

Best-in-Track Poster Evaluation Form WM54A-7B									
Poster Judge:	Session #								
Poster Prefix Listed in Final Program (e.g. A6, A7)									
Five-Digit Abstract Number									
Presentation & Eligibility Checklist: All eligibility rows must be “Yes” in order for the poster to be scored									
Poster was present during poster period <i>Check for Yes</i>									
Presenter was available for poster discussion with judges <i>Check for Yes</i>									
Poster title matches paper title <i>Check for Yes</i>									
Judging Criteria:									
Visual Impact & First Impression (Is it appealing? Easy to scan?) Rate 1-10									
Clarity & Readability (Is text legible from 5 ft? Good flow and Layout?) Rate 1-10									
Content Quality (Clear objective, logic, and relevant results) Rate 1-10									
Presenter Effectiveness (Engagement, clarity, ability to explain) Rate 1-10									
Value (For technical/scientific posters, is it innovative, insightful, well-supported. For non-scientific posters, does it identify intended audience, communicates clearly, presents a unique/creative method) Rate 1-10									
Total Score: 45-50 Superior 40-44 Excellent 30-39 Acceptable <30 Unacceptable									
Recommended for Best in Track <i>Check 1-poster for yes</i>									
Comments:									
Signature:									

POSTER JUDGING CRITERIA 54A-7B



Overview of the Judging Process

Poster judging follows a **three-step process**:

1. **Track-Level Judging (During Conference)**

All posters are rated within their assigned **Track**. Posters are categorized as:

- Superior (45-50)
- Excellent (40-44)
- Acceptable (30-39)
- Unacceptable (<30)

2. **Best-in-Track Selection**

Led by the **Track Lead Judge**, and often with support from Co-Chairs or additional judges, one outstanding poster/presenter combination is selected per track using the evaluation form.

3. **Best-in-Conference Selection (Post-Conference)**

A judging panel reviews **PDFs of the Best-in-Track posters and associated final papers**, selecting two winners:

- One for **ANS Best of Conference Award**
- One for **ASME Best of Conference Award**



Roles & Responsibilities

- **Track Lead Judges** are designated before the conference.
- If a judge is unavailable, the **Session Co-Chair** or designee fills in.
- Track Judges may enlist additional support.
- Track Lead Judges submit award decisions to WM Coordinators **10 minutes before the session ends**.
- Winning posters are relocated to the **“Best of Track”** display area.



Judging Criteria

Criteria	What to Look For
1. Visual Impact	Attractive, professional, uncluttered, and draws attention.
2. Clarity & Readability	Logical layout, legible from 5 ft, minimal jargon, smooth flow.
3. Content Quality	Clear purpose, supported methods, meaningful results and conclusions.
4. Presenter Effectiveness	Presenter engages confidently, explains clearly, answers questions, does not read verbatim.
5A. For technical/scientific posters	Innovative, impactful, contextually and relevant.
5B. For non-scientific posters	Identifies the intended audience, communicates clearly, and presents a unique or creative method effectively.

Use ✓ / ✗ for checklist items (e.g., presenter present, formatting correct)

Provide **brief, constructive comments** (strengths & improvements)

Best-in-Conference Judging

Occurs post-conference:

- WM Staff sends PDF copies of **Best-in-Track posters** and **associated papers** to a judging panel.
- Judges **exclude posters from their own tracks**.
- Judging can occur via group calls or email discussion.
- Final vote selects **2 winners** (one each for ANS and ASME awards).
- Awards are presented at the following year's WM Award Luncheon.

Additional Guidance for Judges

- **Each poster should be clear, concise, and engaging.**
If you read the title and conclusion but still don't understand the poster, it should be reflected in the judge's score.
- **Judging Forms:**
 - Use one form per session, with columns for multiple posters (where applicable).
 - Use only one check for "Recommended for Award" per track or topic.
- **Consider these high-impact judging cues:**
 - Did the presenter communicate a clear "take-home" message?
 - Did the visual presentation enhance the technical content?