**PRESENTATION + DISCUSSION**

**Instructions**

1. By January 29, [sign up](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/18grMYMWR7Y3mMVAiY1evxY9X3v55mAtMnbF-non50iw/edit#gid=0) to present/facilitate during two sessions this semester.
2. By the Monday at 12pm preceding your session, update the [schedule](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/18grMYMWR7Y3mMVAiY1evxY9X3v55mAtMnbF-non50iw/edit#gid=0) with your chosen paper.
3. Within 48 hours following your presentation, please upload your materials (slides, questions) to Canvas with a note about which of these you would like added to the schedule.

**Description**

An essential part of research is reading papers with attention, discussing them thoughtfully with peers, and understanding how the ideas in those papers might inform your work. We will practice these skills by reading and discussing papers in a supportive intellectual environment. We will break each session into two 35-minute blocks, including a presentation (~ 20 minutes) and guided discussion (~ 15 minutes) led by the facilitator. Before the session, the facilitator must choose a paper and post it on the course schedule before noon on the Monday preceding their session, at the latest. A list of candidate papers is available at [this link](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VoTfdo1cQeCqdlkuqPfEhhokaCXTwuDHe6tOarYaNRQ/edit). You are welcome to propose a different paper – just check with me in advance. Each session has been associated with a research area within selective inference, and you should sign up for two of them on [this schedule](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/18grMYMWR7Y3mMVAiY1evxY9X3v55mAtMnbF-non50iw/edit#gid=0) by January 29. Anyone who hasn’t signed up by this point will be assigned randomly. If you want to present a paper on a particular area (e.g., knockoffs) and that session is full, we can adjust the schedule so that some topics are discussed for more/fewer weeks than currently planned.

During your twenty-minute presentation, you should review the main ideas of your paper. You *should not* cover everything that is included in the paper. Instead, select the most relevant aspects of the motivation, approach, and results. You are encouraged to think creatively about special cases, visual explanations, or metaphors that will help communicate the paper’s main ideas. Depending on the subject, it may be worthwhile to include a short primer on the background or terminology used in the paper. You should think critically about the research: are there aspects of the work that you found more convincing than others? Finally, we encourage you to highlight the elements of the paper that are less clear to you. Often, the opaque areas are the most promising avenues for future developments. You are free to use whatever presentation medium that you are most comfortable with, including slides, a chalkboard talk, or a mix (annotating prepared figures).

For the fifteen-minute discussion, you should prepare 2 – 3 questions for group discussion. These questions should be open-ended enough to warrant deep discussion yet narrow enough to ensure discussion does not devolve into blanket statements about the general topic. A successful conversation creates opportunities for clarifying difficult ideas, engaging in controversial points, and discovering connections with other work. A good facilitator ensures that all participants feel welcome to contribute and that no subset of voices dominates the discussion. When a discussant does not develop an idea as fully as it could be, the facilitator should ask follow-up questions that encourage further elaboration.

**Rubric**

For each of your sessions, you will be scored according to the following criteria.

*Precision* (5 points): Avoids vague statements and thoughtfully uses scientific language.

*Perspective* (5 points): Clearly differentiates between central and secondary issues in the presented paper. Provides commentary on which aspects of the research they find convincing.

*Facilitation* (5 points): Listens carefully to all participants during facilitation and encourages a balanced, substantive discussion.

*Clarity* (5 points): Logically describes the research, introduces original visuals, diagrams, tables, or metaphors to communicate complex ideas.