

## Judging process

### 1. Transparency and Openness:

- **Disclosure:** Judges can be aware of participants' identities but must evaluate the poster/oral presentation solely based on the established criteria, disregarding personal biases or affiliations.
- **Openness:** The importance of fairness and impartiality in judging is emphasized, judges are encouraged to be transparent about their assessments.

### 2. Expert Panel with Feedback Session:

- **Expert Judges:** A panel of experts in the field who are well-respected and have a deep understanding of the subject matter is assembled each year.
- **Feedback Session:** A feedback session where judges discuss their evaluations is organized during the event. This promotes consistency and fairness, allowing judges to calibrate their standards collectively.

### 3. Detailed Evaluation Discussions:

- **Thorough Discussions:** Judges are encouraged to have detailed discussions about each presentation, focusing on the strengths and weaknesses in relation to the criteria.
- **Consensus Building:** A consensus among judges is achieved to ensure a consistent evaluation process.

### 4. Participant Presentation Sessions:

- **Live Presentations:** Live presentation sessions where participants can present their oral presentations and/or posters to the audience including judges are organised in advance and promoted on the conference programme.
- **Question and Answer:** Judges and audience are allowed to ask questions after the presentations to gain deeper insights into the research, aiding in the evaluation process.

### 5. Judging Calibration:

- **Calibration Meeting:** A pre-event meeting is conducted, where judges discuss abstracts together, aligning their understanding of the evaluation criteria.
- **Scoring Calibration:** Scores among judges are calibrated to minimize discrepancies and maintain fairness.

### 6. Feedback Loop:

- **Post-Event Feedback:** Feedback is collected from judges after the event and used to improve the judging process for future events.

## Sample Marking Criteria: Poster Presentation Competition

Judging will take place on three aspects:

1. **Abstract review**
  - **Clarity of Research Question**
  - **Novelty, Significance, and Impact**
2. **Visual appeal of poster**
3. **Communication and engagement**

Judges are expected to evaluate each criterion based on the following Likert scale, assigning scores to assess the quality and fulfilment of each criterion in the participants' poster presentations:

### 1. Clarity of Research Question

- **Clear Definition:** Is the research question exceptionally clear, specific, and well-defined? A clear research question is fundamental and non-negotiable.
- **Alignment with Presentation:** Does the entire presentation align with and support the clarity of the research question?

Marks

- **Not Met (1):** The research question lacks clarity and specificity.
- **Met (3):** The research question is clear, specific, and well-defined.
- **Exemplary (5):** The research question is exceptionally clear, focused, and insightful.

*Posters lacking a clear research question will not be considered for further evaluation.*

### 2. Novelty, Significance, and Impact

- **Originality of Approach:** Does the research present an innovative approach or methodology not commonly seen in the field?
- **Novelty of Findings:** Are the results or anticipated outcomes novel and likely to contribute significantly to the field?
- **Relevance and Significance:** Does the poster succinctly answer the questions, “What do we now know as a result of this study that we did not know before?” and “What key message do you want to share with attendees?”
- **Impact on Practice/Policy:** What is the possible impact this research may have on day-to-day occupational medicine practice and/or policy?

Marks

- **Not Met (1):** The research lacks originality, significance, or fails to address key questions.
- **Met (3):** The research demonstrates originality and significance, addressing important questions.
- **Exemplary (5):** The research is highly innovative, significant, and has the potential to make a substantial impact on the field.

### 3. Visual Appeal

- **Design and Layout:** Is the poster visually appealing with a clear and organized layout?

- **Graphics and Images:** Are the graphics, images, and charts clear, relevant, and visually impactful?

Marks

- **Not Met (1):** The poster lacks organization, clarity, and visual appeal.
- **Met (3):** The poster is visually appealing with clear layout and graphics.
- **Exemplary (5):** The poster is exceptionally well-designed, visually impactful, and engaging.

#### 4. Communication and Engagement

- **Clarity of Message:** Is the research communicated in a clear and concise manner, avoiding jargon?
- **Engagement with Audience:** Does the presenter engage with viewers effectively, answering questions and explaining concepts?

Marks

- **Not Met (1):** The presentation lacks clarity, and the presenter does not engage effectively with the audience.
- **Met (3):** The research is communicated clearly, and the presenter engages moderately with the audience.
- **Exemplary (5):** The presentation is exceptionally clear, engaging, and the presenter interacts effectively with the audience, encouraging insightful discussions.

*Notes for Judges:*

1. Judges should evaluate each criterion independently, considering the specific guidance provided for each Likert scale level.
2. Scores should be assigned based on the quality and fulfilment of the criterion in the participant's presentation.
3. Judges are encouraged to provide constructive feedback to participants, highlighting strengths and areas for improvement based on the evaluation criteria.

