

MSACL 2018 EU Trainee Poster Contest

1. This is a trainee competition. You are eligible if you are a student, post-doc, resident, fellow or similar, or you completed your training after September 9, 2017. Troubleshooting posters are not eligible. Reasonable exceptions may apply.
2. Participants should confirm their interest by August 31 and then upload a PDF version of their poster via msacl.org > Abstracts > **Manage Abstract**.

All posters should be A0 in PORTRAIT format.

DEADLINE for Confirming Interest: August 31, 2018

DEADLINE for Poster Upload: September 5, 2018

3. **Judging Parameters:** Poster Judges may use the judging rubric on the following page as guidance for ranking, *although this is not required*.
4. **ROUND ONE: Review of PDF Poster:** The Judging Committee will review the Candidate Posters via Uploaded PDF and/or at the Congress before 12:00 Wednesday. This round *does not stipulate judge-participant interaction*, but ancillary contact or discussion at the participant's poster is permitted. A good way to get exposure is to participate in the [Poster Lightning Talks](#). Each judge will select their 4 top posters, in order of preference. From these selections the Judging Committee will identify the finalists (~8-10). Finalists will be notified by email between 17:00-20:00 on Wednesday September 12. Finalists will move to Round Two (final round).
5. **ROUND TWO: Oral Presentation & Defense:** Thursday 10:00 - 11:00. Each judge will spend up to 5 minutes at each finalist's poster to collect information by which to determine the poster award winners. The judges may perform the finalist interviews as a group, in smaller groups, or individually, with each judge selecting their top 4 posters from which the winners will be determined. There will be up to 3 winners, depending on number of participants and quality of the posters.
6. **Poster Attendance:** You are still required to attend your poster on the time/day that you selected on accepting to present at the conference.
7. **Poster Awards:** Awardees will be announced on Thursday at 15:45 prior to the closing Plenary presentation. **You must be present to win.** Winners will receive awards of 250 USD each, payable post-congress via PayPal.

Judging Rubric

	9-10 Outstanding	6-8 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.

