## **2018 NABT Student Poster Competition: Mentored Undergraduate Research**

The purpose of this category is to encourage and celebrate mentored student research as a highly effective teaching/learning activity. This category is only open to undergraduate presenters at 2-Year or 4-Year undergraduate institutions. All submissions *must* include a faculty or graduate student mentor as a secondary author. Posters should effectively present a mentored student scientific research activity in any area of biology. All students will receive written copies of the judges' completed rubrics by email after the conference to help them improve their written and oral presentation skills. Students and advisers are strongly encouraged to review the guidelines and scoring rubric for the *2018 Mentored Undergraduate Research Poster Session*. Entries are limited to one poster per student. Poster proposals must be received by August 15th to be entered in the competition. The best overall Undergraduate Student will be awarded a cash prize (\$200) and a one- year student membership to NABT. Not all prizes will be awarded if fewer than four participants present at the conference.

- The form and layout are at your discretion. However, please respect the maximum width of 48 inches.
- Please bring your own pins for attachment to the display boards.
- The poster session will be held in the room indicated in the official conference program.
- Please place your posters by number as indicated on the poster boards.

CRITERIA	Expert (4)	Proficient (3)	Emerging (2)	Novice (1)	Score
Introduction Articulation of Purpose or Focus	A central purpose or focus of the work is highly evident	A central purpose or focus of the work is evident	A purpose or focus of the work can be determined	Purpose or focus is not visible or stated clearly	
Introduction Question and Hypothesis	Question and hypothesis are articulated and defended in context of the purpose	Question and hypothesis are stated clearly and context of purpose is apparent	Question and hypothesis are stated clearly, but context of purpose is not apparent	Question and hypothesis are not visible or stated clearly	
Introduction Scholarly Context	Comprehensively places problem or question in appropriate scholarly context	Sufficiently places problem of question in appropriate scholarly context	Partially places problem or question in scholarly context; some critical elements are undeveloped	Scholarly context for the problem or question is not sufficiently demonstrated	
Methods Application of Scholarly Method/ Technique	Method/technique is appropriate for question or purpose	Method/technique is appropriate for question or purpose	Method/technique loosely supports the question or purpose	Method/technique is not appropriate for question or purpose	
Methods Descriptions of Method/ Technique	All elements of methods are fully developed and articulated	Critical elements of method/technique are adequately developed	Critical elements of method/technique are partially developed	Critical elements of method/technique are minimally developed	
Results Presentation of Data and Evidence	Data/evidence are expertly presented	Data/evidence are adequately presented	Data/evidence are partially presented	Data/evidence are minimally or not presented	
Results Quality of Data and Evidence	Evidence supports a mature, complex, and nuanced analysis of the problem	Evidence supports an adequately complex analysis of the problem	Evidence supports a limited analysis of the problem	Evidence supports very limited analysis of the problem	
<u>Discussion</u> Analysis or Interpretation	Interpretation is explicitly linked to theoretical framework	Interpretation is adequately linked to theoretical framework	Interpretation is partially linked to theoretical framework	Interpretation is minimally linked to theoretical framework	

CRITERIA	Expert (4)	Proficient (3)	Emerging (2)	Novice (1)	Score
<u>Discussion</u> Implications/ Impact	Implications and/or questions raised by the project are thoroughly explored	Implications and/or questions are adequately explored	Implications and/or questions are partially explored	Implications and/or questions are minimally supported or unarticulated	
Discussion Limitations of project	Limitations are fully articulated	Limitations are adequately articulated	• Limitations are partially articulated	Limitations are minimally articulated	
Overall Quality of Delivery	Delivery is free of technical errors	Delivery has few technical errors	Delivery has some technical errors	Delivery has frequent technical errors	
Overall Questions	Presenter can fully address questions	Presenter can adequately address questions	Presenter can partially address questions	Presenter can minimally address questions	
Overall Poster Design	Poster design is superior	Poster design is high quality	• Poster design is acceptable	Poster design is low quality	
Overall Quality of Visuals	Poster is easily readable and makes use of visual aids (graphs, tables, flow charts) throughout	Poster is readable and makes use of visual aids for most important aspects	Poster is readable but use of visual aids is limited in scope	Poster is not readable and does not include visual aids	
Overall Judges Copies	8.5"x11" poster copies are provided for the judges and are easily readable	8.5"x11" poster copies are provided for the judges and are readable	8.5"x11" poster copies are provided for the judges, but are not easily readable	8.5"x11" poster copies are not provided for the judges	