

NIDDK Research Conference 2017: Rules and Guidelines

Travel award

- **8 travel grants** will be awarded to the 4 highest scoring oral and poster presentations
- Winners will also have their pictures taken with Dr. Griffen Rogers, NIDDK director
- **Eligibility:**
 - You must be a fellow at NIDDK
 - You must present an oral or poster at the conference
 - You must volunteer to judge at one session
 - ❖ Volunteering to judge multiple sessions is appreciated but will not affect your eligibility

Abstract Submission

- **Due date:** Abstracts are due on the last day of registration, please refer to website for date.
- **Title Length:** Should not exceed 200 characters
 - Your title must be 200 characters or less, including spaces.
- **Abstract Length:** No longer than 2,500 characters
 - Your abstract must be 2,500 characters or less, including spaces and carriage returns.
- **Contents:**
 - Your abstract should clearly describe the research question(s), the methodology employed, and the argument to be made (results).
 - Do not include references, figures, or tables in your abstract
 - Your abstract can be an abstract that you have already written for another occasion: such as a present or upcoming conference, postbac poster day, or the FARE award.

Moderators

- A moderator will be at each session to aid in set-up introduce speakers, and facilitate questions.
 - If you are interested in moderating a session, please contact either Kala Viswanathan (kvish@niddk.nih.gov) or Lorraine Moore (LorraineM@intra.niddk.nih.gov)
- **Instructions**
 - Check-in at the registration table to receive instructions regarding computer sign-on, location of laser pointer, and additional instruction regarding the use of equipment.
 - You are expected to show up at least 10 minutes before the session you are moderating to ensure that all presentations are uploaded on the provided computers.
 - Other responsibilities:
 - ❖ **Introduce speakers**
 - ❖ **Facilitating questions** – If there are none from the audience have one prepared to ask
 - ❖ **Keeping session on time** – Make sure to keep track of how long a speaker is presenting and stand up ~2 minutes before their time is up. If a speaker begins to go over ask them politely to wrap up their presentation.

Oral Presentations

- **Invited speakers (PIs)**
 - Thank you for agreeing to give the opening talk of your designated oral session.
 - **Length:** No longer than 20 minutes, NOT including questions
 - ❖ A moderator will stand up 2 minutes prior to the end of your talk to signal that you are approaching your time
 - ❖ The audience will have up to 5 minutes to ask questions.

- **Selected speakers (Fellows)**
 - **Length:** No longer than 15 minutes, NOT including questions
 - ❖ A moderator will stand up 2 minutes prior to the end of your talk to signal that you are approaching your time
 - If you go over your allotted time, you will receive a penalty in the scoring of your presentation that will affect your final score or the travel award.
 - ❖ The audience will have up to 5 minutes to ask questions.

 - **Content:**
 - ❖ Your presentation should provide sufficient background to understand the research question, clearly describe methodology employed, and show all results needed to support any conclusion(s) being made. Be sure to discuss the significance of the question(s) being addressed and why the method(s) used was selected.

- **General information**
 - A mac and pc laptop will be provided for you in your assigned room along with a laser pointer.
 - We ask that all speakers arrive **10 minutes** before your session to upload your slides on the computer and to introduce yourself to the moderator.

Poster Presentations

- **Size:** Poster must fit on a 4' x 6' board
 - Please note that the poster printers at the NIH facilities noted below are 42" wide

- **Content:**
 - Poster should provide sufficient background to understand the research question, clearly describe methodology employed, and show all results needed to support any conclusion(s) being made. Be sure to discuss the significance of the questions and why the method(s) used was selected in the body of your poster and/or in your presentation.

- **Printing:**
 - **Bldg 3, 2nd floor.** Email Sabrina Intoranat at intoranats@mail.nih.gov and or feel free to call the main line at 301-496-5100.
 - **Bldg 10 / Rm 9C428.** Email Tanya Brown, brownty2@nidk.nih.gov or call her at 301-496-1721

- **General information**
 - Please hang your poster the morning of your poster session and remove your poster at the end of the day.
 - Tacks for hanging your poster will be provided

