ARVIND GAVALI COLLEGE OF PHARMACY JAITAPUR, SATARA

SCIENTIA 4.0

POSTER PRESENTATION RULES

1. All authors mentioned in the provided abstract must be registered, and attendees are required to carry their institute-issued identity cards during the registration process. However, please refrain from wearing the identity cards during the presentation.

2. The recommended poster size is **3 ft×4 ft or 1m×1m.**

3. Use clear and legible fonts, suitable colours, and high-quality images.

4. Total time for the poster presentation is 8 minutes (05 min presentation and 03 minutes defence).

5. Recording and photography of presentations are prohibited without explicit permission from the presenter.

6. All participants are expected to attend the entire session in which their presentation is scheduled.

7. The evaluation of the poster will be conducted in accordance with established rubrics

8. Certificate will be given only to the registered participant who has participated offline during competition.

9. Poster should not mention the name of authors, name of institute, acknowledgement and any other way by which identity would be revealed.

10. Decision given by the judges' panel would be final.

POSTER PRESENTATION RUBRICS

Maximum Marks: 25

	Poor/Not Addressed (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Great (4)	Exceptional (5)	Total Points
Research Question/ Objectives/ Hypothesis	No hypothesis/ RQ given or was exceptionally weak	Hypothesis/RQ was not clear or well- constructed	Hypothesis/RQ was clearly presented and well-constructed	Hypothesis/RQ was clear, well-constructed, and provided insight into the rationale for the project	Hypothesis/RQ was clear, well-constructed, and the student effectively argued that it addressed a pressing question in the field	
Explanation of Methodology/ strategy	Not or poorly explained	Explained, but seemed inadequate for the study goals/purpose	Adequate and clearly explained	Appropriate, clear, and well- connected to the hypothesis/RQ/objectives	Appropriate, clear, well-connected to the hypothesis/RQ /objectives, and showed exceptionally creative and/or meticulous investigation	
Presentation and Interpretation of Results/ Conclusions	Results/ conclusions not presented	Results/conclusions presented, but unclear or not fully developed	Results clearly presented, conclusions clearly flow from results and relate back to	Results clearly presented, discussion hits major points and nuanced interpretations, conclusions clearly flow from results and relate	Results clearly presented, discussion hits major points and nuanced interpretations, con-clusions clearly flow	

			hypothesis/RQ/obj ectives	back to hypothesis/RQ/objectives	from results and relate back to hypothesis/ RQ/objectives, exceptionally clear take-home message	
Overall Poster Design, correct dimesions and Use of Images/Text	Disorganized and hard to follow. Images and/or text unreadable or detracts. Gross spelling/grammatic al errors.	Adequate organization, but somewhat hard to follow. Images did not add or detract from effectiveness. Some spelling/gramm atical errors.	Well organized. Images added to the understanding. Text easily readable. Appropriate image size and amount of text. Well-written with few errors.	Attractive formatting. Organization and images added in understanding and provided clarity. Appropriate, well-written, and helpful text.	Professional appearance and organization. Images and text arrangement exceptionally well done and greatly enhanced understanding.	
Verbal Interaction with Evaluator and Answers to Questions	Did not interact with listener; movements, expression detracted from the presentation and was Unable to address questions	Interacted poorly with listener. Able to partially address some of the questions	Interacted with listener. Made good eye contact. Able to address most of the questions	Interacted well with listener. Answers added to and extended the topics discussed	Movement and expression conveyed poise and enthusiasm while explaining the project. Answers showed exceptional insight into the field	
					TOTAL	

ARVIND GAVALI COLLEGE OF PHARMACY JAITAPUR, SATARA

SCIENTIA 4.0

Oral, Poster & Model Presentation Competition

Rules & Regulations for Model Presentation

1. Maximum number of registered participants per model is 02.

2. Valid identity card provided by the participant's institution is required during registration.

3. The group should display their model throughout the event schedule. Failing this the team may be liable for disqualification.

4. College will provide electric supply if required (ensure to inform about it in advance), no extra utilities will be provided by organizing college.

