

## **Young Scientist Award at the 6<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Scandinavian-Baltic Society for Parasitology - Criteria and Regulations**

The Young Scientist Award is established with the purpose of recognizing the best presentations of young/junior scientists taking place during the 7<sup>th</sup> Conference of SBSP. Awards will be given for 1 oral presentation and 1 poster presentation. Oral and poster presentations are considered to be equal, but are judged separately for a more equal comparison among competitors. If there are 4 or less entries in either category, oral and poster presentations will be judged together and 2 awards will be given, regardless of type of presentation. To be considered for the award, the abstract must be submitted and presented by a MSc or PhD student (see Award Criteria, paragraph 2). The award is given without concern for the presenter's academic status, ethnicity, gender or country of origin. Winners will be determined based on the highest mean score in each category (oral or poster) as judged by an appointed jury. In the event of a tie, the score with the smallest standard deviation will win. In addition, there will be a third award, selected by the audience.

The awards will be announced at the SBSP general assembly, Friday 8 June 2017. The winners will receive a diploma and a cash prize of EUR 500.

### **Award Criteria:**

1. The Young Scientist Award competitor (the candidate) must be a member of the SBSP.
2. Must be a registered as MSc or PhD student, or have graduated/defended within the past 12 months.
3. Previous winners of the award are not eligible for the same award but runner-ups are eligible.
4. Candidates must register at the conference website <http://csbsp7.mozello.com>.
5. If the poster or oral presentation is co-authored the candidate must be first author on the presentation and paper.
6. The presentation must represent a completed body of independent or joint research in which the candidate's contribution has been substantial. To be eligible, the research must be original.
7. The candidate can enter more than one abstract for the Young Scientist Award.

## **CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES FOR A GOOD PRESENTATION**

The selection of winners will in general be based on:

- (i) The scientific content and quality of the presentation (i.e. originality, novelty, significance, etc.);
- (ii) quality of the presentation (i.e. clarity, layout & design, etc.);
- (iii) the presentation itself (i.e. how well the speaker was able to deliver a stimulating talk;
- (iv) the abidance by allocated time;
- (v) the effectiveness of the communication of the concept to the audience, etc.);
- (v) the clarity of the submitted message.

### **Scientific specific criteria**

#### **1. Introduction:**

- a. Was the research problem clearly introduced? Was the importance of the research question explained? Why was the work done? Did the presenter provide background and context for the research? What was the state of the field prior to this study?
- b. Was a clear statement of the hypothesis provided or, in studies that did not test hypotheses, were the objectives and importance of the research clearly stated?

#### **2. Methods:**

- a. Were techniques appropriate and clearly explained?
- b. How creative was the work? If the work employed common techniques, were they used to approach novel issues or novel questions?

#### **3. Results:**

- a. Were the results a valuable contribution to the field?
- b. Was the significance clearly demonstrated?

#### **4. Discussion & Conclusions:**

- a. Were the results well summarized and related to the introduction?
- b. Were the conclusions warranted by the data?
- c. Did the results provide a valuable contribution to our knowledge or did they merely provide details about a phenomenon that is already largely understood?
- d. Was the research sufficiently independent, unique, or creative?
- e. Were the conclusions placed in a broader context?

### **Presentation Style and Logistics:**

- 1. Were the graphics lucid? Were figures intelligible with clearly labeled axes? Were tables legible and intelligible? Were the graphics designed to be as self-explanatory and informative as possible?
- 2. Was specialist jargon minimized so that non-specialists could understand?
- 3. How well did the speaker respond to questions?

4. Did the candidate project a professional demeanor? Were inappropriate references, private jokes, and excuses for poor graphics avoided?
5. (oral) Was the speaker clear and logical, or confused and disorganized? Was eye contact made with the audience, or was the paper simply read from notes or the screen?
6. (oral) Was the speaker poised? Was the presentation “timed” correctly?
7. (poster) Was the poster clearly organized and well planned? Was the poster clearly arranged with minimal text for maximal effect? Were visuals used appropriately for the point being made? Was the font large enough to be easily read from a distance? Was the poster visually appealing and not overly busy?
8. (poster) Was the oral presentation succinct, clear, and focused?

#### **SUMMARY OF CRITERIA FOR ORAL PRESENTATIONS**

*Printed abstract:* concise and accurate summary

*Introduction:* clear objectives and background

*Methods:* appropriate and clearly explained

*Results:* logical; clear; pertinent

*Conclusion:* based on presented results; clear on salient points

*Presentation:* voice clear; loud enough; voice modulations appropriate; eye contact maintained

*Audiovisuals:* well organized; appropriate number for length of talk; simple to Understand; not cluttered

*Organization and timing:* logical sequence; appropriate time for each section of talk; adhere to allotted time

*Understanding of subject:* presenter has good grasp of study and related areas; clear and effective response to questions

*Impact of presentation on audience:* audience attentive due to quality, subject and/or innovativeness of the presentation

#### **SUMMARY OF CRITERIA FOR POSTER PRESENTATIONS**

*Printed abstract:* concise/accurate; summary of pertinent details; follows poster

*Introduction:* literature/background; objectives

*Methods:* scientific method; clear; appropriate; explained; originality.

*Results:* logical; clear; strength of data

*Conclusion:* are they supported by the data; interface with current theory

*Poster Quality:* appropriate figures/tables; readability of text

*Organization:* logical sequence of information

*Presentation:* ability to cover material; enthusiasm

*Understanding of subject:* presenter has good grasp of subject; ability to deal with questions

*Impact on audience:* clear take-home message; contribution to scientific discipline

## **GUIDELINES FOR JUDGES' ELIGIBILITY**

A. Judges will be selected based on past judging experience and knowledge/contribution to their field of research. The President/Young Scientist Awards Committee will be responsible for selecting judges representing different disciplines prior to the meeting and email to them abstracts, judging guidelines, and assessment forms.

B. Board members will always make up a portion of the judging pool.

C. Potential judges will be contacted prior to the meeting to ascertain their interest/availability for judging. All judges will be provided with a written set of judging criteria, and a brief judges meeting at the start of the conference will provide orientation to assure that all judges use the same criteria for judging.

D. To avoid bias or conflict of interest, judges should not have competing candidates (i.e. students) or, if unavoidable, should abstain from voting on their own candidates. A judge may not evaluate a candidate if they serve in his/her thesis committee.

E. President or committee chair of competition must provide one score sheet per candidate for all judges.

F. Judges should meet beforehand to review guidelines and afterwards to vote.

G. Judges should rate presentations based on specific decided criteria. In co-authored papers, the judges will carefully evaluate the candidate's contribution to the presented research. In case of a tie, the score with the smallest standard deviation will win. However, judges may decide on a joint award.

H. Judges should consider returning score sheets to the President or the competition committee chair so that the score sheets can be provided to students as feedback.