Poster Evaluation Rubric

Category	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	Score
Abstract/ Background/ Introduction	Unable to clearly connect background /introduction to research poster or presentation. Hypothesis was inappropriate or missing. Goal of project was unclear or not stated	A questionable hypothesis was presented. Somewhat able to see connection of abstract to research/ presentation. Background/ introduction did not contain sufficient information.	A logical hypothesis was presented clearly. Background information was relevant, but more information would have been beneficial. Showed relevance beyond project.	A logical hypothesis was presented clearly. Connections to previous literature and broader issues were clear. Goal of project was clearly stated and showed relevance beyond project.	
Content	Connection not found between poster content and purpose of study, research hypothesis/question(s), method, conclusions, or implications.	Content presented was difficult to understand and did not sufficiently convey a connection to the study, hypothesis, research question(s), method, conclusion, and/or implications.	The content was adequately presented but support for the study, research hypothesis, or question(s) is somewhat general. Conclusion and implications were reasonable.	Strong material. Well summarized. Clearly shows development of study/ research. Material appears to accurately support purpose of study, hypothesis, or research question. Strong conclusion and implications presented.	
Methods & Control	No discussion of methods or methods section missing. Serious lack of controls.	Little comment on why the methods were chosen. Some significant controls are missing.	Good explanation of choice of method. Most controls were included and discussed.	Thorough explanation of why particular methods are chosen. Appropriate controls were included and discussed.	
Appearance & Organization	Not visually effective. Unable to understand link between information presented and topic of research	Poster needs work to improve visual appeal. Topic of research is not clear. Information presented is somewhat confusing.	Visual appeal of poster was adequate. Topic of there research is apparent. The presentation of information could use refining.	Visually appealing and effective presentation. Topic of research is clear. Layout of poster is logical, and provides sequential information form intro to conclusion.	
Oral Presentation	Presenter was not prepared. Demonstrated problems in several areas (no eye contact, lack of professionalism, no clear discussion of research)	Presenter did not convey a sense of confidence or ability to clearly discuss the research problem, methods, conclusion, and implication. Addition practice would be helpful.	Presentation and understanding of material was acceptable. Some problems (use of excessive jargon, inability to handle questions)	Presenter was confident and professional. Clearly conveyed research problem, methods, conclusions, and implications. Answered questions well.	
Total score (maximum = 60)					

Oral Evaluation Rubric

Category	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	Score
Abstract/ Background/ Introduction	Unable to clearly connect background /introduction to research presentation. Hypothesis was inappropriate or missing. Goal of project was unclear or not stated	A questionable hypothesis was presented. Somewhat able to see connection of abstract to research/ presentation. Background/ introduction did not contain sufficient information.	A logical hypothesis was presented clearly. Background information was relevant, but more information would have been beneficial. Showed relevance beyond project.	A logical hypothesis was presented clearly. Connections to previous literature and broader issues were clear. Goal of project was clearly stated and showed relevance beyond project.	
Content	Connection not found between presentation content and purpose of study, research hypothesis/question(s), method, conclusions, or implications.	Content presented was difficult to understand and did not sufficiently convey a connection to the study, hypothesis, research question(s), method, conclusion, and/or implications.	The content was adequately presented but support for the study, research hypothesis, or question(s) is somewhat general. Conclusion and implications were reasonable.	Strong material. Well summarized. Clearly shows development of study/ research. Material appears to accurately support purpose of study, hypothesis, or research question. Strong conclusion and implications presented.	
Methods & Control	No discussion of methods or methods section missing. Serious lack of controls.	Little comment on why the methods were chosen. Some significant controls are missing.	Good explanation of choice of method. Most controls were included and discussed.	Thorough explanation of why particular methods are chosen. Appropriate controls were included and discussed.	
Appearance & Organization	Not visually effective. Unable to understand link between information presented and topic of research. Slides were too cluttered or lack titles.	Presentation needs work to improve visual appeal. Topic of research is not clear. Information presented is somewhat confusing.	Visual appeal of slides was adequate. Topic of there research is apparent. The presentation of information could use refining.	Visually appealing and effective presentation. Topic of research is clear. Layout of presentation is logical, and provides sequential information form intro to conclusion.	
Oral Presentation	Presenter was not prepared. Demonstrated problems in several areas (no eye contact, lack of professionalism, no clear discussion of research)	Presenter did not convey a sense of confidence or ability to clearly discuss the research problem, methods, conclusion, and implication. Addition practice would be helpful.	Presentation and understanding of material was acceptable. Some problems (use of excessive jargon, inability to handle questions)	Presenter was confident and professional. Clearly conveyed research problem, methods, conclusions, and implications. Answered questions well.	
Presenter went >1 minute over time (-5 points)					
Total score (maximum = 60)					