

Introduction

Excellent $\longleftrightarrow$ Poor/Absent
4 - 3 - 2 - 1

Amount of information

All information is required for understanding the research

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Broad introduction

Orients audience to current state of the field

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Main research question

Clearly explained

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Significance

Motivation for research and its significance clearly explained

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Data

Logical flow

Logically follows the data and each interpretation is clearly justified

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Methods

Clearly explains methods and their significance

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Results

Presents only necessary data

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Clarity

Clearly explains all results figures

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Evidence of collaboration

Clearly describes what candidate did versus collaborators and mentees

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Inferences

Explains what the work infers/means, competing explanations well addressed

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Conclusion/future

Impact of work for the field

Important contribution to the field clearly explained

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Future research <5 years

Suggests what should be done next, points out new questions raised by work

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Future research >5 years

Outlines larger plan for future research

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Overall

Big picture

Clearly articulates the broader context of the work and a unifying theme

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Repetition

Main ideas redefined throughout

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Examples

Use of analogies/anecdotes to known subjects

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Brand

Perspective on the field can be distinguished from mentor(s)

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Career narrative

How you ended up where you are + what's next for you

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Q&A

Excellent $\longleftrightarrow$ Poor/Absent
4 - 3 - 2 - 1

Active listening	Pays attention to and lets questioners finish their questions	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	
Repeating and Clarifying	Repeats the question or rephrases and clarifies it as necessary	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	
Flaws	Gracefully acknowledges flaws or defects pointed out by questioner	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	
Brevity	Answers are short but clear and complete	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	
Discussion	Capable of discussing questions in a thoughtful way	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	

Interaction with audience

Eye contact	Faces audience nearly all of the time, frequent eye contact	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	
Body language	Open body language, appropriately animated (i.e. gestures)	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	
Clarity of delivery	Speaks clearly and loudly enough, does not read from slides/notes, no noticeable disfluencies (ahm/uhm)	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	
Pace	Pace is easy to understand (not too fast)	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	
Jargon	All unfamiliar terms are defined and re-defined throughout presentation	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	

Organization

Slide purpose	Purpose of each slide is clear to the listener (Important: Title of slide contains premise)	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	
Continuity	Effective transitions between slides create a continuous sequence of connected ideas	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	
Figures	Every figure and image is clearly labeled and all figures are fully explained by the presenter	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	
Visuals	Majority of presentation is figures/visual aids instead of text	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	

Summary Evaluation

Strongly
Agree

Agree

Disagree

Strongly
DisagreeDon't know/Can't
assess

I can repeat the main question the presenter is addressing with their research talk to someone else.

--	--	--	--	--

What is the main question? _____

I am convinced that the work is significant in the field.

I have a clear sense of who this person would be as a colleague.

I was excited about potentially collaborating with this presenter.

I am convinced that the presenter has a solid plan for their future projects.

The speaker convinced me that they can think critically about their work.

I could easily tell which parts of the project were driven by the presenter and which were collaborations.

References:

How to Give an Effective Job talk.

Sharon Milgram seminar at the NIH, June 2008

<http://bit.ly/sharonmilgram>

How to give a job talk and why it's not the same as a research talk.

Bill Schrader seminar at Duke, December 2013

<http://bit.ly/billschrader>

How To Give a Good Talk.

Uri Alon, *Molecular Cell*, Volume 36 , Issue 2 , 165 – 167

Guest post: How to give a science talk

Blog post reproducing Andrew Murray's article, August 19, 2011

It Takes 30: A blog from the Department of Systems Biology @ Harvard Medical School

<https://ittakes30.wordpress.com>

Recommended Outline:

For a 45 minute presentation, recommended outline:

- 10-15 min introduction tailored to your audience (longer than a typical seminar presentation)
 - Example: Scientists at all levels (your field and similar fields)
- 20-30 min summary of your methodology and results
 - Tailored to your audience
- 5-10 min potential impacts, future directions, thank you

Use this space below to provide additional comments or suggestions.

Introduction

Data

Conclusions/Future

Overall

Q&A

Interaction with audience

Organization