

## Introduction

The ISIE SEM early career researcher (ECR) awards offer PhD students and researchers within 3 years of passing their PhD opportunities to demonstrate and improve both written and verbal communication skills. We are aiming to make the process as easy and transparent as possible so that no ECRs are discouraged from entering.

There will be two awards:

- One for best poster
- One for best paper presentation

These will be subject to different judging procedures, described below.

## Eligibility

All PhD students and researchers within three years of passing their PhD, who are registered to present a paper or poster, are eligible to be awarded the awards. Only those that notify the committee that they would like to opt-out of the awards will be excluded.

An entrant may collaborate with non-ECRs as long as they are the lead author of the paper or poster.

## Shortlisting

Where the initial number of potential candidates is more than ten, the ECR committee will shortlist candidates using the criteria in table 1:

**Table 1: ISIE SEM ECR abstract shortlisting criteria**

Criteria	Description	Score
Logical development and analytical treatment	Does the abstract include the following vital elements: introduction or need, the methods for addressing the need and conclusions? Well-structured abstract setting out need for research and how research was undertaken.	10
Adequacy of conclusions	Do the conclusions sufficiently answer the need/research questions?	10
Clarity of argument or idea	Is it easy to follow the argument the author is trying to make?	10
Relevance of technical or policy content	Is the subject relevant to the conference themes, ISIE SEM or policy?	10
Grammar and spelling	Is the abstract well-written with good spelling?	5

At least two committee members will review each abstract and the average score will be used to rank potential candidates to go forward for further judging.

## Main judging – posters

Shortlisted posters will be judged during the two poster sessions of the conference by at least two poster judges. The criteria and scoring convention in table 2 will be used to rank candidates and the highest average score will be used to identify the award winner.

**Table 2: Poster Judging Criteria**

Poster # \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria	1	2	3	4	Score
<b>Organization</b>	The information is scant and appears to be disorganized. Unnecessary graphics, charts or images or none of them to support text.	Information is organized, but missing some sections or paragraphs are not well-constructed and missing subheadings or details.	Information is organized, but paragraphs are not well-constructed or poster is missing subheadings or much of the details.	Information is very organized, with well-constructed paragraphs, subheadings, and supporting details, including good use of graphics, if appropriate	
<b>Value of Research</b>	Value of research is not demonstrated.	Value of research discussed briefly without much explanation.	Value of research discussed, but difficult to follow.	Value of research is clearly explained, including examples.	
<b>Quality of argument</b>	Argument is flawed and lacks relation to wider debates.	Argument is flawed or lacks relation to wider debates.	Argument is clear but lacks critical analysis or lacks relation to wider debates.	Argument is clear and incorporates; (i) critical analysis of concepts, theories and findings, and (ii) consistency and coherency of debate.	
<b>Quality of Sources</b>	Poor range of references cited (either number or relation to topic).	Some references are cited that are relevant to topic but missing key references.	Reasonable range of references including key papers.	Comprehensive range of references relevant to topic and wider debate.	
<b>Originality &amp; Effort</b>	Poster does not contribute to a higher level of understanding of industrial ecology research and demonstrates a low level of effort.	Poster loosely contributes to a higher level of understanding of industrial ecology research. Shows minimal effort.	Poster is engaging, or well done. It demonstrates a higher level of understanding of industrial ecology research. Shows effort.	Poster is exceptionally engaging, or well done and it demonstrates a higher level of understanding of industrial ecology research and shows a great deal of effort.	
<b>Subject Knowledge (in response to questions)</b>	Presenter does not have grasp of information; cannot answer questions about subject.	Presenter is uncomfortable with information and/or is able to answer only rudimentary questions.	Presenter is at ease with expected answers to all questions, but fails to elaborate.	Presenter demonstrates full knowledge (more than required) by answering all questions with explanations and elaboration.	
					<u>    </u> /24

## Main judging – papers

The presentation of shortlisted papers will be viewed by at least two judges, who are senior members of the ISIE and/or key note speakers at the conference. Presentations will be scored by each judge, using the criteria in table 3, and the highest average score will be presented with the paper award. The criteria are more subjective than for poster awards, because of the greater variation in form of presentations.

**Table 3: Poster Judging Criteria**

Criteria	Description	Score
Originality	Originality of contribution to knowledge with an emphasis on the research's innovativeness in one or more of; (i) theoretical development, (ii) empirical results or, (iii) policy development.	20
Quality of argument	Quality of argument incorporating; (i) critical analysis of concepts, theories and findings, and (ii) consistency and coherency of debate.	20
Positioning	Clear positioning of the presentation topic in a scientific or policy context with a conclusion(s) that is both convincing and of significant potential.	20
Presentation slides	Clear presentation aids (slides), with good use of graphics	20
Presentation style and discussion/defence	Confidently delivered and good response to any questions.	20