

Five Digit Abstract Number															
Poster Set-Up Was on Time	Check for Yes														
Booth Attended by Author 1 st 30 - Minute Period	Check for Yes														
Booth Attended by Author 2 nd 60 - Minute Period	Check for Yes														
Poster Removal Was on Time	Check for Yes														
Poster Presentation Title Agrees with Final Program Title	Check for Yes														
Poster presenter was a "No Show"	Check for Yes														
<i>Poster Scoring: For additional guidance on scoring see form 54D-3.</i>															
1. Compliance with WM Guidelines	(Max 10)														
2. First Impression	(Max 10)														
3. Readability	(Max 10)														
4. Title	(Max 5)														
5. Aims/Objectives	(Max 10)														
6. Methods	(Max 10)														
7. Results	(Max 10)														
8. Conclusions	(Max 10)														
9. Content	(Max 15)														
10. Presenter Effectiveness	(Max 10)														
Total Score (of 100 possible points)															
Check One: Total Score:															
Unacceptable	Total score was ≤ 60														
Acceptable	Total score was 61 - 80														
Excellent	Total score was 81 - 90														
Superior	Total Score was > 90														
Poster is recommended for the Best-in-Topic	Check for each Topic														
Check box if Poster is approved for publication If not state why below.															
Evaluator:															
Comments:															

Best-in-Conference Poster Presentation /Paper Evaluation Form

WM54C-4

Please Complete All Sections

Track Number	2	3	5	6	7	9	11		
Five Digit Abstract Number									
Track Co-Chair/Judges Final Selection Scores of Poster									
1. Adherence to WM Guidelines (Max 10)									
2. First Impression – Poster (Max 10)									
3. Readability (Max 10)									
4. Title (Max 5)									
5. Aims/Objectives (Max 10)									
6. Methods (Max 10)									
7. Results (Max 10)									
8. Conclusions (Max 10)									
9. Content (Max 15)									
10. Presenter Effectiveness (from records)(Max 10)									
Paper Rating (Max 100) (TBD by Track Co-Chairs for Papers)									
Total Poster/ Paper Score (of 100 possible points)									
Name									
Poster Judge: Print Last Name: _____ (Signature)	Comments: (Print) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____								
ANS Award Winner – Abstract # _____									
ASME Award Winner – Abstract # _____									

Please See Other Side for Paper and Poster Judging

**SUMMARY CHECK-LIST OF BEST-IN-CONFERENCE PAPER PREPARATION
REQUIREMENTS**

These are the Primary Paper requirements, some of which may not apply to the Paper (= NA). This checklist is intended to aid Judging.

REQUIREMENT				REQUIREMENT			
#		YES/ NA	NO	#		YES/ NA	NO
1	No spelling errors			19	Correct use of Acronyms		
2	Page Header on all pages			20	Correct CONCLUSION section placement		
3	Correct Title placement			21	Correct REFERENCE section format		
4	Correct Title format			22	Correct ACKNOWLEDGMENT section placement		
5	Correct Author(s) listing			23	Correct text spacing throughout the Paper		
6	Correct Author name(s) placement			24	Correct referencing of Isotopes		
7	Has an ABSTRACT section			25	Correct Figure placement(s)		
8	Correct ABSTRACT placement			26	Correct Figure size(s)		
9	Has an INTRODUCTION section followed by "descriptive" section(s)			27	< 7 figures per page are used		
10	Correct INTRODUCTION placement			28	Correct Figure/Picture file(s) provided (if not included in text)		
11	Paper > 4 pages total			29	Correct numbering of Figure caption(s)		
12	If > 15 pages, has PAC Chair approval			30	Correct placement of Figure caption(s)		
13	All pages correctly numbered			31	Correct placement of Table(s)		
14	Pages in US letter size			32	Correct numbering of Table(s)		
15	All margins 2.54 cm (1 inch)			33	Correct Table format		
16	All units are in SI units			34	Correct Table footnote placement		
17	All text is in one font size (11)			35	Correct Equation format		
18	All terms, images, logos, software, services, or any other articles or items that are trademarked, registered trademarks, or copyrighted are identified						
#	COMMENT(S)						
1							
2							
3							
4							

Posters are judged at the conference and “Best-in-Conference” is judged after the conference. The main three steps are:

- 1) All posters are rated (by and within each Track) for 1 of 4 possible categories: Superior, Excellent, Acceptable or Non-Acceptable.
- 2) At the conference, the Poster Session Co-chairs led by the Track Lead Judge select the eight “Best-in-Track” Poster Awardees by judging: 1) the Poster with 2) its presenter
- 3) After the conference, a representative and the Lead Judge from each Track will select the two awards for “Best-in-Conference” by evaluating the eight papers with the related posters pdfs from the Best of Track awardees.

