

---

# CALL FOR PAPERS FOR THE POSTER SESSION

## PURPOSE

To showcase NACAA members work by giving them the opportunity to present posters at the Annual Meeting/Professional Improvement Conference. This award program has two categories to recognize NACAA members:

- 1) Applied Research – to give individuals an opportunity to present a poster on applied research they have conducted.
- 2) Extension Education – this category is designed to give members an opportunity to present a poster on new or different educational methods or technologies he or she has used.

The program also provides an opportunity to discuss how an identified educational need in the community was addressed and what the observed results were.

## ELIGIBILITY

An NACAA member in good standing must submit contributed papers, originated by one or more investigators. A member can only be the senior author (the first name appearing on the poster) on one poster in each category each year.

## GUIDELINES

- Poster size must be no larger than 44" x 44". This allows all posters to fit nicely on the frames used at AM/PIC.
- There is no limit to the number of posters on which a member can be listed as a junior author.
- **Any member who does not follow these guidelines and submits more than one poster on which he/she is the lead author in the same category, will have all posters disqualified.**
- *No poster or abstract will be presented at the 2007 AM/PIC that has been presented at any previous NACAA AM/PIC.*
- The Poster Session Committee will have full authority to accept or reject a poster abstract upon evaluation of the title and submitted abstract. Rejection of poster abstract by the Poster Session Committee will be final.

## RECOGNITION

Peer reviewed papers will be selected for presentation and authors will receive a certificate and will have paper published in the NACAA Annual Meeting and Professional Improvement Proceedings.

## JUDGING

Poster judging will be based on the following criteria:

- |  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1. Scientific/Educational Merit                  | 60% |
| 2. Poster Presentation                           | 30% |
| 3. Follow instructions for presentation/mounting | 10% |

## ENTRY

Complete the "General Application Form" on page 1 and write an abstract. Both must be sent and in the possession of your Professional Excellence Committee State Chair by March 15, 2007. See page 12 for abstract example and format that must be followed.

## AWARDS

Awards for the best poster papers in each category at the annual meeting are as follows:

Best Contributed Poster	\$500 and a certificate w/holder
Second Place	\$250 and a certificate w/holder
Third Place	\$150 and a certificate w/holder
Region Winners	Certificate

**CASH AWARDS WILL BE DISTRIBUTED IF ADEQUATE FUNDING IS SECURED FROM A NATIONAL DONOR/SPONSOR.**



---

---

## GUIDELINES FOR APPLIED RESEARCH AND EXTENSION EDUCATION POSTER SESSION

### Mounting of the Poster:

Foam core display boards will be provided for you. Posters should not exceed the 44" x 44" size limitation. Pushpins must be used to mount the poster and you must provide your own.

### Program Title, Author, Institution and Address:

Poster title, author names, and affiliations *should appear on the top* of the poster. A simple sans-serif typeface (i.e., Arial or Helvetica) should be used. Lettering for the title should be at least one half (1/2) inch.

### Abstract:

The abstract that was submitted with the poster session application has to appear on the poster. The abstract title, author(s) and affiliations can be omitted in the abstract affixed to the poster. However, the word "abstract" should appear at the top of the abstract text. Minimum size for abstract typeface is 16 points.

**Extension Education abstracts should show program impact. Applied Research abstracts should include research data.**

### Supporting Materials:

Material that supports the poster (i.e., workshop workbooks, handouts, etc.) may be placed below the poster on the floor. Room for supporting material is limited to space directly below your poster. A pocket will be attached below each poster to allow people who are interested in learning more about your program to drop their business card into it.

### Content:

Do not prepare a poster as if it were a manuscript. Primarily use tables and figures and limit verbiage. Details of the work can be discussed during the "Meet the Author Sessions" with interested parties. Make sure that the selected typeface is easy to read. No more than two different typefaces should be used on the poster. Lettering for text and illustrations should range in size between 24 and 48 point type.

24 point      48 point

### **"Quality Matters When Preparing a Poster"**

**Adapted from Communicaid article by Evie Liss and Bernadine Strik, 1991**

- 1. How well is the message conveyed (simplicity and clarity of the message)?** Most people spend less than ten minutes at a poster. Each poster will be reviewed for one to three main points or themes the presenter wants people to retain. Also, each poster will be evaluated for a center of interest to identify and introduce the message.
- 2. How easy is the poster to read at three feet?** The judges will look for posters with text tables and figures in letter (type) sizes that are easy to read at three feet. Readability of lettering style is also important.
- 3. Is the poster visually balanced and organized?** Successful posters do not crowd the information. Details can be shared on a handout. Attractive posters have a logical order with figures, photos, and text throughout.
- 4. Does the poster use colors and contrast to visually attract the readers?** Contrasting colors are used to lead the viewer's eye throughout the poster, and imaginative ways to add color might include photographs, illustrations. Charts graphs, and colored poster board.

---

---

# INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMITTING ALL ABSTRACTS WHERE REQUIRED

## I. Abstract Format

1. The text should be roughly 150-250 words, in font size of 12. An original copy of the abstract has to be submitted. Electronic copies of the abstract are also required. They should be sent on a DOS compatible diskette in Wordperfect or Microsoft Word.
2. **TITLES SHOULD BE COMPLETELY CAPITALIZED**, and typed from the left margin on the first line. It should not be underlined. The body of the abstract should be fully justified (both margins even).
3. Name(s) of author(s), institutional affiliation(s), and address(es) should be entered two lines below the title line. Name(s) of author(s) should be underlined and written in the order of family name and the initials of the given and middle name. The last name of the presenter should be marked with an asterisk (\*) at right.
4. Insert an empty line before beginning to type text. Text should be preceded with a space of three letters.
5. Scientific names (i.e., botanical names) should be written in italic type or underline.

## II. General Instructions for Applications that require an abstract.

1. **Written and electronic copies** of the abstract are to be submitted with the application to the appropriate State Committee Chair. Be sure to send them in an envelope supported with cardboard so that they will not be bent.
2. Abstracts will not be accepted if they do not conform to the instructions contained herein, both in content and/or format.
3. The following is an example of the abstract format that must be followed for all abstracts. The abstract selected is the 2006 National Winner of the Poster Session Applied Research category.

### Sample FORMAT FOR All NACAA ABSTRACTS

When published, the entire abstract (including the title and by-line), will be printed by phototype process exactly as you submit it. Author(s) underlined and written in order of family name, given and middle initials, with an asterisk (\*) to the right of the presenting author; followed by the address; and that the text starts on the next two lines, indented three spaces.)

The Committee responsible for the award category **may choose not to publish an abstract if it does not meet the required rules and format layout.**

Abstracts must be in the hands of the respective committee state chair by March 15, 2007. Additional information (the schedule of presentation, details on presentation methods, and so on) will be provided after the abstract has been approved.

## EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF BIO-FUNGICIDES IN THE PRODUCTION OF FRESH MARKET ORGANIC TOMATOES

Blevins,\* P.K.<sup>1</sup>, Straw, R.A.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>. Extension Agent, Virginia Cooperative Extension, Washington County, Abingdon, Virginia 24210

<sup>2</sup>. Extension Specialist, Virginia Cooperative Extension-Southwest Virginia AREC, Glade Spring, Virginia 24340

Disease control in fresh market tomatoes is a major factor limiting the adoption of organic production methods by growers in Southwest, Virginia. Six bio-fungicides were compared to a conventional standard [Bravo (3 pts/acre) alternated with Manzate (2 lbs/acre) plus Tanos (8 oz/acre) plus BCS Copper (64 oz/acre) for the first four weekly sprays, and Bravo alone thereafter] and an untreated check (UTC) for relative effectiveness in controlling diseases such as early blight. The biological materials and rates applied were, Storox (1% solution), Biophos (2% solution), Prophyte (4 pts/acre), Serenade Max (3 lbs/acre), BCS Copper (2qts/acre), and Serenade Max (3lbs/acre) plus BCS Copper (2qts/acre). All treatments were made on a weekly basis. The tomato variety 'Mountain Fresh Plus' was used in a drip irrigated, trellised, plasti-culture system. Fruit was harvested and graded and placed into one of the following grades: Jumbo, Extra Large, Large, Medium, Small, No. 2, or Cull. Yield data and disease ratings were analyzed using ANOVA techniques and means were separated using Duncan's Multiple Range Test. There were no statistical differences in yield of total marketable fruit. The UTC plot produced the greatest number of Jumbo fruit, while the Serenade/BCS Copper produced the lowest. Storox has been a material that local organic growers have relied on for disease control. In terms of disease control, all treatments including the UTC were better statistically than Storox, which had leaf area damage ratings in excess of 40%. This study suggests that there are differences in the relative effectiveness of these bio-fungicides for disease control. However, in this case it did not significantly impact total marketable yield. If harvest had continued, yield differences would have been expected due to defoliation by early blight.