

## Research Day Judging Procedure

### Background

Based on the feedback from the Academic Staff and Graduate students, the Research Day Committee have drafted the following judging procedure. The new procedure aims to better assess and fairly judge the posters submitted by students for the Research Day. The main change is that the new procedure will identify abstracts that would be more suitable for podium presentations rather than selecting them solely based on judging the candidates' poster presentations. This will give more time for judges to rank the students' submissions for the highest research quality as well as inform the selected presenters early on in the process by their ranking so they can also get more time to prepare their podium presentations.

### Procedures – Before the Research Day

- An email announcing the opening of abstract submissions to be sent out to the Faculty.
- An email will be sent to the academic staff to ask for interest in being judges.
- Students to submit their abstracts by the abstract submission deadline and to indicate their submission category. (Abstract criteria are discussed below)
  - *Category A*: Undergraduate students (this includes PharmD students)
  - *Category B*: Master students
  - *Category C*: PhD students
  - *Category D*: Postdoctoral fellows
- Abstracts will be forwarded to the judges. Depending on the number of the submitted abstracts, each judge will get approximately 6-8 abstracts to grade. Judges to independently grade the abstracts using **the abstract rubric** (see below) and assign a grade to each abstract. Each abstract will be graded by two judges.
- The average of the two grades of each abstract will be used to rank abstracts within each group. The authors of the top ranked abstracts within each category will be contacted and invited to provide a 10 minute podium presentation at the Research Day.
- As awards for the poster presentations will be determined by combining the abstract ranking with the poster presentation ranking, it is very important to note that **a selection to present in the podium IS NOT a guarantee to win a poster award**. However, it is a good indication that this would be more likely to happen, depending on the ranking of the poster presentation.

## Procedures – At the Research Day

- Poster sessions will be grouped by the abstract category selected.
- Each poster display board will be 4' (48") x 6' (72") mounted horizontally. All poster material should be confined to the space provided. The poster presentation should not exceed the surface space provided.
- Poster board numbers and category assignments will be emailed before the event.
- Poster presentations to judges will proceed as follows (Groups A-D):
  - Groups of up to seven posters will each be judged by **two Faculty members who will be different from the abstract judges (see above)**.
  - Judging will commence at the time given in the itinerary for the respective poster category. At this time, both judges and all students from the respective poster group will meet at poster #1 in the group.
  - The first presenter will present his/her poster in a max. of **5 minutes**. Presenters will be cut off by the judges after 5 minutes. **Time limit should be enforced by the judges.**
  - The poster may then be discussed by the whole poster group for 2 to 3 minutes. All – i.e. both the judges and the presenters in the group – are invited to ask the presenter questions regarding their poster.
  - The whole group (students and judges) will then proceed to the next poster to be discussed.
- Judges will independently score each poster using **the Poster Presentation rubric**. The criteria will be focused on the presentation skills and how materials are presented in the poster (while the abstract judging above will focus mainly on the scientific merit and content).
- The strength/weaknesses section will be returned to each poster presenter to provide feedback.
- **The grades of the poster presentation will be added to the grades of the abstracts and the winners will be decided based on the total mark from both rubrics.**
- Podium presenters will be graded according to **the podium presentation rubric** by 3 judges and the winner and runner up will be decided based on the average grade of the three judges.

## Abstract Guidelines

When preparing an abstract for submission to the Faculty of Pharmacy Research Day, please follow these guidelines:

- Submit the abstract file by email (submission email to be announced)
- Submit the abstract as a Word file (.doc or .docx). It must be formatted as described below.
- Abstracts to be submitted by the announced deadline. Late abstracts will not be accepted.
- Please indicate in your email
  - a. your category and the name of your FACULTY of PHARMACY supervisor
  - b. your research category (Pharmacokinetics; Drug Delivery; Pharmacology; Toxicology; Pharmacy practice or Other)
  - c. The submitted abstract is your original work

### **Abstract Format:**

--Text should be set in Times New Roman font, 11 point

--Structure of Abstract:

- **Abstract Title** (bold, left aligned).
- Authors (First name followed by the last name; do not type last names first). Separate all authors with a comma (no “and”, even if only 2 authors)
- Affiliations: The authors' institution(s), city, province and the country
- --One line free--
- Abstract Body: A structured abstract of fewer than 300 words, single-spaced, is required and should be arranged, in one paragraph, under the following headings (underlined): Purpose, Methods, Results, Conclusions.
- Information on funding if desired, add another heading, “Support:” to the abstract body and mention funding sources in a last sentence (will count towards the <300 words)

## **Sample Abstract**

### **Beer Is A Member Of The Wine Family**

Edward Monton, Harry J. Dunno, Johnny S. Bach

Faculty of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada

Purpose: Just some sample text provided here, lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipisicing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua. Ut enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exercitation ullamco laboris nisi ut aliquip ex ea commodo consequat. Methods: Duis aute irure dolor in reprehenderit in voluptate velit esse cillum dolore eu fugiat nulla pariatur. Excepteur sint occaecat cupidatat non proident, sunt in culpa qui officia deserunt mollit anim id est laborum. Results: Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipisicing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua. Ut enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exercitation ullamco laboris nisi ut aliquip ex ea commodo consequat. Duis aute irure dolor in reprehenderit in voluptate velit esse cillum dolore eu fugiat nulla pariatur. Excepteur sint occaecat cupidatat non proident, sunt in culpa qui officia deserunt mollit anim id est laborum. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipisicing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua. Ut enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exercitation ullamco laboris nisi ut aliquip ex ea commodo consequat. Duis aute irure dolor in reprehenderit in voluptate velit esse cillum dolore eu fugiat nulla pariatur. Excepteur sint occaecat cupidatat non proident, sunt in culpa qui officia deserunt mollit anim id est laborum. Conclusions: Ut enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exercitation ullamco laboris nisi ut aliquip ex ea commodo consequat. Duis aute irure dolor in reprehenderit in voluptate velit esse cillum dolore eu fugiat nulla pariatur. Excepteur sint occaecat cupidatat non proident, sunt in culpa qui officia deserunt mollit anim id est laborum. Support: Grant# xx-608, National Foundation for X, Ottawa, Canada.

