

Maximizing Effort While Maintaining Purpose: Randomized, Pooled Judging for Undergraduate Research Showcases

2024 ConnectUR Annual Conference

Co-Presenters: JJ Sadler & Amy Childress



Intended Outcomes

Through engaging in this session, participants will:

- *Develop a randomized, pooled judging process for their own undergrad research showcases.*
- *Prepare discussion points from previously successful conversations with campus-wide constituents when traditional judging formats are valued by others.*
- *Design event-based evaluation questions to determine the quality and effectiveness of the new judging process.*



This QR code will take you to the website:

(<https://purdue.edu/undergrad-research/conferences/CUR2024.php>)
containing information from multiple ConnectUR presentations by staff in the Purdue University Office of Undergraduate Research.



Presentation Outline

- Historical perspective of events and judging at Purdue
- Considerations when creating a new judging process
- Implementation of new judging process
- Evaluation results of new judging process



3

Purdue's Situation

- 3 campus-wide conferences each year
 - 2 are judged (*fall and spring*)
 - *Started with 1 with only posters, now includes posters, talks, and virtual presentations*
- Undergraduate Research Planning Committee with campus-wide representation
- 500+ presentations per judged conference



4

Historical Perspective

Judging Process Component

Presentation allocated to a specific unit

Judges recruited from specific unit

Judges assigned to specific presentations

Judges check-in to evaluate presentations

Constant checking posters are evaluated



Purdue's Situation

- 3 campus-wide conferences each year
 - 2 are judged (*fall and spring*)
 - Started with 1 with posters, now includes posters, talks, and virtual presentations
- Undergraduate Research Planning Committee with campus-wide representation
- 500+ presentations per judged conference

5

Historical Perspective

Judging Process Component

Presentation allocated to a specific unit

Judges recruited from specific unit

Judges assigned to specific presentations

Judges check-in to evaluate presentations

Constant checking posters are evaluated

Challenge Presented

"Ownership" of the presentation deliberated

Unit recruited/assigned each judge (time!)

Re-assigning if judges cannot/do not show

Specific lists and assignments needed

Some posters are missed at the end



6

The Need to Create Something New

Challenge Presented	Consideration for Something New
“Ownership” of the presentation deliberated	Presentation connected to mentor
Unit recruited/assigned each judge (time!)	Anyone can judge any presentation
Re-assigning if judges cannot/do not show	Judges who show up are assigned there
Specific lists and assignments needed	Judges are given the “next” presentations
Some posters are missed at the end	Physical way to determine completion

Implementation

Consideration for Something New	Implemented Solution
Presentation connected to mentor	Still in discussion with planning committee
Any one can judge any presentation	Judge recruitment is centralized and pooled
Judges who show up are assigned there	Those who arrive are our “formal” judges
Judges are given the “next” presentations	Abstract copies are provided in order
Physical way to determine completion	4 collated sets of abstracts are copied

Conversation Topics with Campus Partners

- Emphasize the purpose of a campus-wide conference to match evaluation and judging process

Purdue's purpose: Provide methods for students to disseminate their research to the Purdue community.

Judging process: Evaluate the ability for students to convey their research to the entire Purdue community, including those not in their discipline.



9

Conversation Topics with Campus Partners

- Emphasize that judging is evaluating the presentation of the research project and not the merit of the research.

Purdue's process: We require mentors to approve all presentations. This is when the merit of the research project from a disciplinary standpoint is determined.

Judging process: Rubric has not included disciplinary content.

Evaluation tool allows free response for disciplinary-specific feedback.



10

Conversation Topics with Campus Partners

- Awards are distributed by academic units; therefore, they want to determine who receives their awards

Award purpose: Provide recognition to those students who excel in presenting their research to the Purdue community.

Award process: Scores and comments are shared with the units and they have final say on who wins awards.

Has eliminated most ties that were more prevalent when units did not select.

11



Evaluation Results Regarding New Judging Process

- Slight increase in judge check-in process satisfaction (95.4% in SP'22 → 98.6% in SP'24)
- No change in judging volunteer sign-up process satisfaction (98.3% in SP'22 → 100% in SP'24)
- Minimal (<5%) free response inclusion of wanting to only evaluate presentations within their discipline.

Example: *"My recommendation is to assign judges to a relevant area (broadly defined) rather than random assignment."*



12

OUR Reflections

- Unit representatives prefer this method since they do not have to assign/re-assign judges
- Check-in time is practically eliminated and is more for answering questions
- It is easier to see how many times an abstract has been distributed
- Posters are evaluated in “waves” as judges pick up their assignments
- Judges can evaluate more presentations instead of only those within “their” unit

Upcoming Updates/Considerations

- Presentations are connected to academic unit of the mentor
 - Challenge: Not all mentors are in an academic unit (e.g., Research District; Vet Med)



What are your questions...



This QR code will take you to the website:

(<https://purdue.edu/undergrad-research/conferences/CUR2024.php>)

containing information from multiple ConnectUR presentations by staff in the Purdue University Office of Undergraduate Research.

JJ Sadler, jjsadler@purdue.edu

Amy Childress, childres@purdue.edu

