

GUIDELINES FOR POSTER PRESENTATION

Poster Session

Poster session within MERD'16 has been organised with the main purpose to provide an opportunity for presenting and discussing on-going research or work.

During the poster session, the authors must stand next to their posters so they can present their work and address questions from the delegates and poster award judging panel. Each poster presentation will be evaluated by TWO independent judging panels for consideration of the "BEST POSTER AWARD". Each presenter will be allotted up to 5 minutes to present their work to the judging panels.

Posters will remain displayed during the entire event and can be viewed during the refreshment and lunch breaks.

Best Poster Award

Awards will be given to the best TEN posters.

In deciding about the awards, the judging panel will take into consideration the following criteria:

- originality of the research
- scientific quality (literature acknowledgement, methodology, results and discussion)
- presentation quality of the poster (visual and author's presentation)

Therefore, for the references and preparation of the poster, authors are advised to go through the example of poster evaluation form.

The awards will be announced at the closing event of the MERD'16 on Thursday 31 March 2016.

Posters

Posters should be put up before 08:30am on Thursday 31 March 2016 and removed by 02:00pm on the same day.

Material for attaching the poster will be supplied by the organizer.

Some general good practice guidelines for poster preparation are given below:

- A2 portrait format (W420mm x H594mm)
- the poster should be legible from a distance of 1 metres
- min. 30 font size for the title
- min. 20 font size for subtitles such as introduction, methods, results, etc.
- min. 15 font size for main body text
- good colour schemes for improved clarity

For any question regarding the poster session, feel free to contact AP Ahmad Rivai at rivai@utem.edu.my.

EXAMPLE OF POSTER EVALUATION FORM

Panel's Name:

Poster Number:

Score/Criteria	1	2	3	4	5	Score
Introduction	Failed to convey project in context of literature. No rationale. Purpose was unfocused and unclear	Vaguely conveyed project in context of literature. Weak rationale. Purpose was poorly focused and not sufficiently clear	Project moderately conveyed in context of literature. Moderately clear rationale. Purpose was somewhat focused and clear.	Conveyed project in context of literature. Moderately strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused.	Clearly conveyed project in context of literature. Strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused.	
Methods/ Approach	Little or no description of materials, methods/procedures	Inadequate description of materials, methods/procedures	Moderate or excessive description of materials, methods/procedures	Most/slightly excessive detail included in description of materials, methods/procedures	Appropriate detail in description of materials, methods/procedures	
Results/ Outcomes	Absence of pertinent results, tables/figures unlabeled or no legend	Few pertinent results, tables/figures inappropriate or poor labels or legend	Some pertinent results not reported, results presented in clear, concise manner. Tables/ figures generally labeled	Most pertinent results reported in fairly clear, concise manner. Tables/ figures labeled	All pertinent results reported in clear, concise manner. Tables/ figures labeled	
Discussion and Summary	Little or no discussion of project findings, conclusions unsupported. Displayed poor grasp of understanding.	Major topics inaccurately described, conclusions not entirely supported.	Discussion too brief/excessive. Several inaccuracies/ Omissions. Conclusion generally based on findings	Sufficient discussion with few errors, though not particularly thought provoking. Conclusions based on findings and appropriate.	Brief and concise discussion of major findings. Was superior, accurate, thought provoking. Conclusions clearly based on findings.	
Appearance	Aesthetically displeasing, unbalanced, many errors, text cannot be read.	Poor visual presentation, alignment. Numerous errors, most text easily read.	Moderately aesthetically pleasing and balanced. Some errors, generally text easily read.	Generally aesthetically pleasing and balanced. Few errors, text easily read.	Exceptional poster. Aesthetically pleasing and balanced. No errors, text easily read.	
Judges Questions	Not prepared, no eye contact.	Not very smooth or polished, little eye contact, not a good job answering questions.	Reasonably answers questions, students understand topic, but hesitate, not good eye contact	Good answers, but could be more polished and engaging. Eye contact good.	Answers are smooth and engaging. Articulate description clearly demonstrates understanding. Great eye contact.	