

SOCIETY FOR CARDIOVASCULAR PATHOLOGY

Young Investigator's Award

Scope

Applies to the Young Investigator's Award, to be given annually at the Society for Cardiovascular Pathology's (SCVP) Annual gathering.

Purpose

To outline a process for identifying judges who will then use the described criteria for selecting participants to compete for the SCVP's Young Investigator Award and to provide a basic set of criteria on which the winner will be chosen from those participants.

Policy

- The SCVP's Awards Chair will gather a list of all abstracts that have a trainee (student, resident, fellow) in the first author position that have been submitted to the United States and Canadian Academy of Pathology's (USCAP) annual meeting.
- The Awards Chair will then, from the Society, select a panel of at least 2 (and no more than 4 additional judges) who do not share authorship with any identified trainees. The Awards Chair and the additional selected judges will comprise the Awards Committee.
- The Committee will select five trainee abstracts to be presented to the SCVP's general audience at the USCAP meeting. In the event there are five or fewer abstracts, the Awards Chair may elect to select all submitted trainee abstracts for presentation.
- Judges will independently grade the presentations at the USCAP meeting, using the attached criteria. Following the presentations, the committee will meet and the young investigator scoring the highest total will be named the Young Investigator for that year.
- In the event of a tie, two recipients may be named.

SOCIETY FOR CARDIOVASCULAR PATHOLOGY

Young Investigator's Award Grading Criteria

Presentation Title:										
Presenter:										
Please score each of the following areas (1=low - 10=high)										
Presentation Style										
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity and fluency (primary criterion) • Slides clean and not overly busy • Images well placed • Citations appropriate • Evidence of team-based approach (use of “we” instead of “I”) 										
Accuracy										
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of data presentation and discussion (primary criterion) • Use of adequate / state-of the-art methods • Technical excellence 										
Scientific Merit										
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate use of the scientific method (primary criterion) • Appropriate control group • Discussed limitations 										
Impact / Original Contribution										
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Originality and extent of conceptual novelty (primary criterion) • Degree of advance over previous knowledge • Relevance • Potential implications for other work 										
TOTAL SCORE										

JUDGE _____