Additional Details for “Best-in-Track” Poster/Presentation judging are:

1. Lead Judges are only from the Tracks having Posters
2. A Lead Judge for each Track is designated before the conference by the Lead Track Co-Chair.
3. The Lead Track Co-Chair, or their designee, will be the replacement Judge if any Judge specified is not available.
4. The Lead Judge in each Track may solicit other Judges to help in the Track’s selection process.
5. For each Track, the Lead Judge makes the decision of which is the best poster and presentation combination in their Track (without considering the paper).
6. The paper of each poster must already be reviewed and approved by the Paper Reviewer to be eligible for consideration for the Best of Track. WMS staff will notify the Lead Judge of any ineligible posters. The Poster will still be rated, but not eligible for consideration for Best of Track.
7. If a Final Paper has not been approved and all copyrights obtained, it is ineligible from award consideration.
8. The posters should be the ‘picture worth a 1000 words’ in that it is the visual representation of the key elements. Preferably, a pdf of the Poster would be uploaded to the web before the conference.
9. Presenters need to be at their poster at the designated times, 30 minutes at the start and 60 minutes at the end.
10. For Single Topic Tracks, the Judge(s) will use judging form - WM54A. One or both of the Topic Session Co-Chairs should act as the Best-in-Track Judges and evaluate all the Posters in their assigned Track and complete form WM54A with a single “Best-in-Track” recommendation.
11. For multiple Topic Tracks, the Topic Judge(s) will use judging form -WM54B. One or both of the Topic Session Co-Chairs Judges should evaluate all the Posters in their Topic and complete form 54B for use in the post conference analysis. The Track Judges (they can be the same as the Topic Judges) can use the existing data and forms for 54B or obtain from WM Staff a new Form 54A “Best-in-Track “Judging Form for the finalist to identify their choice for “Best of Track” Finalist. The criteria is the same.
12. The Lead Track Judge will provide their Best-in-Track Award result to the WM Poster Coordinators at least 10 minutes before the end of their poster session.
13. After each Track’s poster session, the WM Poster Coordinators will assist in moving the “Best-in-Track” Poster to a different poster board reserved for them. Photos will also be taken of each winner with their Poster. The 8 “Best-in-Track Poster/Presenter” Posters are set-up in an area for recognition by the attendees for the remaining length of the conference.

Additional details for the second step, “Best-in-Conference” Poster/Paper judging are:

1. WMS will verify on Saturday evening of the conference the Lead Track Judges or another designee for the “Best of Conference” judging.
2. After the conference, the Paper and the Poster pdf for the Best of Track awardees will be e-mailed by WMS Staff to the Judges.
3. The Judges may have conference, video, or other similar group communication efforts for discussion and then vote on the two best “poster / paper” combinations for the conference. One combination for the ANS and one for the ASME Best of Conference awards
4. The Lead Track Co-Chair, or their designee, will be the replacement Judge if any Judge specified is not available.
5. Selection for the two “Best of Conference” awards should be made three months after the conference.

Each Poster Presentation must be clear, concise, important, relevant and eye-catching. Remember, if as the Judge you have e read the Title and the Conclusion and still do not understand the Presentation, then the Poster/PowerPoint should not receive a high score.

1. Adherence to WM guidelines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information legible at 5 feet or provided via handout. Title, Author, Affiliation in letters 2-inches-high at the top. Used the provided Poster board or PowerPoint ~40-inch x ~90-inch projection. 	Possible Points: 10 Superior = 10, Good = 8, Fair = 4, Poor = 0
2. First Impression-Poster: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Poster stimulates interest and discussion. Poster is easy to read. The sequence in the Poster is easy to follow. There is a good flow of information (logical layout). Poster visually organized. Color schemes are easy on the eye (Author minimized use of red/green together (colorblindness issue)). Poster is uncrowded, easy to review. 	Possible Points: 10 Superior = 10, Good = 8, Fair = 4, Poor = 0
3. Readability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Poster or Slides contain an appropriate amount of text. The Poster is succinct with the appropriate amount of information. Grammar or spelling is correct. The descriptions are simple and brief. Jargon was avoided. Photographs, drawings, charts, tables, and graphs are simple, well organized, and well labeled. The message is clear. 	Possible Points: 10 Superior = 10, Good = 8, Fair = 4, Poor = 0
4. Title: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Title is specific/adequate. The Title is unambiguous. Title is the appropriate number of characters (<100). 	Possible Points: 5 Superior = 5, Good = 3, Fair = 1, Poor = 0
5. Aims/ Objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The aim/objectives are clearly stated. The aim/objectives are supported. 	Possible Points: 10 Superior = 10, Good = 8, Fair = 4, Poor = 0
6. Methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The methods are adequately detailed and understandable. The methods are appropriate for the audience. The methods are original. The methods are supported with enough explanation. 	Possible Points: 10 Superior = 10, Good = 8, Fair = 4, Poor = 0
7. Results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results are clear and legible and are illustrated via text, graphs, figures, charts, drawings. The results are presented in a logical sequence. The results are believable. 	Possible Points: 10 Superior = 10, Good = 8, Fair = 4, Poor = 0
8. Conclusions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions presented reflect the aims and are supported by the data presented. There a memorable “take-home” message. The point of the Poster is clear. 	Possible Points: 10 Superior = 10, Good = 8, Fair = 4, Poor = 0
9a. Content - If Poster is Scientific in Nature <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research was put into broader context and/or justification was provided for the research. The content was suitable for the intended audience. There was sufficient scientific explanation. 	Possible Points: 15 Superior = 15, Good = 10, Fair = 5, Poor = 0
9b. Content - If Poster is Programmatic or Administrative in Nature: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Poster was on communication of scientific content, the original target audience was identified. This method of communication was unique or different. The results clearly identify why it was or was not successful. 	Possible Points: 15 Superior = 15, Good = 10, Fair = 5, Poor = 0
10. Presenter effectiveness: (Use First Stage Results for Second Stage Judging) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Presenter’s explanations demonstrate knowledge/ ownership/enthusiasm for his/her work. The Presenter was able to explain simply answers to questions versus lecturing or reading from text. 	Possible Points: 10 Superior = 10, Good = 8, Fair = 4, Poor = 0