

MSACL 2024

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 April 1, 2023. Troubleshooting posters are not eligible. Reasonable exceptions may apply.
2. Participants either confirmed their interest when submitting their abstract, or they can do so before March 1 via their Network Directory Profile as part of their Abstract Management .
3. Participants are required to **upload a PDF of their poster** via their [Network Directory Profile by March 1](#).

All posters should be no larger than 42x42" (inches).

DEADLINE for Poster Upload : March 1, 2024

4. **Judging Parameters:** Poster Judges may use the judging rubric on the following page as guidance for ranking, *although this is not required*.
5. **ROUND ONE : Review of PDF Poster :** The Judging Committee will review the Candidates' Uploaded PDFs (**deadline March 1**) with final decisions made by March 13. Each judge will select their 4 top posters, in order of preference. From these selections the Judging Committee will identify the Finalists (~6-10). Finalists will be notified by email by March 15. Finalists will move to Round Two.
6. **ROUND TWO : Oral Presentation & Defense:** This will take place during your poster attendance period. Each judge will spend 3-5 minutes at each Finalist poster. The judges may perform the interviews as a group, or individually, with each judge selecting their top 4 posters from which the winners will be determined. There will be up to 3 winners.
7. **Poster Awards:** Awardees will be announced on Thursday at 17:30 prior to the Gala Dinner. Winners will receive awards of up to 500 USD, payable via PayPal. The awards will be \$500/\$400/\$300 for 1st/2nd/3rd places.

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.

