**Appendix 17. PSG Student Presentation Award Guidelines**

**Student Paper Awards**

Each year at the annual meeting, PSG gives one award for Best Student Oral Presentation, and one award for Best Student Poster Presentation. Judges are drawn from the PSG membership, with the intent of having at least two judges score each presentation. The exact scoring system may vary from meeting to meeting, depending on the discretion of the lead judge (Past-Chair); however, in general the criteria will remain the same. Following are criteria for each award.

**Oral Presentation
Title and Abstract** - Is the abstract will written? Did it describe the presentation adequately? Is the title appropriate and interesting (e.g., catchy)?

**Big Picture/Context** - What is the larger issue of interest within which the specific reported research is placed (and is this addressed; *i.e.*, is the context relevant only to seabird research, or is it broader)? Is the context species-specific, methods-oriented, or theoretical and is the research clearly presented within this context?

**Question/Hypothesis** - Is there a clear question being addressed? Is it answered?
**Analysis** - (How) are the data analyzed? Is the analysis appropriate given both the data and the questions posed? Is the analysis innovative?

**Graphics** - Are the graphics clear and easy to read?
*Graphs*: Do the graphs tell a clear story? Are they of the correct type given the data?

Are they presented judiciously (rather than ad nauseam)? Is there a clear, key point(s) presented per graph? Do these points support the question being addressed?

*Photographs*: Do the photographs enhance the presentation (or are they fatuous)? *Drawings/Diagrams*: Do these images enhance the presentation (or are they fatuous)?

Are they easy to read/interpret?
*Tables*: Are they easy to read and to the point (versus too many cells)?
*Word Slides*: Are they easy to read and to the point (versus too many words)?

**Style** - Does the speaker effectively convey the research to the audience? Is the speaker enthusiastic? Is the talk finished within the allotted time?

*Speaking*: Clear; without distracting conjunctions (um, ah, like, well, I mean, you know). *Body Language*: Facing the audience (versus the screen); gesturing (versus hands in pockets - change jingling is extra points off).

*Questions*: Does the speaker handle questions well? Are the questions understood? Are less than savvy questions handled with grace?

**Format** - Does the presentation have a clear:

* Introduction
* Question/Hypothesis addressed
* Methods
* Results
* Conclusion(s)

**Poster Presentation
Title and Abstract** - Is the abstract well written? Did it describe the presentation adequately? Is the title appropriate and interesting (e.g. catchy)?

**Big Picture/Context** - What is the larger issue of interest within which the specific reported research is placed (and is this addressed; i.e. is the context relevant only to seabird research, or is it broader)? Is the context species-specific, methods-oriented, or theoretical and is the research clearly presented within this context?

**Question/hypothesis** - Is there a clear question being addressed? Is it answered?
**Analysis** - (How) are the data analyzed? Is the analysis appropriate given both the data and the questions posed? Is the analysis innovative?

**Graphics** - Are the graphics clear and easy to read?
*Graphs*: Do the graphs tell a clear story? Are they of the correct type given the data?

Are they presented judiciously (rather than ad nauseam)? Is there a clear, key point(s) presented per graph? Do these points support the question being addressed?

*Photographs*: Do the photographs enhance the presentation (or are they fatuous)? *Drawings/Diagrams*: Do these images enhance the presentation (or are they fatuous)?

Are they easy to read/interpret?
*Tables*: Are they easy to read and to the point (versus too many cells)?

**Format** - Does the presentation have a clear:

* Title
* Introduction
* Question/Hypothesis addressed
* Methods
* Results
* Conclusion(s)
* Literature Cited
* Acknowledgments

**Layout** - What is the ratio of the space to words, of graphics to words? Can the poster be understood from a distance (or is the feel more that of a written paper pasted up on the wall)? Is the flow obvious (top to bottom, left to right, in columns, etc.)? Is there a creative use of color and form? Is there a creative use of any additional material?

**Style** - (during Poster Session) - Clear; without distracting conjunctions (um, ah, like, well, I mean, you know).

*Body Language*: Interacting with readers (versus shrinking into the corner). *Questions*: Are the questions understood, and /or answered well?

**Judges should view the posters during the poster session in order to speak directly with the poster presenter.**