

# MIDWESTERN CRIMINAL JUSTICE ASSOCIATION STUDENT POSTER COMPETITION

## ELIGIBILITY & ATTENDANCE REQUIREMENTS

Any student presenting a poster during the poster session of the Midwestern Criminal Justice Association annual conference is eligible for the competition. Students interested in entering the Student Poster Competition must indicate so by telling the registration table by 10am on Friday, September 27<sup>th</sup>, 2019.

Additional items to note:

- You may compete in **both** the paper and poster competition.
- You may be a graduate or undergraduate student. There will be awards given for each division.
- You may co-author the research with a faculty member, but you must be first author.
- Entries for this competition are limited to a single submission per participant.
- Oral presentations should be no longer than 10 minutes.

## PROCEDURE FOR JUDGING ENTRIES

The MCJA Student Poster Competition Award Committee will judge entries based on the rubric on the following page. Each poster will be judged by at least three Committee members, and the average score will be taken.

## AWARDS & DISTRIBUTION

Awards will be announced and distributed during the MCJA business meeting at the annual conference and **students participating in the competition must be present at that meeting to receive an award**. The best poster from each of two divisions (graduate and undergraduate) will receive \$75.00.

mccia

MCJA Student Poster Competition Judging Rubric

Presenter's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Poster Title \_\_\_\_\_

Undergraduate Graduate

Category	10-12	7-9	4-6	1-3	SCORE
<b>Poster Content</b>	Strong material. Well summarized. Clearly shows development of study or research. Material appears to accurately support purpose of study, hypothesis, or research question. Strong conclusion and implications presented.	The content was adequately presented but support for the study, hypothesis or question(s) is somewhat general. Conclusion and implications were reasonable.	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.	Connection not found between poster content and purpose of study, research hypothesis/question(s), method, conclusions, or implications.	
<b>Research Complexity</b>	Complex research project. Purpose of the study was completely defined and results displayed in a manner interpretable by the general audience.	Complex research project. Purpose of the research and results were difficult to interpret by the general audience.	Less complex research project. However, purpose of the study and the results easily interpreted by the audience.	Less complex research project. Purpose of the study and analysis of results not easily interpreted by the audience.	
<b>Poster Appearance/Clarity</b>	Visually appealing and strongly effective presentation. Easy to read. Utilized creativity in fonts, headings, colors, and white space.	Poster was adequate but could improve effectiveness through better use of space through fonts, headings, and white space.	Poster was acceptable but needs work to improve visual appeal through better utilization of fonts, colors, headings, and white space.	Not visually appealing.	
<b>Poster Organization</b>	Topic of research is clearly evident. Layout of poster is logical and provides sequential information from introduction to conclusion and references.	Topic of the research is apparent. The presentation of information could use refining.	Topic of research is not clear. Information presented is somewhat confusing.	Unable to understand link between information presented and topic of research.	
<b>Presenter's Oral Presentation</b>	Presenter was confident and professional. Established eye contact. Clearly conveyed research problem, methods, conclusions, and implications. Answered	Presentation and demonstration of understanding was acceptable. Demonstrated some problems (speaking too softly, using jargon,	Presenter did not convey a sense of confidence or ability to clearly discuss research problem, methods, conclusion, and implications. Additional practice would be helpful.	Presenter was not prepared. Demonstrated problems in several areas (no eye contact, no clear discussion of research, lack of professionalism).	

	questions well. Discussed research in layman's terms or appropriate to judge.	hesitation, inability to handle questions, etc.)			
					<b>TOTAL SCORE</b> (maximum of 60)

Judge's Name:

Additional Comments:

mcia