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**Contest Guidelines**

The goal of the NACTA Posters session is to promote the sharing of learning and research that support agriculture.

**Poster Submission Requirements**

Posters are accepted in two categories: non-empirical and empirical. The contest is open to students who are the primary author of the poster and present the poster at the meeting.

**Non-Empirical Category**

Posters in this category should address agricultural teaching/learning/experiences at the post-secondary levels. This category does **not** use require collected data and standardized statistical methods. Examples would be course experiential learning projects or lab experiences, comprehensive coverage of an agricultural topic, teaching methods, or an innovative or entrepreneurial idea for future application.

**Empirical (Research) Category**

Posters submitted in this category involves examining a research question that is clearly defined and answerable by using standardized statistical methods on collected data. This may include either quantitatively or qualitatively collected data. Must represent agricultural research completed prior to the submission.

**Poster Format**

The poster should have these heading/sections when appropriate:

**NON-EMPIRICAL:**

* Introduction
* How it works/methodology/phases/steps involved
* Results/implications
* Costs/resources needed
* References

**EMPIRICAL:**

* Introduction/need for research
* Methodology
* Results/findings
* Conclusions
* Implications/recommendations
* References

**Presentation**

Posters are requested to be 23” x 35”. Other sizes can be accommodated.

**Authors must be present at their poster on April 2nd from 2:00 pm to 3:00 pm to answer questions by judges and anyone else viewing the posters. Business casual or business professional dress is expected. Part of the judging process will be how well the poster author addresses questions. Authors must be present during the presentation to be eligible for awards.**

**Submission Instructions:**

1. Submit a pdf file of your poster and ‘poster information form’ (posted with poster rules on website) by March 30th to Dr. Brittany Howell at bjhowell@fhsu.edu. You will receive a confirmation email within 24 hours of your submission. If you do not, please send a follow-up email to confirm receipt.
2. Bring your printed poster to the contest. Push pins will be provided. You will be notified of your poster number at registration to use to find the display board for your poster at Cunningham Hall (room number TBA). The room for displaying posters will be open and available to set up posters after 8:30 am on April 2nd. Actual room number will be included in your submission confirmation email and available at registration on April 1st.

Tips:

* Do not copy images from the internet and paste them into your document – the result may be pixelated or blurry.
* A clear, dark font on a light background is the easiest to read.
* Do not use a font smaller than 24 pt.
* Don’t forget to proofread or ask someone to proofread your poster and fix typos!

**Poster Evaluation**

**Non-Empirical Poster**

General Notes: These guidelines are intended to assist the reviewer in assigning point values for the scoring categories. The reviewer is free to assign values between those suggested and to apply additional criteria Missing sections may be scored a zero since the rubric was available to all authors.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | PointsPossible  | Needs Improvement | Acceptable | Outstanding |
| Introduction | 20 | Idea is has very limited appeal or benefit (e.g. specific to a small number of programs) and poorly described 0-10 points  | Idea has appeal to many programs, but need/goals are not well addressed. 11-15 points | Idea has broad appeal and need/goals are well described. Could be implemented in many programs. 16-20 points |
| How it works / methodology/phases/ steps involved | 20 | Methods seem inappropriate, poorly described and hard to follow. 0-10 points | Methodology is appropriate, but would be hard to reproduce from the description given 11-15 points | Methods are very appropriate and implementation is well described. Could be easily reproduced. 16-20 points |
| Results/implications | 20 | Results not complete or poorly described. Idea not fully implemented 0-10 points | Results complete, but not tied to implications. 11-15 points | Results fully described with implications well addressed 16-20 points |
| References | 10 | No References 0 points | Minimal references 1-5 points | References provide a good foundation for the poster.6-10 points |
| Style, clarity and grammar | 10 | Difficult to read, spelling and grammar errors common 0-3 points | Minimal spelling and grammar errors, easy to read, generally follows style requirements 4-7 points | No obvious grammar or spelling errors. Easy read. Follows style requirements. 8-10 points. |
| Author presentation | 20 | Did not understand questions or answer directly. Lack of general knowledge of subject. Does not handle criticism. 0-10 points | Mostly understands questions and answers fairly directly. Good general knowledge of subject. Handles criticism somewhat. 11-15 points | Clearly understands questions and answers directly. Excellent general knowledge of subject. Can handle criticism.16-20 points |
| Total points Earned | 100 |  |  |  |

NACTA POSTER Non-Empirical Poster Session

Reviewer’s Number: \_\_\_\_\_\_

For each of the categories below, please indicate the number of points earned. Please total the scores.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Poster Number |
|  | Points Possible  | #1 | #2 | #3 | #4 | #5 | #6 | #7 | #8 |
| Introduction | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How it works/methodology/ phases/steps involved | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Results/implications | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| References | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Style, clarity and grammar | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Author presentation | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total points earned | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Empirical (Research) Poster**

General notes: These guidelines are intended to assist the reviewer in assigning point values for the scoring categories. The reviewer is free to assign values between those shown below and to apply additional criteria. Missing sections may be scored a zero since the rubric was available to all authors.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | PointsPossible | Needs Improvement | Acceptable | Outstanding |
| Introduction | 10 | Research is esoteric and would have limited implications to the broader Agriculture community 0-4 points | Research has a regional need and is tied to general agricultural research needs 5-7 points | Research has a broad need and is tied general agricultural research needs 8-10 points |
| Methodology | 15 | Methods seem inappropriate, poorly described and hard to follow. 0-5 points | Methodology is generally appropriate, but would be hard to reproduce from the description given 6-10 points | Methodology is very appropriate, well described and could be easily reproduced. 11-15 points |
| Results/findings | 15 | Study has not been completed (0 points) or results poorly described0-5 points | Results are adequately described and tied to the methodology. 6-10 points | Results are well described and clearly connected to the methodology. 11-15 points |
| Conclusions | 15 | Conclusions are not supported by results.0-5 points | Conclusions are generally supported by the results of the research. 6-10 points | Conclusions are clearly supported by the results of the research. 11-15 points |
| Implications/Recommendations | 15 | No or minimal implications / recommendations. 0-5 points | Author makes adequate recommendations or description of the implications of this research. 6-10 points | Author makes excellent recommendations or description of the implications of this research. 11-15 points |
| References | 5 | No References0 points | Minimal references or inappropriate references 1-3 points | References provide a good foundation for the poster. 4-5 points |
| Style, clarity and Grammar | 10 | Difficult to read, spelling and grammar errors common 0-4 points | Minimal spelling and grammar errors, easy to read, generally follows style requirements 5-7 points | No obvious grammar or spelling errors. Easy read. Follows style requirements. 8-10 points. |
| Author presentation | 15 | Did not understand questions or answer directly. Lack of general knowledge of subject. Does not handle criticism. 0-5 points | Mostly understands questions and answers fairly directly. Good general knowledge of subject. Handles criticism somewhat. 6-10 points | Clearly understands questions and answers directly. Excellent general knowledge of subject. Can handle criticism.11-15 points |
| Total Points Earned | 100 |  |  |  |

NACTA POSTER Empirical Research Poster Session

Reviewer’s Number: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

For each of the categories below, please indicate the number of points earned. Please total the scores.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Poster Abstract Number |
|  | PointsPossible | #1 | #2 | #3 | #4 | #5 | #6 | #7 | #8 |
| Introduction, need for research | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Methodology | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Results/Findings | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conclusions | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implications/Recommendations | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| References | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clarity/Grammar | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Author presentation | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total points earned** | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\*\*These rules and guidelines were adapted from those written and used by the American Association for Agricultural Education