STUDENT SYMPOSIUM FIRST-ROUND JUDGE

The **Student Symposium First-Round Judge** will judge the papers submitted by student groups participating in the 2021 SAS Global Forum Student Symposium competition. As a first-round judge, you will be assigned several papers to review and score. Your commitment will be completed **_prior_** to the conference and the review period will span approximately 2-3 weeks, between March 2021 and April 2021. When the paper judging process is completed, the top 8 teams will be selected and will provide recordings of their presentations to be judged during the week prior to SAS Global Forum.

BENEFITS: You will have direct access to the types of research ideas and the problem-solving capabilities of students who are currently preparing for their careers as SAS professionals. You will also reap the rewards of knowing that you played a significant role in providing the selected teams a venue for presenting their research in a high-profile environment, along with opportunities to network with seasoned SAS professionals attending the virtual event.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. Pre-Conference: When student paper submissions are ready for review, you will receive an email from the Student Symposium Coordinators with your assigned papers attached and a rubric for scoring the papers in nine areas (See rubric below). Once you have received that email, we ask that you:

    a. Download the assigned papers to be reviewed.

    b. Using the scoring rubric provided in the email, read and review your assigned papers.

    c. Using the link to the online evaluation form provided in the email, you will score each assigned paper submission on each of the nine areas.

    d. Notify the Student Symposium Team when you have completed the online evaluation form for all assigned papers.

2. On-Site at Conference:

    a. No responsibilities

3. Post-Conference:

    a. No responsibilities

NOTES:

As a first-round judge, you will not have to judge every paper submission. The number of papers you will judge depends upon both how many papers are submitted and how many judges volunteer. Our

goal is to keep the number of papers to be reviewed per judge to around four or five – or less if we have a good number of volunteers.

Each student paper submission is from two to five pages in length.

You do not have to attend the virtual SAS Global Forum 2021 in order to be a judge. However, we invite you to view the video recordings of students' presentations when those links are made available and provide your invaluable feedback in the form of comments, sharing links, etc. We also hope that, during SAS Global Forum, you take time to attend the virtual session where the top 3 student teams will be announced.

The projected timeline is as follows: Student paper submissions will be due Wednesday, March 24, 2021. Within a few days of the submissions, each judge will receive an email with the assigned paper submissions, instructions, and a link to the online evaluation form. The scoring of all assigned papers will be due by Friday, April 2, 2021.

SAMPLE RUBRIC:

2020 Student Symposium Competition

JUDGING OF ENTRIES: Paper Submissions

Eligible entries will be judged according to the following criteria and considerations:

Components of paper submissions to be judged:

- **Introduction** – Is the introduction appropriate and provide a concise lead-in to the report given?
- **Data** – Is the source of the data adequately documented?
- **Problem** – Is the problem(s) clearly defined and objectives of the study precisely given?
- **Data cleaning/validation** – Is the data cleaning process adequately explained?
- **Analysis** – Were appropriate analytical methods used and adequately explained?
- **Visualization** – Are appropriate graphics and visuals provided?
- **Generalization** – Are results provided for a general, non-technical audience?
- **Suggestions for future studies** – Are issues for future studies/different problem approaches given?
- **Conclusions** – Are conclusions concisely given?

Evaluation Rubric:

1 – Vague, not given, poorly explained

2 – Emerging, shows some possibilities

3 – Beginning, additional details needed

4 – Potential exists, more development needed

5 – Developing, shows promise

6 – Adequate, ok, needs more polish

7 – Accomplished, acceptable

8 – Proficient, of high quality

9 – Exemplarily, excellent quality

10 – Outstanding, one of the best