

Tentative Programme – 2024 PhaNuSpo Annual Retreat

DAY 1	Day of Science
8:30	DEPARTURE from 1190 Vienna, Josef-Holaubek-Platz 1 (in front of B.KA)
10:00 - 11:00	Arrival in Frankenfels → WALK to the seminar hotel Steinschaler Dörfel
about 11:00	ARRIVAL seminar hotel & check-in
11:30 – 12:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome Activity games to network and to connect everyone led by <i>Johanna Sick and Max Wodak</i> Housekeeping & Intro to retreat programme by <i>Jürgen König</i>
12:30 - 14:00	LUNCH
14:00 - 15:00	<i>To be confirmed</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SAB members keynote speeches and panel discussions, <i>moderated by PhD students Johanna Sick and Max Wodak</i>
15:00 - 15:10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rules for poster sessions by <i>Marietta Zille</i>
15:10 - 16:10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poster session A: odd numbers
16:10 - 16:40	COFFEE BREAK
16:40 - 17:40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poster session B: even numbers
17:50 – 18:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PPT Science Karaoke, one per discipline, <i>hosted by Johanna or Max</i> Public online voting for best presentation.
18:30 onwards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DINNER Poster & Science Karaoke Award Ceremony Dorffest/ Party: <i>details to follow</i>

DAY 2	Day of Career Talks for PhDs & on Supervision for PIs
Until 9:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual morning activities (walk, jogging, etc.) Breakfast and Check-out
09:00 - 12:00	<p>Parallel sessions:</p> <p>A) For PhD students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Career talks with invited postdocs on "My career path and its successes and challenges" - 3 groups, rotating (<i>invited experts tbc</i>) The "self-help group" exchange / Austausch "Selbsthilfegruppe" <p>B) For Supervisors/PIs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshop on supervision, Trainer Markus Böckle
12:00 - 13:30	LUNCH
13:30 - 15:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group photo Round-up
15:30	DEPARTURE

PPT Science Karaoke

One person or a group from each of the main disciplines (pharmacy, nutrition and sport) creates a presentation on a topic that falls within the respective subject area and is thematically as well-defined and far removed from the other areas as possible (so that the presenters have as little knowledge or prior knowledge as possible). Before the presentations, a draw is held to decide who will present which topic (not their own, of course). Please note...

- 10 slides per presentation
- Include pictures, illustrations, graphics etc. (preferably also of quite abstract or complex processes, so that hopefully funny and creative attempts at explanation arise)
- Not too much text, rather work with bullet points, keywords etc.
- If possible, no unnecessary animations of the slides (i.e. a slide should not change once it appears, and the person sees it for the first time)
- On a specific topic that is well differentiated from the other subject areas and where there is no overlap with the other disciplines (as much as possible...)

Poster authors: poster guidelines and evaluation criteria

There are likely to be two poster sessions, each with a one-hour time slot for active presentations and discussions with attendees. The VDS PhaNuSpo will award 4 poster prizes (two per session €200 each). The jury will consider criteria and mechanisms to ensure that PhD students from each discipline will have a fair chance to win a prize.

The aim of the poster session is to

- encourage scientific excellence.
- provide a space for developing communication and presentation skills for a wider audience.
- encourage young researchers to engage with their PhD topic.
- represent the diversity that exists within the PhaNuSpo.

About 4 jury members per session (different background, different academic career, i.e., students and PIs) will judge the posters according to the following criteria:

- **Scientific content/Comprehensibility** (*=most important criteria*).
What is the scientific advancement and is this properly explained on the poster (even for those not familiar to this research field?) Are the objectives clearly explained/self-explanatory? Are the methods adequate? Are the conclusions justified?
- **Layout** (*You'll need to use the UniVie poster template. The layout will be judged on the part you can design yourself.*)
How well does the poster present the data (text, graphics, figures)? Are they clearly presented and in a logical order? Readability?
- **Oral presentation/discussion at the retreat.**
Is the presenter familiar with the topic? Are questions from the audience/jury members well addressed and explained by the presenter?

According to current tentative programme, poster presentations and evaluations are:

- **Session A – odd numbered posters:** on 16.09. from 15:10 - 16:10
- **Session B – even numbered posters:** on 16.09. from 16:40 - 17:40

Presenters are advised to remain on their poster for the duration of their session

Jury: Evaluation of posters presentations

- Jury coordinating PI: Marietta Zille
- NB: Jury members will have access to all submitted posters via u:cloud about 1-2 weeks before the retreat takes place, as well as to the list of presenters including poster title by session you are responsible for.

Evaluation criteria for individual scores

	5	3	1
Comprehensibility / Quality of scientific content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objectives are presented, and they correlate to the methods and conclusions. • The methods will reasonably allow to obtain the expected results. • The conclusions are logically deduced from the results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The connection of the objectives to the methodology and/or the conclusions is unclear. • The methods are unclear or there is enough reason to question their adequacy. • The connection between the results and the conclusions is unclear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objectives were not explained. • The methods are not presented, or they will certainly not allow to obtain the expected results. • The conclusions do not derive from the results and/or have no connection to the objectives.
Layout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The order of the poster is logical (i.e. objectives-methods-results-conclusions). • All text and figures are big enough to be read/seen. • The figures/graphics are clear and relevant (i.e. they allow for a better understanding). • There is a nice balance between images and text. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are missing sections in the poster. • Most of the text and figures are big enough to be read/seen. • There are figures or graphics that do not add value to the poster. • There are figures or graphics that are unclear or difficult to understand. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The poster lacks order, it is not possible to follow it without the presenter's aid. • Most of the text and figures are too small or unclear to be read/understood. • None of the figures/graphics add value, they are decorative. • The figures and graphics are unclear even after the presenter's explanation.
Oral presentation / discussion on site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relevance and context of the research are explained. • The presented information is clear and orderly. • The presenter clearly knows the topic, even if they pause to think to give an answer. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Either the relevance or the context of the research was not mentioned. • The presented information lacks order, making it difficult to follow. • The presenter knows most of their topic, but sometimes struggles (i.e. to give context, to answer questions, etc.). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neither the relevance nor the context of the research was explained. • The presented information is so disorganised that it is impossible to understand the topic. • The presenter can't answer questions and seems to be reciting information rather than understanding it.
SUM			

How to evaluate:

- If all the requirements for 5 are met, then 5.
- If there are some points that match with the descriptions of 5 and another that match 3, then '4'. The same criteria are applied for 3 and 1.
- If more information is needed to evaluate a certain point, more questions should be asked to the presenter. Don't punish the presenter for the same reason in two different categories.