## Sample Marking Criteria: Oral Presentation Competition

Judging will take place on three aspects:

1. **Abstract review**
  - **Clarity of Research Question**
  - **Novelty, Significance, and Impact**
2. **Communication and engagement of presentation**
3. **Quality and visual appeal of slides**

Judges are expected to evaluate each criterion based on the following Likert scale, assigning scores to assess the quality and fulfilment of each criterion in the participants' oral presentations:

### 1. Clarity of Research Question

- **Clear Definition:** Is the research question exceptionally clear, specific, and well-defined? A clear research question is fundamental and non-negotiable.
- **Alignment with Presentation:** Does the entire presentation align with and support the clarity of the research question?

Marks

- **Not Met (1):** The research question lacks clarity and specificity.
- **Met (3):** The research question is clear, specific, and well-defined.
- **Exemplary (5):** The research question is exceptionally clear, focused, and insightful.

*Oral presentations lacking a clear research question will not be considered for further evaluation.*

### 2. Novelty, Significance, and Impact

- **Originality of Approach:** Does the research present an innovative approach or methodology not commonly seen in the field?
- **Novelty of Findings:** Are the results or anticipated outcomes novel and likely to contribute significantly to the field?
- **Relevance and Significance:** Does the oral presentation succinctly answer the questions, "What do we now know as a result of this study that we did not know before?" and "What key message do you want to share with attendees?"
- **Impact on Practice/Policy:** What is the possible impact this research may have on day-to-day occupational medicine practice and/or policy?

Marks

- **Not Met (1):** The research lacks originality, significance, or fails to address key questions.
- **Met (3):** The research demonstrates originality and significance, addressing important questions.
- **Exemplary (5):** The research is highly innovative, significant, and has the potential to make a substantial impact on the field.

### 3. Communication and Engagement

- **Clarity of Message:** Is the research communicated in a clear and concise manner, avoiding jargon?
- **Engagement with Audience:** Does the presenter engage with viewers effectively, answering questions and explaining concepts?

#### Marks

- **Not Met (1):** The presentation lacks clarity, and the presenter does not engage effectively with the audience.
- **Met (3):** The research is communicated clearly, and the presenter engages moderately with the audience.
- **Exemplary (5):** The presentation is exceptionally clear, engaging, and the presenter interacts effectively with the audience, encouraging insightful discussions.

### 3. Quality and visual appeal of slides

- **Design and Layout:** Are the slides visually appealing with a clear and organized layout?
- **Graphics and Images:** Are the graphics, images, and charts clear, relevant, and visually impactful?

#### Marks

- **Not Met (1):** The presentation slides lack organization, clarity, and visual appeal.
- **Met (3):** The presentation slides are visually appealing with clear layout and graphics.
- **Exemplary (5):** The presentation slides are exceptionally well-designed, visually impactful, and engaging.

#### *Notes for Judges:*

1. Judges should evaluate each criterion independently, considering the specific guidance provided for each Likert scale level.
2. Scores should be assigned based on the quality and fulfilment of the criterion in the participant's presentation.
3. Judges are encouraged to provide constructive feedback to participants, highlighting strengths and areas for improvement based on the evaluation criteria.

## Selection of Judges Guidelines

### **Expertise and Background:**

- **Relevant Experience:** Judges should have expertise in the field related to the theme of the competition. Judging panels typically include a representative from the Faculty of Occupational Medicine and the Society of Occupational Medicine.
- **Diversity:** Aim for a diverse panel representing different subfields, backgrounds, and perspectives to ensure comprehensive evaluation.

### **Conflict of Interest:**

- **Avoidance of Conflicts:** Judges must not have any professional or personal affiliations with the participating individuals or institutions to ensure impartiality.
- **Disclosure:** Judges should disclose any potential conflicts of interest before the competition begins.

### **Selection Committee:**

- **Formation:** The conference committee are responsible for identifying and inviting qualified judges.
- **Transparency:** Ensure transparency in the selection committee's process for choosing judges.

### **Rules and Guidelines Distribution:**

- **Distribution in Advance:** Provide judges with the competition rules and guidelines well in advance of the event.
- **Familiarization:** Judges are expected to familiarize themselves thoroughly with the provided rules and guidelines before the competition.

### **Reputation and Credibility:**

- **Professional Standing:** Judges should have a reputable professional standing in the scientific or academic community, and be in good standing with the Faculty of Occupational Medicine and/or Society of Occupational Medicine.
- **Integrity:** Select judges known for their integrity and fairness in evaluations.