Guidance for Dwornik Judges

Judges are asked to provide a numerical score for each candidate in the following categories. Both the candidate’s two-page written abstract and presentation (oral or poster) are judged. The following categories provide rough guidance for how one might score a presentation using a five-tiered scoring system that mimics the NASA/NSF proposal scoring categories of Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, and Excellent for each element of the presentation. Please be self-consistent in the application of criteria.

Once you have entered in this information, proceed to the next page of the on-line form. Here you are asked to rank each presentation you reviewed, separated by type: undergraduate oral, undergraduate poster, graduate oral, graduate poster. Please do not rank undergraduates against grad students. Also, you are strongly encouraged to include typed comments in the text box provided in the on-line form to provide additional insight into your decision-making process.

Presentation Breakdown

Two-page Written Abstract

Scientific Content (0–15 point range)
- 0–3 = poor: science poorly defined / not included
- 4–6 = fair: defined but not clear / needs improvement
- 7–9 = good: basic science conveyed
- 10–12 = very good: science clearly defined
- 13–15 = excellent: exceptionally clearly defined

Presentation / Writing (1–5 point range)
- 1 = poor: writing is of low quality
- 2 = fair: writing not clear / needs improvement
- 3 = good: presentation is sufficient but not exceptional
- 4 = very good: very clearly written / well presented
- 5 = excellent: exceptionally well written / well presented

Oral or Poster Presentation

Clear statement of:

Introduction / Statement of Problem (0–10 point range)
- 0–2 = poor: not defined/not included
- 2–4 = fair: defined but not clear / needs improvement
- 4–6 = good: basic idea conveyed
- 6–8 = very good: very clearly defined
- 8–10 = excellent: exceptionally clearly defined

Methodology (0–15 point range)
- 0–3 = poor: not mentioned or described
- 4–6 = fair: described but not clear / needs improvement
Results / Interpretations (0–15 point range)

0–3 = poor: not mentioned or presented
4–6 = fair: presented but not clear / needs improvement
7–9 = good: basic results and interpretation presented
10–12 = very good: clearly presented
13–15 = excellent: exceptionally clearly presented

Conclusions (0–10 point range)

0–2 = poor: not mentioned or presented
2–4 = fair: presented but not clear / needs improvement
4–6 = good: basic conclusions given
6–8 = very good: very clearly presented
8–10 = excellent: exceptionally clearly presented

Delivery / Layout / Visuals (0–20 point range)

0–4 = poor: no visuals, poor layout or delivery
5–8 = fair: visual and delivery not clear / needs improvement
9–12 = good: basic conclusions given
13–16 = very good: very clearly presented
17–20 = excellent: exceptionally clearly presented

Questions / Discussions (0–10 point range)

0–2 = poor: no questions answered
2–4 = fair: answers provided not clear / need improvement
4–6 = good: basic answers given during Q&A
6–8 = very good: very clear and engaged discussion
8–10 = excellent: exceptionally deft handling of questions

Possible Score: 1–100

Next section of web-based form:

Notes / Comments field:
Please provide additional insight into your decision-making process, particularly for those presentations that you deem to be of high quality. Helpful comments could include, “This presenter’s project is especially innovative and/or represents a significant scientific advance” or “this presentation was particularly polished and she/he answered questions well.” In other words, if you view a presentation that you feel may be a strong contender for a Dwornik award, please let us know in the comments field.
Ranking:
Finally, you are asked to rank each presentation that you review. Please only rank presentations of like type against one another: undergraduate oral, undergraduate poster, graduate oral, graduate poster. Please do not rank undergraduates against grad students.

Of the [1–25] [oral / poster | graduate / undergrad] presentations I judged, this ranks: [1–25]

Note you must make three selections from the drop-down menus. These are, from left to right: (1) number of presentations of a given type that you judged; (2) the presentation type, i.e., graduate oral, graduate poster, undergraduate oral, or undergraduate poster; and (3) your ranking among those of like type.

If you have general questions or concerns, please email bjt@bu.edu. For technical queries specific to the online judging form or to change your selections, please email jhinds@uidaho.edu.