

Seminar Evaluation Form

Seminar given by:

Date:

Please rank the following items on a scale of 1 – 5, where 1 is least and 5 is greatest.

1. **Scientific significance.** To what extent did the presenter adequately communicate the significance of the research reported? Scientific significance may be expressed in terms of actual or potential applications to technology *and/or* contributions to understanding fundamental principles or phenomena in nature. _____
2. **Introduction.** To what extent was sufficient background/introductory material presented? Were you able to understand the material presented? Did the introductory material logically lead to a central hypothesis or statement of the research problem to be addressed? Was the basis and rationale for the experimental approach clear? _____
3. **Knowledge of subject.** To what extent did the speaker exhibit a good grasp of the material presented? Was the expertise of the presenter undermined by misstatements, factual errors, or omission of important details? What level of questions was the speaker able to field from the audience? _____
4. **Clarity of presentation.** To what extent did the presenter pass on his or her knowledge of the subject to the audience? Were the experiments and the data derived from them clearly described? Was superfluous information kept to a minimum? With what level of confidence could you give a brief summary of the talk to a peer unable to attend the talk? _____
5. **Quality of visual aids.** To what extent did the speaker make effective use of visual aids? Were all aspects of each slide clearly visible (images, annotation, text, etc.)? Was the text used necessary and succinct? Was the large majority of information available on each slide used, or were there large amounts of superfluous data? Were images clear and sharp or were they highly pixelated and/or distorted? Were the slides consistent (same size and type of fonts used throughout, side-by-side graphs/images sized appropriately, etc.)? Did the speaker undermine his or her credibility by using distracting “cute” clipart, animations, and/or sound effects? Was the talk distracted by *foreseeable* technological glitches? _____
6. **Quality of presentation.** Was the presentation logically organized? Were the experiments and the data obtained from them presented in a logical manner? Were conclusions logical and supported by the data? Was a rational summary and conclusion presented at the end of the seminar? Did the speaker exhibit good public speaking form (i.e., clearly audible voice, well-articulated words and phrasing, eye contact, poise and confidence, absence of awkward “uhms” and “ahs”, effective and *safe* use of laser pointer). _____
7. **Summary score.** Provide an overall rating for the presentation. A good way to think about this is in terms of a seminar given as part of a job interview. If you were an employer and the speaker was a job applicant, rank your likelihood of hiring him or her on the basis of this presentation. (In scientific careers, this is not at all out of the realm of possibility). _____

Additional constructive comments for the speaker on his/her presentation: