

Biostatistics Fall 2019 Final Project Presentation Evaluation Form

Presenter _____ Reviewer Name _____

| Criterion | Excellent 5-4 | Good 4-3 | Average 3-2 | Fair 2-1 | Score |
|--|--|------------------------------------|---|---|-------|
| Software Design | Clearly stated objectives and rationale; specific hypothesis/predictions; appropriate research methods (including statistics); production of reliable data | Some elements deficient or missing | Many, but not most, elements deficient or missing | Objectives/rationale not clearly stated; lack of hypothesis or predictions; flawed methodology and/or analysis; inadequate data to draw conclusions | |
| Originality & Significance | New research question; creativity in Software interpretation; study and results are important and shed new light on the issue; suggests adequate methods/procedures; clear case for importance of research in larger context | Some elements deficient or missing | Many, but not most, elements deficient or missing | Does not add significant value to existing literature; poor case for importance of research in larger context | |
| Organization | Distinct introduction outlining the talk and providing rationale for research; distinct middle section with clear explanation of the complex techniques and main results; distinct conclusion section with a summary of the important results and ideas, a clear take home message, and applications to future work clearly defined. | Some elements deficient or missing | Many, but not most, elements deficient or missing | Important background information and rationale lacking; difficult to follow research design; failure to put the work into a larger context, including how the results contribute to the scientific knowledge in the field and what future directions to take. | |
| Delivery | Clear speech with an appropriate tempo; no distractive movements or gestures; maintained audience attention with eye contact, voice inflection, facial expression; avoided jargon and used simple language; talk was targeted appropriately to the audience | Some elements deficient or missing | Many, but not most, elements deficient or missing | Tempo was either too fast, too slow, or often "broken"; speaker had a distractive movement; speaker didn't engage with the audience; speech was full of jargon and not targeted appropriately to the audience | |
| Visual aids & Technical aspects | Well-constructed, easy-to-interpret images/figures/tables that are used effectively; slides easy to read and not overcrowded; easily viewable slides with no typos or slides out of order; familiarity with A/V equipment, including smooth transitions | Some elements deficient or missing | Many, but not most, elements deficient or missing | Projection of color choices and slide layouts difficult to read; speaker didn't project well enough to be heard over entire room; went through some slides too fast; overcrowded slides; multiple typos | |
| Ability to field questions | Stimulated interesting questions, not just clarification of the technical aspects of the work; repeated or paraphrased questions and answered them appropriately; demonstrated a depth of knowledge about the field and was able to critically apply this knowledge to his/her own work. | Some elements deficient or missing | Many, but not most, elements deficient or missing | Few questions generated about the content beyond clarification of technical aspects; answered questions inappropriately due to failure to understand the question and/or the larger context of the field | |
| TOTAL (out of 30 possible): | | | | | |

Additional Comments: