LCAC Poster Judging Guidelines

Chapters,

This document will serve to explain the process behind the judging process that goes on for determining in the Poster Judging that goes on annually at the American Meteorological Society (AMS) Annual Meeting. This will hopefully provide some clarity in what exactly the LCAC committee members (judges) are looking for in determining the award.

There are two rounds of judging that go on in this contest. Each of the rounds are explained in detail with what the LCAC committee is to look for when judging the posters.

Round #1 Objectives

This is where the judges go through all the submitted posters and decide which ones are worthy enough to be considered for an award. This is very subjective of course, but one can usually tell which posters have had a lot of time & effort put into them. It is the posters that really stand out that we want to consider for further judging in Round #2. This is a round that has no scoring and criteria. It's simply the "eyeball test." The judges should be asking themselves "does this poster look like a 1st, 2nd, or 3rd place winner?" If so, the judge will move said poster on to Round #2.

After Round #1 is completed, all the judges will gather together and cross reference the posters that they've decided to move on to Round #2. A poster that has the simple majority of the judge's approval to be moved to Round #2, will advance to Round #2. If a judge feels strongly about advancing a poster that other judges did not, he or she can discuss the reasons why they advanced them.

| Student Chapters | Judge 1 | Judge 2 | Judge 3 | Judge 4 | Judge 5 | Judge 6 | Judge 7 | Judge 8 | Judge 9 | Judge 10 | Judge 11 | Judge 12 | Total |
|------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| American State University | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 |
| Bear State University | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 9 |
| Ginsburg University | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 |
| Table Top Tennis University | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 11 |
| Western Brazil University | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Regular Chapters | Judge 1 | Judge 2 | Judge 3 | Judge 4 | Judge 5 | Judge 6 | Judge 7 | Judge 8 | Judge 9 | Judge 10 | Judge 11 | Judge 12 | Total |
| Archery State University | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 |
| Tonga Unversity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| United States University | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 12 |

Regardless of chapter affiliation, all members can vote in this round.

Round #2 Objectives

In this round, a more formal ranking system will be applied. This criteria is based off three categories that each have several criteria to be judged. The three categories that are judged are Content, Visual and Overall. A number ranking system of 1 to 5 will be applied to each category, with 5 being the highest number of points that a category can have. The following is how each number should be interpreted:

5 - Outstanding 4 - Above Average, 3 - Average/Ok, 2 - Below Average, 1 - Poor

The following is an explanation of each category and the criteria that make up each category are explained below:

Content-This category focuses on the information that is presented on the poster about the chapter's successes and news.

Clarity- Is the information presented in a clear and concise manner?

Quality of Information - Is the information presented relevant, detailed and informative?

Structure & Organization - Is the information presented in logical and structured way to the viewer?

Visual - This category focuses on the visual appeal and portions of the poster, including text, images and color.

Text - Is the text easy to read. This includes font style and size

Images - Are the images presented the right size, are they clear, is there a good balance between the number of photos and text?

Color - Are the colors on the poster complimentary?

Overall - How does the poster overall look? A good way to view this category is, how is this poster's elevator speech?

Creativity & Originality - Winning posters in the past have had a themes, others have been just very professional. Does your poster stick out?

Eye Appeal - How does this poster appeal to the naked eye.

After each judge has gone through each poster and rated them 1 through 5 in each of the three categories, each judge's scores will be tallied and the three posters with the highest scores will move on to Round #3. Only 3 posters can advance to Round #3. These are the posters that all the judges feel are worthy of being considered for 1st, 2nd, or 3rd place. During the discussion, all rankings will be tallied up and the top 3 will be announced by each judge. Someone in the group will be designated to record each judge's top 3 posters. Once that has be recorded, the 3 posters with most times ranked in the top three will advance to Round #3. It doesn't matter who

was ranked #1 or #2 or #3 the most, we are only trying to determine who are final three poster are. For example, if a particular poster was ranked highly by the judges (consistently in the top three rankings by all the judges), then that poster would likely be chosen for Round #3. To further illustrate this, see the following example of a judge's sheet:

| | 97 th | Ame | rican Me | eteorolog | gical | Socie | ty Ar | nual Mee | ting | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------|------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------|-------|-----------------------------|---------------|----|
| | 22-26 January 2016Seattle, Washington | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Local Chap | ter Affair Con | nmittee Poster Judging Form | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Rou | ınd 2 | | | | |
| | | Content | | | | Visual | | Overall | | |
| | Pass to | Clarity | Quality of Information | Structure & Organization | Text | Images | Color | Creativity & Originality | Eye Appeal | L |
| Student Chapters | Rnd #2 | , | | Organization | | | | | Appear | То |
| American State University | <u>Y</u> | 3 | | | 3 | | | 3 | | |
| Bear State University | Υ | 4 | | | 2 | | | 2 | | |
| Ginsburg University | Υ | 3 | | | 4 | | | 4 | | |
| Table Top Tennis University | Υ | 4 | | | 5 | | | 4 | | |
| Western Brazil University | N | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Round 2 | | | | | | | | |
| | | Content | | | Vsual | | | Overall | | |
| | Pass to | Clarity | Quality of | Structure & | Text | Images | Color | Creativity & | Eye | _ |
| Regular Chapters | Rnd #2 | , | IIIIOIIIIalioii | Organization | | | | Originality | Appeal | То |
| Archery State University | Y | 3 | | | 3 | | | 3 | | |
| Tonga Unversity | N | | | | | | | | | |
| United States University | Υ | 5 | | | 5 | | | 5 | | |
| | - | | _ | | | _ | | | | + |

Top 3 Student Posters

| Judge #1 | Table Top, Ginsburg, American | Judge #7 Ginsburg, Table Top, Ginsburg | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Judge #2 | Ginsburg, Bear State, Table Top | Judge #8 Ginsburg, Table Top, American | | | | | |
| Judge #3 | Table Top, American, Bear State | Judge #9 Bear State, Ginsburg, American | | | | | |
| Judge #4 | Bear State, Table Top, American | Judge #10 American, Table Top, Bear State | | | | | |
| Judge #5 | Table Top, American, Ginsburg | Judge #11 Table Top, Ginsburg, American | | | | | |
| Judge #6 | American, Bear State, Ginsburg | Judge #12 American Table Top, Ginsburg | | | | | |
| # of Times in Tan 2 | | | | | | | |

of Times in Top 3

| American | 10 |
|------------|----|
| Bear State | 6 |
| Ginsburg | 10 |
| Table Top | 9 |

Round #3

The judges will then go as a group to each of the top 3 posters and have a discussion about each poster. The judges will then form a consensus on the overall 1 through 3 rankings. This could be a quick process if one poster stands out as the clear #1 or it may be a more involved discussion with multiple visits to each of the three final posters to determine the ranking order.

In normal circumstances (i.e., enough judges), judges with affiliations of chapters in the top 3 will be asked to abstain from voting.

Once the final rankings have been determined, they will be announced at the annual LCAC business meeting that evening and awards will be given out the following morning at the annual LCAC Chapter Officers Breakfast.