



**MURRAY STATE**  
UNIVERSITY

**Hutson School of Agriculture**

**NACTA** Judging  
Conference 2019

**Poster Contest Official Rules**

Thursday, April 11<sup>th</sup>

Location and Time to Be Determined

**Contest Director:**

Dr. Brian Parr

(270) 809-2966

[bparr@murraystate.edu](mailto:bparr@murraystate.edu)

# Contest Guidelines

The goal of the NACTA Posters session is to promote the sharing of ideas and research that support agriculture.

## Poster Submission Requirements

Posters are accepted in two categories: innovative ideas and research. The contest is open to students who are the primary author of the poster and present the poster at the meeting.

### Innovative Ideas Category

Posters in this category should address agricultural teaching/learning/experiences at the post-secondary levels.

Ideas must be implemented prior to submission.

### Research Category

Posters submitted in this category must represent agricultural research completed prior to the submission.

### Poster Format

The poster should have these heading/sections when appropriate:

#### INNOVATIVE IDEA:

- Introduction/need for innovation or idea
- How it works/methodology/program phases/steps
- Results to date/implications
- Future plans/advice to others
- Costs/resources needed
- References

#### RESEARCH:

- Introduction/need for research
- Conceptual or theoretical framework
- Methodology
- Results/findings
- Conclusions
- Implications/recommendations/impact on profession
- References

### Presentation

Posters should not exceed 48" x 48".

Authors must be present during the presentation to be eligible for awards. Posters not in compliance with size restrictions may be displayed within the available space, but will not be eligible for awards.

## Poster Evaluation

### Innovative Idea Poster

General Notes: These guidelines are intended to assist the reviewer in assigning point values for the scoring categories. The reviewer is free to assign values between those suggested and to apply additional criteria. Missing sections may be scored a zero since the rubric was available to all authors.

	Points Possible	Needs Improvement	Acceptable	Outstanding
Introduction, need for idea or innovation	25	Idea is has very limited appeal or benefit (e.g. specific to a small number of programs) and poorly described 0-10 points	Idea has appeal to many programs, but need/goals are not well addressed 11-20 points	Idea has broad appeal and need/goals are well described. Could be implemented in many programs. 21-25 points
How it works / methodology program phases / steps	15	Methods seem inappropriate, poorly described and hard to follow. 0-5 points	Methodology is appropriate, but would be hard to reproduce from the description given 6-10 points	Methods are very appropriate and implementation is well described. Could be easily reproduced. 11-15 points
Results to date / implications	15	Results not complete or poorly described. Idea not fully implemented 0-5 points	Results complete, but not tied to implications. 6-10 points	Results fully described with implications well addressed 11-15 points
Future plans / advice to others	15	Weak discussion of where this idea will go from here 0-5 points	Future plans are addressed and concrete suggestions for others are presented. 6-10 points	Excellent recommendations and/or advice to others wishing to implement the idea. 11-15 points
Costs / resources needed	15	Cost is poorly addressed, incomplete, not quantified. 0-5 points	Both direct and indirect (existing support) costs are addressed but not well quantified 6-10 points	Both direct and indirect costs are addressed in a quantifiable way. 11-15 points
References	5	No References 0 points	Minimal references 1-3 points	References provide a good foundation for the poster. 4-5 points
Style, clarity and grammar	10	Difficult to read, spelling and grammar errors common 0-4 points	Minimal spelling and grammar errors, easy to read, generally follows style requirements 5-7 points	No obvious grammar or spelling errors. Easy read. Follows style requirements as described in the "Call" 8-10 points.
Total points earned	100			



## Research Poster

General notes: These guidelines are intended to assist the reviewer in assigning point values for the scoring categories. The reviewer is free to assign values between those shown below and to apply additional criteria. Missing sections may be scored a zero since the rubric was available to all authors.

	Points Possible	Needs Improvement	Acceptable	Outstanding
Introduction, need for research	10	Research is esoteric and would have limited implications to the broader Agriculture community 0-3 points	Research has a regional need and is tied to general agricultural research needs 4-7 points	Research has a broad need and is tied general agricultural research needs 8-10
Conceptual or theoretical framework	15	Minimal effort to describe the foundations of this research. No theory identified. 0-5 points	The framework is appropriate, but lacking detail. Theory is identified, but may not be well supported. 6-10 points	The framework clearly shows that this research is solidly built on previous work. A relevant theory is identified. 11-15 points
Methodology	15	Methods seem inappropriate, poorly described and hard to follow. 0-5 points	Methodology is generally appropriate, but would be hard to reproduce from the description given 6-10 points	Methodology is very appropriate, well described and could be easily reproduced. 11-15 points
Results/Findings	15	Study has not been completed (0 points) or results poorly described 0-5 points	Results are adequately described and tied to the methodology. 6-10 points	Results are well described and clearly connected to the methodology. 11-15 points
Conclusions	15	Conclusions are not supported by results. 0-5 points	Conclusions are generally supported by the results of the research. 6-10 points	Conclusions are clearly supported by the results of the research. 11-15 points
Implications / Recommendations / Impact on Profession	15	No or minimal implications / recommendations / impact on Profession. 0-5 points	Author makes adequate recommendations or description of the implications / impact based on this research. 6-10 points	Author makes excellent recommendations or description of the implications / impact based on this research. 11-15 points
References	5	No References 0 points	Minimal references or inappropriate references 1-3 points	References provide a good foundation for the poster. 4-5 points
Style, clarity and grammar	10	Difficult to read, spelling and grammar errors common 0-4 points	Minimal spelling and grammar errors, easy to read, generally follows style requirements 5-7 points	No obvious grammar or spelling errors. Easy read. Follows style requirements. 8-10 points.
Total points earned	100			

NACTA POSTER Research Poster Session

Reviewer's Number: \_\_\_\_\_

For each of the categories below, please indicate the number of points earned. Please total the scores.

	Poster Abstract Number								
	Points Possible	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
Introduction, need for research	10								
Conceptual or theoretical framework	15								
Methodology	15								
Results/Findings	15								
Conclusions	15								
Implications/Recommendations/Impact on Profession	15								
References	5								
Clarity/Grammar	10								
Total points earned	100								

\*\*These rules and guidelines were adapted from those written and used by the American Association for Agricultural Education.