5. Space allotted for model will be 2.5x2.5 Feet.

6. Any sign in the form of specific mark or display of name of student or college will not be allowed.

7. The decision of the judges will be final and no sort of disputes will be entertained.

Samarth Educational Trust's

Arvind Gavali College of Pharmacy Jaitapur, Satara

SCIENTIA 4.0

MODEL COMPETITION RUBRICS (25 MARKS)

Rubrics	Exemplary (05)	Superior (04)	Good (03)	Satisfactory (02)	Not satisfactory (01)
Theme of the model	Theme is exceptional, demonstrating creativity and depth.	Theme is highly relevant and effectively communicated.	Theme is well-defined and relevant.	Theme is good but needs improvement.	Theme lacks clarity and relevance.
Presentation skills	Outstanding communication, compelling, and highly engaging.	Engaging communication, strong organization, and delivery.	Clear communication with a well-organized presentation.	Basic communication, needs improvement in organization.	Poor communication, unclear, and disorganized.
Model construction	Artistic look and Exceptional model construction, demonstrating sophistication.	Highly structured and logically organized model.	Well-constructed model with clear components.	Basic structure with room for improvement.	Model lacks structure and coherence.
Defence	Outstanding defense, showcasing depth and critical thinking.	Strong defense, well-supported with compelling arguments.	Adequate defense with convincing supporting arguments.	Basic defense with some supporting arguments.	Weak defense, lacks supporting arguments.
Applicability of Model	Exceptionally applicable model, demonstrating real-world utility.	Highly applicable model with practical implications.	Demonstrates practical relevance and applicability.	Limited practical applicability, needs improvement.	Model lacks practical relevance and applicability.

Rules for Oral Presentation

1. It is compulsory to register all authors mentioned in the given abstract and make sure to carry the identity card during the presentation which is issued by your institute.

2. Total time for the oral poster presentation is 8 minutes (05 min presentation and 03 minutes defense).

3. Presentations should be in the standard digital format and compatible universally on each computer system. PowerPoint or PDF of your presentation will be considered.

4. Use clear and legible fonts, suitable colors, and high-quality images. Maximum slides for oral presentation are 10 and must include the presentation code. The presentation must be directly related to the submitted abstract and aligned with the scientific theme of Scientia 2024.

5. Ensure that all audio-visual aids are functional and have been tested before the presentation.

6. Presenters must reach at event place well in advance to test their presentations.

7. Recording and photography of presentations are prohibited without explicit permission from the presenter.

8. All presenters are expected to attend the entire session in which their presentation is scheduled.

9. Presentation slides should not mention the name of authors, name of institute, acknowledgement and any other way by which identity would be revealed. Decision given by the judges panel would be final.

10. Certificate will be given only to the registered candidate that participates offline during competition.

11. Presentation will be evaluated with reference to the rubrics given in table 1

Table 1: Rubrics for evaluation of Oral Presentation

Sr. No.	Criteria	Exemplary (5)	Exceeds standard (4)	Adequately meets standard (3)	Well below standards (2)	Substandard (1)
1.	**Relevance to the theme and knowledge**	Completely relevant and demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the topic.	Relevant to the theme and accurately represents key concepts with appropriate examples.	Partially relevant and good representation of concepts and avoids misconceptions or inaccuracies.	Averagely irrelevant and ideas unclear.	Irrelevant and absolutely unclear idea.
2.	**Content**	Comprehensive coverage of the research topic with clear objectives, background, methods, results, and conclusions.	Adequate information provided on the research topic; some areas may require further detail.	Limited information on the research topic; key elements may be missing or unclear.	Minimal information; lacks essential content.	Virtually no relevant content; major information gaps.
3.	**Creativity and Originality**	Very creative; Demonstrates unique and insightful evidence of critical thinking and seems original contribution.	Creative and original contribution.	Looks ordinary and serve only the purpose of activity.	Lack in creativity and originality.	Non creative and plagiarized
4.	**Contribution to the Field**	The research makes a substantial and innovative contribution to the field, advancing knowledge.	The research contributes meaningfully to the field, providing valuable insights or building on existing knowledge.	The research makes a modest contribution but may not significantly advance the field.	The contribution is limited, with minimal impact on the existing body of knowledge.	The research makes little to no contribution to the field; it lacks relevance or originality.
5.	**Delivery and Interaction**	Confident, clear, and engaging presentation; effectively responds to questions.	Presentation is generally clear but may benefit from more polish; responds adequately to questions.	Some difficulty in communication; struggles to respond to questions effectively.	Ineffective communication; unable to answer questions satisfactorily.	Extremely poor communication; unable to convey information effectively.