**Research Day**  
**Abstract Assessment Rubric**

**Student's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Assessor's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Abstract Number:** \_\_\_\_\_

*Please circle the number that you think best describes the presentation in each of the following categories.*

<b>1 – Unacceptable</b>	<b>2 – Needs Improvement</b>	<b>3 – Acceptable</b>	<b>4 – Remarkable</b>	<b>5 – Outstanding</b>
Outcome measure clearly not achieved. Information substantially incomplete, missing, or at an inappropriate depth.	Outcome measure partially achieved. Some important information incomplete, missing, or at a suboptimal depth.	Outcome measure generally achieved. All important information included, but depth may be suboptimal for some aspects.	Outcome measure achieved in exemplary fashion. Exceptionally complete and succinct information at an appropriate depth.	Outcome measure exceeded expectations exemplary fashion. Exceptionally complete and succinct information at an outstanding depth.

<b>Criterion (Ideal Exemplar)</b>	<b>Scale</b>				
<b><i>The Title</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How engaging is the abstract title?</li> <li>Does the abstract title accurately represent the content within the abstract?</li> </ul>	1	2	3	4	5
<b><i>The Rationale, Objectives &amp; Hypothesis</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the author clearly outline the rationale for their study?</li> <li>Does the author clearly indicate the study's objectives?</li> <li>Was a hypothesis included and clearly stated?</li> </ul>	1	2	3	4	5
<b><i>The Methods, Results &amp; Conclusions</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are sufficient experimental details provided?</li> <li>Does the author clearly describe the reported observations arising from their experiments?</li> <li>Do the conclusions accurately represent the main findings contained within the abstract?</li> </ul>	1	2	3	4	5
<b><i>Overall Impression of the Writing (x2)</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is your overall impression on how the abstract is written (e.g. is it written in a clear and concise manner, does it flow well from one section to the next)?</li> <li>Is the abstract free of grammatical/spelling errors</li> </ul>	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Total</b>	/ 25				
<b>Comments:</b>					

## Research Day

### Poster Presentation Assessment Rubric - Poster

**Student's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Assessor's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Poster Number:** \_\_\_\_\_

*Please circle the number that you think best describes the presentation in each of the following categories.*

1 – Unacceptable	2 – Needs Improvement	3 – Acceptable	4 – Remarkable	5 – Outstanding
Outcome measure clearly not achieved. Information substantially incomplete, missing, or at an inappropriate depth and/or breadth.	Outcome measure partially achieved. Some important information incomplete, missing, or suboptimal depth and/or breadth.	Outcome measure generally achieved. All important information included, but depth and/or breadth may be suboptimal for some aspects.	Outcome measure achieved in exemplary fashion. Exceptionally complete and succinct presentation at an appropriate depth & breadth.	Outcome measure exceeded expectations exemplary fashion. Exceptionally complete and succinct information at an outstanding depth.

Criterion (Ideal Exemplar)	Scale
<b>Knowledge in Subject Area</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate background/rationale provided</li> <li>• Objective(s) clearly defined and appropriate</li> <li>• Study design/methods/outcome measures appropriate</li> <li>• Results appropriately interpreted/limitations adequately explained/conclusions consistent</li> </ul>	1   2   3   4   5
<b>Poster Oral Presentation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completed within appropriate timeframe (3 min)</li> <li>• Presented in a clear, organized, and concise manner</li> <li>• Audible, good enunciation, enthusiasm for subject</li> <li>• Polished, poised, &amp; confident speaker</li> </ul>	1   2   3   4   5
<b>Poster Visual Presentation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear, concise, visually pleasing, well organized</li> <li>• Stands alone – meaning/intent evident without verbal explanation</li> </ul>	1   2   3   4   5
<b>Response to Questions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quickly grasps intent of question</li> <li>• Answers are concise and complete</li> <li>• Effectively answers questions to enhance presentation</li> </ul>	1   2   3   4   5
<b>Overall Impression</b>	1   2   3   4   5
<b>Total</b>	/ 25
<b>Comments:</b>	



**UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA**  
**Faculty of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences**



**Research Day**  
**Oral Presentations**

Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_

Judge: \_\_\_\_\_

*Please circle the number that you think best describes the presentation in each of the following categories.*

1 – Unacceptable	2 – Needs Improvement	3 – Acceptable	4 – Remarkable
Information substantially incomplete, missing, or at an inappropriate depth and/or breadth.	Some important information incomplete, missing, or suboptimal depth and/or breadth.	All important information included, but depth and/or breadth may be suboptimal for some aspects.	Exceptionally complete and succinct presentation at an appropriate depth & breadth.

<b>Content</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
Clearly explained objective and scope of project				
Addressed audience at appropriate level				
Demonstrated competence in subject matter				

<b>Delivery</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
Presentation well organized with logical flow of ideas				
Spoke clearly, audibly, and neither too fast nor too slow				
Established good rapport with audience (eye contact, posture, etc.)				
Provided concise and thoughtful answers to questions				
Presentation of appropriate duration (5 minutes)				

<b>Overall impression</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
General evaluation about this presentation				

<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>/ 12</b>
--------------	-------------

**Comments:**