

The COS ACES competition will be Friday April 12th

The physics department would like to defend its titles for best oral presentation and best graduate student poster. To that end we request the following:

- 1) Faculty nominations of graduate students to represent the physics department in the 15 minute oral presentation.
- 2) The nominated students should prepare an abstract to submit by March 8th at 5pm (see abstract details below), and prepare a 15 minute talk for March 22nd presenting their work for an audience that has a scientific background but not necessarily in physics.
- 3) Up to six of the nominated students will present their practice talk on Friday March 22nd in CPB 303, with the abstract used for pre-selection if too many students are nominated.
- 4) A panel of physics profs will select the speaker, with the rest of the contestants encouraged to prepare a poster.

In addition to the speaker session of ACES, which will have one speaker from each discipline in COS, all research active students should be strongly encouraged to submit an abstract to the poster session. Although the deadline for abstract submission is March 22nd there may be some selection based on abstract submission time, so please get in your abstracts as soon as possible (preferably before spring break).

Final acceptance for posters will be March 29, so on April 3rd we will have a practice pre-ACES where students can present their results and get feedback from profs or other students (details of pre-ACES will be given in the fullness of time).

ABSTRACTS:

Should be submitted to the web site:

www.uta.edu/science/events/aces

Preparing an abstract for ACES:

- Limit your abstract to a maximum of 2500 characters (This will be approximately 250 words.)
- The person submitting the abstract must be the presenter and presentations should reflect the author's first-hand investigative efforts.

In preparing an ACES abstract, each student author should be certain to address the following:

- A clear statement of the central issue to be investigated
- A description of the results of the study, including reference to what was investigated (i.e., data, texts, etc.)
- An interpretation of the study's results
- A note as to the significance of the findings as they relate to your discipline



CALL FOR ABSTRACTS

2nd Annual College of Science ACES Research Symposium

Friday, April 12, 2019

CHEMISTRY & PHYSICS BUILDING (CPB) ATRIUM and PLANETARIUM

ACES has long been a place for students to showcase their research accomplishments. This is the second year that the College of Science has organized the event for our students. Please join us!

This event is open to the public. Please RSVP on the website.

www.uta.edu/science/events/aces

Abstract submission by March 22, 2019 at the website

- Undergraduate and graduate students in the College of Science are eligible to participate.
- COS ACES will be primarily based on poster presentations, but each department will select one graduate feature oral presentation. Prizes will be awarded for best presentations.



Thank you to our corporate sponsors:



SHIMADZU



Presenter's Name (Last, First), Is talk based on their own research (YorN)



Scheduled Presentation Time: _____

Rubric for Oral Presentations

For each of the categories, enter a score of "1" through "5" in the rightmost column.



CONTENT						
Categories	1-Emerging	2-Developing	3-Good	4-Very Good	5- Exceptional	Score
<i>How accessible was the talk to educated listeners of diverse backgrounds?</i>	Scope either too broad or too narrow; lacks depth; AND Too much jargon	Scope too broad/too narrow OR Lacks depth OR Too much jargon	Reasonable scope & depth; Doesn't lose audience in technical details; Good learning experiences	Good score & depth; Doesn't lose audience in technical details; Good learning experience	Excellent scope & depth; A truly valuable learning experience	Accessibility
<i>How well was the central issue (thesis) identified?</i>	Lacks clear statement of central issue/thesis	Incomplete or unfocused	Reasonably clear	Clear & concise	Clear, concise, engaging, and thought provoking	Thesis
<i>How well organized was the talk?</i>	No clear information sequence; very difficult to follow	Evidence of some organization but not optimal; sometimes difficult to follow	Reasonably logical sequence of ideas; easy to follow for the most part	Presented in logical & interesting way; easy to follow but not oversimplified	Exceptional organization in light of the fact that the topic is complex	Organization
<i>How well was evidence invoked to support the work's main claims?</i>	No appropriate evidence presented to support the work's central claim(s)	Some evidence but either insufficient or not clearly supportive of central claim(s)	Evidence supports the central claim(s) sufficiently and in reasonable detail	Evidence clearly supports main claims; good detail; opposing evidence considered	Evidence detailed, rich & compelling; opposing evidence considered & refuted	Evidence
<i>How well did the work draw conclusions?</i>	No apparent conclusions; no discussion of potential implications	Conclusion are mostly restatements of previous claims	Brings closure with some synthesis; could better address implication	Brings closure; nicely synthesizes; alludes to broader implications	Clearly synthesizes; convey clear implications; suggests new perspectives	Conclusion
DELIVERY						
Categories	1-Emerging	2-Developing	3-Good	4-Very Good	5-Exceptional	Score
<i>How well did the talk fit the time allotted?</i>	Much too short or much too rushed	A bit too short or a bit too rushed throughout	Reasonably timed but with patches that were too slow or rushed	Well timed & paced; a point or two left a bit slow or rushed	Excellent timing and pacing throughout	Timing/Pace
<i>How clearly delivered was the talk?</i>	Consistently difficult to understand	Frequently difficult to understand	Mostly clear, with few lapses	Readily understood throughout	Exceptionally clear and engaging	Elocution
<i>How confident was the presenter?</i>	Seemingly ill-at-ease; appeared to lack confidence	Somewhat relaxed; seemed to lose confidence on occasion	Reasonably relaxed/confident; recovered from minor lapses	Relaxed, confident, and poised	Exceptionally relaxed, confident, and poised	Confidence
<i>How well did the presenter engage the audience?</i>	Not at all; speaker seemed unaware of the audience; little attempt to answer any questions	Minimally; engaged the audience on occasion; some difficulty in answering any questions	Moderately; seemed to lose contact with audience on occasion; adequate answers to any questions	Consistently engaging and convincing; minor lapse(s) in contact; provided well-supported answers to any questions	Exceptionally engaging & convincing; answers to any questions were articulate, well-supported, and thought provoking	Engagement
SIGNIFICANCE						
Categories	1-Emerging	2-Developing	3-Good	4-Very Good	5-Exceptional	Score
<i>How well did the presenter convey or explain the importance of the work to their discipline.</i>	Importance was not addressed or was unclear	Importance was addressed but could be more clearly conveyed or explained	Importance was clearly presented and adequately conveyed and explained	Importance was very clearly addressed and was well conveyed and explained	Importance was exceptionally well addressed, explained and conveyed	Significance
Grand Total (out of 50)						



