

## **CPA Developmental Section Elinor Ames Presentation/Poster Award**

Aim: To recognize excellence in Developmental Section members' developmental work presented at CPA.

Amount: \$500 per award (number awards to vary based on year-to-year availability of funds)

### Eligibility:

- Current CPA Developmental Section Member
- Presenting developmental work at CPA (must be presented to an adjudicator during the session to which the presentation is assigned, e.g., during poster session B)
  - Must be first and presenting author for the work
- Student (undergraduate or graduate) or postdoctoral researcher
- Presentations must be presented in either Canadian Official Language, English or French.
  - Every attempt will be made to find adjudicators fluent in both languages and to ensure that adjudicators are fluent in the language of the presentation abstract within the CPA program.
  - If an adjudicator does not speak the official language of the presenter, the presenter may request that they be evaluated by an adjudicator that does speak their official language.
  - *Requesting an awards adjudicator that speaks your official language will in no way influence the evaluation of the presentation. We rely upon and encourage presenters to let us know their preferred language of presentation, to ensure that we are fairly evaluating their work.*
- Award winners consent to having their names, presentation titles, and presentation materials (and optional picture of themselves) posted on the CPA Developmental Section website

Evaluation criteria	Score/4
Introduces the project: Presents the theoretical motivation for the research. Refers to and cites research upon which the study builds. Builds the case for why the study is important. Background information is accurate.	
States the research question and hypotheses clearly in a way that builds upon the introduction. The hypotheses should follow from the background information presented in the introduction.	
Explains the methodology in a way that links to the research question - so it is clear how the methodology will inform the research question. Provides sufficient detail so that a non-specialist could understand what participants were asked to do and how this informs the research question.	
Results are presented in a way that clearly links to the research question, the test of the hypothesis, and the methodology. Results are presented descriptively so that they can be understood by non-specialists. Figures and tables are clear and explained verbally.	
Why the results matter and are important is explained in a way that could be understood by a non-specialist. Reference back to the theoretical rationale and hypotheses. Any inconsistencies between what was expected and what was found is explained. Does not provide an overly-rich interpretation beyond what the methodology would permit.	
Language is clear, non-technical, and could be understood by a non-specialist audience. All information is accurate in representing previous and current research.	
Presentation style is engaging, entertaining, and educational. I would want to see this presenter present this study again.	
Supporting materials (slides or poster) are well done, accurate, creative, and complement the materials being presented. The presenter refers to the supporting material in a way that enhances the presentation.	
<p><b>Ratings Explained:</b></p> <p><b>4: Excellent:</b> Exceeds expectations. Very clearly articulated and presented. Engaging. Avoids jargon and explains all terms that otherwise would not be understood by a lay audience.</p> <p><b>3: Very good.</b> Meets expectations and does very well. Clearly articulated and presented on the slides/poster. Engaging. Generally avoids jargon and explains most technical terms.</p> <p><b>2: Good.</b> Generally provides the information for the section, with some omissions or inconsistencies (e.g., hypothesis may not clearly be linked to the background presented, but is not inconsistent with it). May not meet all of the requirements, be entirely clear, or explain all technical terms.</p> <p><b>1: Poor or omitted.</b> Some logical inconsistencies, confusion, or omissions. May not clearly link to other aspects of the study (e.g., hypothesis does not logically follow from the background presented). Not clearly explained or explained with technical terms that non-specialists would not understand.</p>	