

Society of Forensic Toxicologists

Young Forensic Toxicologists Poster Award

Eligibility criteria

To be eligible for the best poster award, you must be first author of the abstract, attend the meeting, and be less than 41 years old by October 18, 2010. When submitting your abstract for the 2010 meeting, please denote your abstract as an entry for the competition. There will also be an opportunity to sign up for the competition at the meeting.

Judging criteria

The Young Forensic Toxicologists Committee members will evaluate posters using the following scoring system. The highest score determines the winner of the Best Poster Presentation.

Analytical Approach _____ points (out of possible 6)

The presentation (choose 1):

- clearly demonstrates a systematic analytical approach and appropriate experimental design (3 pts)
- demonstrates a logical scientific approach (2 pts)
- includes minimal information on the systematic scientific approach and experimental design (1 pt)
- does not demonstrate a systematic scientific approach, and does not include appropriate experimental design (0 pts)

Validation data (choose 1):

- are present or cited and statistical calculations are reported (3 pts)
- may be included, but presenter indicates more work is needed before implementing the procedure (2 pts)
- the reliability of the data is unclear (1 pt)
- are not presented (0 pts)

Scientific Merit _____ points (out of possible 13)

The research (choose 1):

- is a novel, innovative approach to a relevant problem in toxicology (5 pts)
- may have some impact or improve an existing technique (3 pts)
- is unlikely to have an impact on toxicology &/or does not improve an existing technique (1 pt)

The research (choose 1):

- adds significant knowledge or statistical data to forensic toxicology or a forensic technique (5 pts)
- importance cannot be determined without additional information &/or the cost benefit of implementing may not warrant further exploration (3 pts)
- provides information previously reported or known to the relevant scientific community (1 pt)

Conclusions (choose 1):

- are appropriately drawn from the data presented and suggestions for future directions given (3 pts)
- are sufficient (2 pts)
- seem over-stated (1 pt)
- are not present (0 pts)

Quality of Poster Presentation _____ points (out of possible 6)

The presentation (choose 1):

- is well-organized and presented information is relevant to the topic (3 pts)
- appears organized, though portions of the presentation may lack clarity and are somewhat vague (2 pts)
- is unorganized and lacks clarity (1 pt)

The presenter (choose 1): **If presenter is not available, the presenter receives a 0 for this category.**

- answers questions appropriately with thoughtful insight and results are not overstated (3 pts)
- answers questions appropriately, but provides vague answers and might overstate results (2 pts)
- provides vague and/or incorrect answers to questions (1 pt)

_____ **Total points (out of 25)**

Award Details coming soon!