Presenter's Name (Last, First): _____

Poster Number: _____

Aces – Rubric for POSTER PRESENTATIONS

For each of the categories, enter a score of "1" through "5" in the rightmost column.



CONTENT						
Categories	1-Emerging	2-Developing	3-Good	4-Very Good	5- Exceptional	Score
<i>How accessible was the poster to educated viewers of diverse backgrounds?</i>	Scope either too broad or too narrow; lacks depth; AND too much jargon	Scope too broad/too narrow OR Lacks depth OR too much jargon	Reasonable scope & depth; lapses into detail not accessible to audience	Good scope & depth; Doesn't lose audience in technical details; Good learning experience	Excellent scope & depth; A truly valuable learning experience	Accessibility
<i>How well was the central issue (thesis) identified?</i>	Lacks clear statement of central issue/thesis	Incomplete or unfocused	Reasonably clear	Clear & concise	Clear, concise, engaging, and thought provoking	Thesis
<i>How well organize was the poster?</i>	No clear information sequence; very difficult to follow	Evidence of some organization but not optimal; sometimes difficult to follow	Reasonably logical sequence of ideas; easy to follow for the most part	Presented in logical & interesting way; easy to follow but not oversimplified	Exceptional organization in light of the fact that the topic is complex	Organization
<i>How well was evidence invoked to support the work's main claims?</i>	No appropriate evidence presented to support the work's central claim(s)	Some evidence but either insufficient or not clearly supportive of central claim(s)	Evidence supports the central claim(s) sufficiently in reasonable of detail	Evidence clearly supports main claims; good detail; opposing evidence considered	Evidence detailed, rich & compelling; opposing evidence considered & refuted	Evidence
<i>How well did the work draw conclusions?</i>	No apparent conclusions; no discussion of potential implications	Conclusion are mostly restatement of previous claims	Brings closure with some synthesis; could better address implication	Bring closure; nicely synthesizes; alludes to broader implications	Clearly synthesizes; convey clear implications; suggests new perspectives	Conclusion
DELIVERY						
Categories	1-Emerging	2-Developing	3-Good	4-Very Good	5-Exceptional	Score
<i>How well did author use the space for laying out information?</i>	Poster is far too crowded or far too sparse; no graphics	Too crowded or too sparse; graphics lack clear value; several redundancies	A bit too crowded (or sparse); not all graphics add value; minor redundancies	Well laid out; graphics add value and impact; no redundancies	Perfectly laid out; graphics are of professional quality; highly polished work	Timing/Pace
<i>How clear and error-free was the text?</i>	Many unclear or ungrammatical passages; many typos	Some unclear/ungrammatical text; a few typos	Mostly clear, with few lapses; one or minor types/errors	Clear and coherent text; error-free	Exceptionally lucid and well written work; error-free	Elocution
<i>Interacting with viewers, how confident was the presenter?</i>	Seemingly ill-at-ease; appeared to lack confidence	Somewhat relaxed; seemed to lose confidence on occasion	Reasonably relaxed/confident; recovered from minor lapses	Relaxed, confident, and poised	Exceptionally relaxed, confident, and poised	Confidence
<i>Overall, how well did the poster engage the viewer?</i>	Not at all; little attempt to answer any questions	Minimally; some difficulty in answering any questions	Moderately; adequate answers to any questions	Consistently; provided well-supported answers to any questions	Exceptionally; answers to any questions were articulate, well-supported, and thought provoking	Engagement
IMPACT						
	1-Emerging	2-Developing	3-Good	4-Very Good	5-Exceptional	Score
<i>How important is this research? What is its likely impact?</i>	Importance & impact are not clear at this time	Potentially important; will benefit from further development	Important; likely to have a positive impact	Very important; very likely to have a positive impact	Extremely important; almost certain to have a positive impact	Impact

Comments for future iterations of the presentation and/or the research:

Grand Total
(out of 50)

--