

Student Paper and Poster Competition Guidelines

AGX Annual Meeting, 22-25 October 2025, St. Louis, MO

AGX is excited to invite you, the students participating in this year's AGX meeting in St. Louis, MO, to enter one of our student competitions!

Four Categories of Student Competitions

- Undergraduate Poster Competition
- Undergraduate Paper Competition
- Graduate Poster Competition
- Graduate Paper Competition

Eligibility Criteria

- You must be enrolled as an undergraduate, master's, or doctoral student.
- You will present research conducted recently, during your undergraduate studies if you are an undergraduate student, or during your graduate studies.
- The papers and posters must be solely produced by you, though your advisor or other collaborators may be listed as co-authors.

Participation Process

1. [Register](#) for the meeting.
2. **Submit a regular abstract** for the meeting, either at the time of registration or after logging back into the "[Indico](#)" portal this year's organizers are using for registration and abstract submission.
3. When submitting your abstract, include your advisor's name and their email in the information box.
4. All participating students must present their work at the conference to be eligible.

Evaluation Process

All participants will be judged during their participation using the rubric below.

Judges will convene during the meeting after all presentations are completed and will collectively evaluate each presenter.

Winners will be announced at the meeting and posted on the AGX web page, and on AGX's social media.

Winners will be contacted to arrange delivery of rewards.

Rubric

Evaluation Criterion	Outstanding (5)	Competent (4)	Adequate (3)	Insufficient (2)	Not Evident (1)
Introduction, including problem statement	Clearly articulates the problem with a compelling introduction.	States the problem clearly, but lacks depth.	Problem is identified, but the introduction is vague or lacks focus.	Problem statement is unclear or underdeveloped.	No clear introduction or problem statement.
Research objectives / questions / hypotheses	Specific, well-defined, and align with the problem.	Clear but may lack specificity.	Present but poorly articulated or too broad.	Vague or not aligned with the problem.	Unclear or not present.
Research methods	Well explained, appropriate, and executed.	Explained and appropriate, but may lack detail.	Present but lack clarity or completeness.	Inadequately described or inappropriate.	No clear description of methods.
Results	Clearly presented and well-analyzed.	Presented but may lack depth or clarity.	Present but poorly presented or under-analyzed.	Incomplete or poorly analyzed.	No results are presented.
Discussion and Conclusion	Discussion is insightful, and conclusions are well-supported by data.	Discussion and conclusions are logical but may lack depth.	Discussion and conclusions are present but underdeveloped.	Discussion and conclusions are weak or poorly supported.	No discussion or conclusion.
Engagement with supporting literature	Extensive and relevant literature is well-integrated.	Relevant literature is cited but may lack integration.	Literature is cited but either limited or poorly integrated.	Minimal engagement with literature.	No engagement with literature.
Originality	Introduces a novel research approach or significant new insight.	Thoughtful extension or new application of existing research.	Builds on existing research with minor new contributions.	Little innovation, largely reiterating existing research.	No new contribution, mirrors existing research closely.
Significance	Research is very significant and has strong implications.	The research is significant, but its impact may be limited.	The research is of moderate significance.	The research is of little significance or relevance.	The research has no clear significance.
Writing	Clear, concise, and free of errors.	Generally clear with few errors.	Understandable, but with errors or awkward phrasing.	Unclear or with significant errors.	Poor or unreadable.
Total	50	40	30	20	10