Your responsibilities as judge are:

1. read the abstracts; each is a short paragraph, less than one page.
2. take a quick look at the posters – they should all be up by the end of the keynote!
3. if time, visit each poster in a personal way – talk to one author of each poster, listen to the students explain their work.
4. give Judy your first cut short rating form about 10:30am – this will let her know if it’ll be an easy or hard decision!
5. meet with the other judges in the lunch room, if possible at 11:45 on Saturday, so we can confer in person!
6. pat yourself and other judges on the back for their work!

Judging criteria are as follows:

1. 60% Content (modeled on evaluation criteria for proposals at the National Science Foundation):
   1. Intellectual Merit. Is the computer science content of the poster exciting and interesting for its own sake?
   2. Broader Impacts: Does the work on which the poster is based have impact beyond computer science content, e.g., educational impact (K-12, or higher education, or public interest), application to other fields. Is the computer science content particularly relevant to these times?
2. 40% Presentation at the Conference:
   1. How well the poster itself conveys the intellectual merit and broader impact of the work. Is the poster aesthetically pleasing, easy to read, etc.
   2. How well do the student(s) present orally to the audience. Students should be prepare to present a 1-3 minute oral overview of the work to conference attendees, and be able to follow up with more in depth descriptions of the work, as well as to answer questions posed to them by attendees.
   3. Supplementary materials at the conference (if any): how well do these complement the poster itself and the oral presentations of the work.