RESEARCH SEMINAR: MEDC 690 Guidelines

- Seminar titles are to be decided by graduate students in consultation with their faculty advisor. Spring seminars should fall under the category of "Methodologies of Medicinal Chemistry Research". Examples of these seminars include synthetic organic chemistry methods, biophysical chemistry techniques, biochemical methodologies, molecular modeling, computational chemistry techniques, enzyme analysis, structural biology techniques, gene analysis methods, etc. Each topic should be drawn from these broad themes. The chosen topic(s) should not closely or narrowly relate to the student's graduate research topic.
- Seminar titles for Spring semester (1st Yr PhD and MS students) will be submitted to the coordinator of MEDC 690 before December 1st. Seminar titles for Fall semester (2nd Yr PhD students and others) will be submitted to the coordinator before July 31st. It is strongly advised that MS and PhD graduating students inform the coordinator of MEDC 690 of their intent to present their final research seminar as early as possible.
- The group of students presenting seminar in consultation with the coordinator will determine the dates of presentations. The coordinator's decision will be final.
- Attendance at each student presentation is important for all MS and PhD students. At least 80% attendance is mandatory.
- One week before the seminar, the student will circulate an abstract to all members of the Department. The seminar abstract is an overview of the presentation. It should neither be too vague nor too detailed. It should highlight importance of the topic that will be presented, its relevance and summarize the highlights of the presentation to follow. It should stand alone (implying that if a reader should be able to grasp important points by reading the abstract alone). A video available from http://videos.med.wisc.edu/videoInfo.php?videoid=665 may be referred to for additional insight.
- The seminar abstract will contain the following information: the title, date of seminar, the presenter's name, the body of information to be covered in the presentation, and appropriate bibliography. Guidelines for the format of abstract are made available in a MS Word template, which can be requested from the Secretary of the Department. An inappropriately prepared abstract may be returned to the student for revision and resubmission, and may receive a lower grade. The format of bibliography should be as described in the template. If these guidelines are not enough, the format should follow *J. Med. Chem.* guidelines. Please see http://pubs.acs.org/userimages/ContentEditor/1230948856355/jmcmar authguide.pdf.
- The seminar abstract should be circulated in an electronic format, such as an e-mail attachment. Please use an appropriate software to convert your text file into print document format (pdf) format. For e-mail circulation, the student will provide a copy of the abstract to the Secretary of the Department, who will forward it to all Department members.
- Seminar evaluation will be performed by the faculty, students, post-doctoral fellows, and scientists of the Department.
- An evaluation form will be handed to each student in the beginning of the seminar for grading. An evaluation will not be used, if evaluator's name section is left blank.
- Each student present for the full seminar will critique the day's presentation. Evaluation will be performed independently by each student without any discussion at the end of the question and answer session. Evaluation should be completed within 15 minutes of the conclusion of the seminar. Each student is expected to bring his/her writing instrument for this purpose.

- The presenter will also perform a self-evaluation at the end of the seminar using the same evaluation form provided to others.
- The MEDC690 seminar committee will review each critique and assign a seminar grade.
- At the end of the semester or year, the evaluations performed by each student will be handed over to both the student's advisor and the Chairman of the Department of Medicinal Chemistry. These evaluations will be deposited in the evaluator's Department file as a record of his/her teaching and service activities, and may provide useful information for recommendation letters. Students falling short of the 80% attendance will have to undertake compensating activity, which will be decided by the MEDC 690 Seminar Committee.
- Post-doctoral fellows, visiting scholars, etc. are expected to be present for each seminar in the Department. Evaluation of student seminars is required for these scholars and is in the interest of their professional development. The evaluations performed by each scholar will form a permanent record of his/her teaching and service activities, and may provide useful information for recommendation letters. The evaluations performed by each post-doctoral fellow and visiting scholar will be collated and handed over to both his/her advisor at the end of the seminar program.

Name of Evaluator																							
Name of Presenter: Date:																							
Title of Presentation:								_															
[NOTE: 1 = exceptional; 2 = outstanding; 3 = excellent; 4 = very good; 5 = good; 6 = satisfactory; 7 = fair; 8 = marginal; 9 = poor									oor]														
I.	ABSTRACT																•					-	
1.	 Did you read the abstract? Does the abstract convey important points clearly? Circle <u>YES</u> or <u>NO</u> If <u>NO</u> , Skip to Section II										II												
2.																							
3.	3. Did you find the abstract useful?																						
4. Does the abstract adequately represent the material presented in the seminar?5. Does the abstract follow the recommended guidelines (pg limits, fonts, references, etc.)																							
Additional Comments on ABSTRACT (if any) {Please Write LEGIBLY}																							
	PRESENTAT																						
 Were the slides easy to read? Was information easy to interpret? Were the slides or audio-visual aids organized in a logical, well thought-out manner? 																							
3. Did the presenter convey information with clarity?											Ш												
4. Did the presenter demonstrate ability to speak before an audience?																							
<u>A</u>	dditional Comi	ments	on PR	ESE	NTA	TIC	N {]	Please	Writ	e L	EG	IBL	Y}										
_																							
III.	TOPIC																						
1.	Was the topi	c han	dled ap	prop	riate	ely (i	.e., v	was it j	ust r	ight	t/to	o fo	cuse	d/to	o g	gener	al?)						
2.	2. Was the subject matter seemingly accurate and the literature well reviewed?																						
3. Was appropriate historical context presented?4. Was appropriate current work included in the presentation?5. Was appropriate relevance presented?																							
6.	Did the stude	ent dis	splay a	ppro	priat	e int	eres	t in pre	senti	ing	the	top	ic?										
7.	Did the stude	ent ev	oke yo	ur in	teres	st thi	ougl	h the p	eser	ıtati	ionʻ	?											
8. Does the student appear to possess a thorough understanding of the subject matter?												\dashv											
<u>A</u>	dditional Comi	ments	on TC	PIC	{Ple	ase	Writ	e LEG	BL	/ }													
IV.	QUESTION A	AND A	ANSW	ER	Sess	ion																	
1.	Did the stude	ent an	swer q	uesti	ons	accu	ratel	y and	onc	isel	y?												
2. Does the student possess a good understanding of the subject as evidenced by the Q&A session								n?															
Additional Comments on QUESTION & ANSWER {Please Write LEGIBLY}								l															
															•								
_																							

V.	ANY OTHER COMMENT(S): {Please Write LEGIBLY}
-	
•	
-	