



PhD STUDENT AWARD &



YOUNG RESEARCHER AWARD



PhD Student (PhD) and Young Researcher (YR) speakers at the CTS-HYCON Workshop will contend for the **Best PhD Student Presentation Award** AND the **Best Young Researcher Presentation Award**. As the names indicate, the prizes honor the best presentations at the CTS-HYCON Workshop by a PhD Student for the first award and by a Young Researcher, i.e. a Doctor having less than 10 years of experience, for the second award. **The awards are given both for presentation technique and for scientific content.**

The Prize Commissioners are:

- **Professor George Bastin**
- **Professor Eduardo Camacho**
- **and Professor Gauthier Sallet**

The awards of the prize will proceed as follows. The chair of a session, in which a PhD or YR speaker gives a presentation and three senior volunteers in the audience, will fill out an evaluation form; an example of this form is attached. After the session the completed forms will be collected by the Prize Commissioners who will compute a ranking at the end of the Workshop. The winners will be chosen by the Prize Committees from the top five presentations in this ranking in each category (PhD and YR), after a thorough review of the scientific content. **For this, each speaker who wants to compete is requested to hand a copy of his/her slides to Françoise Lannabhi-Lagarrigue on arrival to the Workshop.**

The name of the winner will be communicated during the closing ceremony of the Workshop and posted on the Workshop's website. The prize includes a certificate for the top five presentations and a trophy for the winners.

Some detailed information concerning the prize competition is given below for the session chairs, for the volunteers in the audience who will complete the evaluation forms, and for the prize candidates.

For the session chairs: You will receive a set of envelopes corresponding to each of the PhD or YR who are giving a presentation during your session, as well as a spare envelope. Each envelope contains a set of four evaluation forms. Please find three volunteers in the audience (not belonging to the research group that the speaker comes from) who are willing to complete a form. Complete one form yourself. After the talk please collect the forms, check that they are indeed completed, and put them back into the envelope. Please hand all envelopes to one of the Prize Commissioners.

For the jurors: The Award depends on the efforts of those who volunteer as jurors; so your assistance is most appreciated. What we are asking you is to rate in a scale of 1 to 5 several parameters. Please tick one box in each line; take the leftmost box if you agree with the statement on the left, the rightmost box if the statement on the right seems adequate, or choose a box in between to indicate an intermediate position. The categories appearing on the form are to be interpreted as follows.

Questions 1 to 3 deal with the scientific content of the talk: the choice of the problem (question 1), the adequacy of the theoretical tools used to deal with the problem (question 2) and the results obtained (question 3). One can expect that scientific quality is very difficult to assess from the presentation alone. That's why we use these forms to create a short list of talks whose scientific content will be thoroughly reviewed before choosing a winner.

Question 4 asks whether the speaker clearly sets out what the talk is about and why the subject is of interest. Question 5 deals with several aspects of 'clarity'. The talk should be organized in a logical and well structured way, with the key issues clearly highlighted, the steps that lead to the realization of these goals clearly set out and subordinated to the main issues.

Question 6 deals with the way that the talk is concluded. The speaker should clearly summarize what was achieved in the work described in their research, and relate this to the goals stated at the beginning of the presentation.

Question 7 is about the speaker's use of English. Although full grammatical correctness is not an absolute requisite for effective communication, errors such as misuse of words and wrong pronunciation can be distracting and therefore should be counted negatively.

Finally, questions 8 and 9 deal with the speaker's ability to make effective use of facilities; question 8 is about the 'human' facilities (voice, facial expression, gestures, interaction with the audience), question 9 about the technical equipment (slides, overhead projector, ...).

Since the forms will be returned to the speaker, it will be helpful if you give some hints about what could be improved in the talk.

For the contestants: The ranking system associated with the prize is based on marks given by volunteers who probably do not all use the same standards, and so there is an unavoidable element of chance in the system. Therefore the prize should not be taken too seriously, and certainly should not give rise to an atmosphere of fierce competition. For the proud winner: congratulations. For all the others: the envelope with your results will be available immediately after the winner has been announced in the same room. Perusing marks and reading the suggestions that some jurors may have written on the reverse of the form, may give you some ideas of how to improve your presentation technique. Some of the remarks could be also taken into account in the final version of the paper which will be included in the book ISTE (before 25 July 2006).

For further information regarding the Awards, please contact the Chair of the Workshop.

Evaluation form for presentations

Speaker's NAME :.....

Session :.....

Competing for PhD Student Award (PhD Award)
or Young Researcher Award (YR Award) *(delete where inapplicable)*

Please tick one box in each line to indicate whether you agree more with the statement on the left or with the statement on the right. For additional remarks please use the reverse side; your suggestions will be appreciated!

	1	2	3	4	5	
1. The problem discussed is trivial or improperly formulated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The problem discussed is an important scientific issue
2. The approach to the problem is too elementary, haphazard, nonrigorous or otherwise inadequate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The approach is ingenious, rigorous and perfectly suited to the problem
3. Results are trivial, well known or clearly wrong	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Results are original and highly relevant
4. Speaker just plunged into the subject	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Speaker took care to introduce and motivate the goals of the talk
5. Impossible to understand connections between different issues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Main points carefully brought out, intermediate steps and subgoals well stated in a clear and logical sequence
6. Talk ended suddenly, conclusions not clear	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conclusions were clearly stated and focused on the key issues
7. Broken English, barely understandable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Clear and correct English
8. Monotone voice and behavior, avoidance or poor interaction with the audience	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Lively speech and performance. Speaker addressed directly the audience
9. Slides barely readable and/or too full; speaker messed with equipment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Slides were crisp and clear, speaker used all facilities smoothly

Comments and remarks to the speaker: