MedPhys Slam: Rules & Judging Criteria

Who is Eligible?
Individuals must be current Student, Junior, or Resident members of AAPM or COMP at the time of the 2020 Joint AAPM/COMP Annual Meeting. Individuals involved in planning the final MedPhys Slam competition are not eligible. Presentations must be based on your own, original research. Finalists and winners of the AAPM MedPhys Slam from previous years are eligible to compete provided they still meet all eligibility requirements as a new participant and present new, original research.

How do I Enter?
Each AAPM Chapter will be holding a separate competition. International trainees who are members of either AAPM or COMP, those who belong to an AAPM Chapter not holding a competition, and COMP trainees enter the competition via video application. The winner of each preliminary AAPM Slam and two to three COMP contestants will be invited to participate in the final competition at the 2020 Joint AAPM/COMP Annual Meeting. Contact your local AAPM Chapter, COMP Student Council representative, or AAPM STSC representative for more information.

Final Live Presentation Rules
- **Visuals**
  - PowerPoint slides allowed but optional; no Prezi or other presentation formats
  - Maximum of 3 slides, not including title slide generated by STSC
  - Slide material cannot be created by a professional
  - No embedded audio and/or video clips
  - No gifs, animations, or slide transitions
  - Participants will be asked to provide their slides in pdf format
- **No additional props are permitted, including but not limited to notes, laser pointers, costumes, musical instruments, and laboratory equipment**
- The presenter’s contribution to the project must be salient and clearly specified
- Presentations must be given in English. Spoken word presentations (e.g. poems, rap, or song) are not permitted
- Presenters must remain on stage for the duration of their presentation
- Timing will commence from the moment the contestant starts talking. Three (3) minutes are permitted. If contestant goes over three minutes, a time penalty will be applied as follows: -1 point if overtime, plus an additional 1 point penalty per 5 seconds thereafter
- An absolute -10 points penalty will be applied if notes are used
- An absolute -10 points penalty will be applied if more than 3 slides, not including title slide generated by STSC, are used

Prizes
1st place: $500
2nd place: $300
3rd place: $200
Videotaping
The 2020 Joint AAPM/COMP Annual Meeting MedPhys Slam live event will be photographed and videotaped. By entering the contest, you agree to allow the AAPM/COMP to use the resulting photographs and/or video, which may include your image or presentation, in publicity surrounding the contest and/or in other contexts, such as websites, promotional materials, etc.

Direct any and all questions to Catherine Steffel (catherinesteffel@gmail.com).

Judging Criteria

Comprehension/Content (points out of 10):
- Did the presentation clearly identify the research question/topic being addressed and its significance?
- Did the presentation help the audience understand the research?
- Did the presenter clearly outline the nature and aims of research?
- Did the presenter clearly indicate what was significant about this research, and how their individual work advances the area of research?
- Did the presentation follow a logical sequence?

Communication (points out of 10):
- Was the thesis topic communicated in language appropriate to a non-specialist audience?
- Did the speaker use sufficient eye contact and vocal range, and maintain a steady pace?
- Did the speaker avoid scientific jargon, explain terminology, and provide adequate background information to illustrate points?
- Did the presenter spend the right amount of time on each element of the presentation – did the presenter elaborate for too long or rush?
- Did the slides enhance, rather than detract from, the presentation; was it clear, legible, and concise?

Engagement (points out of 10):
- Did the presentation make the audience want to know more?
- Was the presenter careful not to trivialize or 'dumb down' the research?
- Did the presenter convey enthusiasm for the research?
- Did the presenter capture and maintain their audience's attention?
- Would the audience want to know more about the speaker's research?