

**AWARD JUDGING FORM FOR BEST ORAL DISCUSSION/E-PRESENTATION  
PRESENTED AT THE SEG 2017 ANNUAL MEETING IN HOUSTON**

Paper # <<PAPER NUMBER>>

Session Number: <<SESSION SEQUENCE>>

Session Name: <<SESSION NAME>>

Paper Title: <<TITLE>>

Speaker: <<FIRST NAME>> <<MIDDLE NAME>> <<LAST NAME>>

Affiliation: <<COMPANY>>

Presentation Date and Time: <<DATE>>

**Check boxes if:**

- The speaker did not show up to give this presentation.
- You thought this was a commercial presentation.

**CATEGORY and QUESTIONS TO ASK IN ESTABLISHING THE GRADE**

For each of the four categories, circle the one score that fits best from each rating scale

**1 - DELIVERY**

RATING SCALE 0=POOR, 10=OUTSTANDING

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Did the speaker communicate to the audience effectively?           | Was the paper clearly and logically delivered?           |
| Would you want to hear another paper by the same speaker?          | Was the presentation both entertaining and enlightening? |
| Did the use of notes deter from the effectiveness of the delivery? | Was the talk well prepared?                              |
| Did the speaker talk to the screen, the podium, or the audience?   |  |
| Did the speaker address questions from the audience effectively?   |  |

RATING SCALE: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**2 - MATERIAL**

RATING SCALE 0=POOR, 10=OUTSTANDING

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Was the material new or simply a rehash of old concepts?<br>(If this is a case history, judge the completeness of the treatment and ingenuity of the approach.) | Are you taking new insight or knowledge away with you? |
| Was the subject fully covered or were numerous holes in the logic evident?  |  |
| Does the material demonstrate innovative or novel thinking?   |  |

RATING SCALE: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**3 - SLIDES**

RATING SCALE 0=POOR, 10=OUTSTANDING

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Could you see the slides? (Consider the audience near the rear)         | Did they make sense?                                |
| Did the slides support the talk?  | Did the slides require a great deal of explanation? |
| Did you spend more time trying to figure out the slides than listening? |   |

RATING SCALE: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

**4 - OVERALL**

In your mind, is this paper a likely candidate for the Best Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting Award?

- No = 0                      Yes = 3  
(Circle one)

**TOTAL POINTS for ALL FOUR CATEGORIES:** \_\_\_\_\_

Place the sum of the circled scores on the Total Points line.

Do not judge on the timing of the presentation. The timekeeper will apply penalties for papers that run overtime.

Return these forms to the Volunteer Room (320A)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Judge

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Judge

**AWARD JUDGING FORM FOR BEST POSTER PAPER  
PRESENTED AT THE SEG 2017 ANNUAL MEETING IN HOUSTON**

Paper # <<*PAPER NUMBER*>>  
Session Name: <<*SESSION NAME*>>  
Paper Title: <<*TITLE*>>  
Speaker: <<*FIRST NAME*>> <<*MIDDLE NAME*>> <<*LAST NAME*>>  
Affiliation: <<*COMPANY*>>

Session Number: <<*SESSION SEQUENCE*>>

Presentation Date and Time: <<*DATE*>>  
Poster Station Location: <<*LOCATION*>>

**Check boxes if:**

- The speaker did not show up to give this presentation.
- You thought this was a commercial presentation.

**CATEGORY and QUESTIONS TO ASK IN ESTABLISHING THE GRADE**

For each of the four categories, circle the one score that fits best from each rating scale

**1 - VERBAL**

*RATING SCALE 0=POOR, 10=OUTSTANDING*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Did the speaker communicate effectively?                | Was the speaker prepared?                      |
| Did the speaker seem fully knowledgeable and confident? | Did the speaker address questions effectively? |
| Did the speaker attend to all comments and questions?   |  |

**RATING SCALE: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10**

**2 - CONTENT**

*RATING SCALE 0=POOR, 10=OUTSTANDING*

- |   |                                  |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Was the material new or simply a rehash of old concepts?  | Is the scientific content valid? |
| Does the material demonstrate innovative or novel thinking?                                       |                                  |
| If this is a case history, judge the completeness of the treatment and ingenuity of the approach. |                                  |

**RATING SCALE: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10**

**3 - PRESENTATION**

*RATING SCALE 0=POOR, 10=OUTSTANDING*

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Were the posters attractive and well organized?    | Did they make sense?                    |
| Were they self-explanatory?                        | Did they flow through the presentation? |
| Did you spend more time trying to understand them? |   |

**RATING SCALE: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10**

**4 - OVERALL**

In your opinion is this poster a likely candidate for Best Poster?

No = 0                      Yes = 3

(Circle one)

**TOTAL POINTS for ALL FOUR CATEGORIES: \_\_\_\_\_**

Place the sum of the circled scores on the Total Points line.  
Do not judge on the timing of the presentation. The timekeeper will apply penalties for papers that run overtime.  
Return these forms to the Volunteer Room (320A)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Judge

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Judge