presenter unable to summarize poster. Shows poor understanding of subject matter. Provides vague answers to questions.