

## GRADUATE STUDENT PRESENTATION AWARD

The award consists of an inscribed plaque, a \$500 for travel to a scientific meeting in 2005-2006, a one-year on-line or print subscription to one APS journal, as well as membership in both APS and the NE Division. Each participant must submit the attached form.

### Eligibility Rules:

1. The senior (first) author must have been registered as a graduate student during the time that the research covered by the presentation was performed. Each student is limited to **one** first place award per degree sought.
2. The presentation must be made prior to or not more than one year after receipt of the degree for which the research was performed.
3. The senior author must make the presentation.
4. An abstract of the presentation must be submitted before the deadline established for receipt of abstracts.
5. The completed "Graduate Student Presentation Award Designation Form" must be attached to one copy of the "Abstract Submission Form" to indicate that the paper is to be considered for the award and emailed to Cheryl Smith [cheryl.smith@unh.edu](mailto:cheryl.smith@unh.edu). NEDAPS Sec/Treasurer by  
**1 September 2005**

The recipient of the award will be selected by a Panel of Judges who will evaluate all papers to be considered for the award. The following criteria will be considered: Content and Merit, 50%, and Delivery 50%.

The Program Committee will attempt to schedule papers for consideration so that only one of these papers is presented at any given time. Papers to be considered for the award will not be specifically designated or treated differently in any respect from other papers that are not to be considered for the award. Thus, only the Program Committee, the Award Committee, and the Panel of Judges will be aware of those papers under consideration.

-----  
**Send this form as an attachment with the abstract and abstract form to:** Cheryl Smith ([cheryl.smith@unh.edu](mailto:cheryl.smith@unh.edu))

### **GRADUATE STUDENT PRESENTATION AWARD DESIGNATION FORM American Phytopathological Society - Northeastern Division**

The presentation covered by the attached abstract shall be considered for the 2005 Northeastern Division Graduate Student Presentation Award:

Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Author(s): \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Senior Author

I certify that the research described by this abstract was conducted while the senior author was registered for the \_\_\_\_\_ degree at \_\_\_\_\_ Institution. This degree was or is expected to be conferred \_\_\_\_\_ (date).

\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Department Head or Chair

**NED-APS Graduate Student Award  
Judging Sheet (revised 2001)**

**Speaker** \_\_\_\_\_

**Instructions.** Circle the number with your evaluation of the speaker's performance. The coded ratings are:

- 10 = Excellent
- 7 = Good
- 5 = Average
- 2 = Poor
- 0 = Deficient

**Content and Merit: 50%**

- |    |   |    |   |   |   |   |
|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | How did the speaker relate his/her research to prior research on the topic?<br>Did the speaker explain why this research was conducted? | 10 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| 2. | Was there a <u>clearly</u> stated set of hypotheses and objectives?   | 10 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| 3. | Was the methodology appropriate to address the hypotheses? Were the controls adequate? Was the experimental design appropriate?         | 10 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| 4. | Were the data appropriately summarized and analyzed?  | 10 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| 5. | Was there a set of conclusions? Did the conclusions flow logically from the data set? What are the needs for future research, if any?   | 10 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 0 |

**Delivery: 50%**

- |    |  |    |   |   |   |   |
|----|--|----|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Was the speaker composed? Easy to understand and audible?<br>(Consideration to be made if English is not the primary language)                                   | 10 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| 2. | Was the presentation organized to fit within the allotted time? Was there too much, too little or the right amount of content?                                   | 10 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| 3. | Did the speaker effectively lead the audience through the talk? Could a pathologist unfamiliar with the specific topic readily understand what was done and why? | 10 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| 4. | Were the visual aids easy to read/understand and effectively used?   | 10 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| 5. | Were questions answered satisfactorily?  | 10 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 0 |

**Total Score (Based on 100)** \_\_\_\_\_