Hoatlin Lab
BIOCHEMISTRY AND MOLECULAR BIOLOGY
Oregon Health and Science University, Portland, OR
Laboratory Rotation Evaluation

STUDENT'S NAME:

ROTATION MENTOR:

DATE:

ROTATION (please mark one)

11-Week Rotations	Semester Rotations
☐ 1 of 3 ☐ 2 of 3 ☐ 3 of 3	☐ 1 of 2 (Fall Semester) ☐ 2 of 2 (Spring Semester)

EVALUATION

	Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average
Communication Skills				
Ability to organize facts and ideas				
Motivation				
Reliability				
Ability to handle stress				
Ability to interact well with colleagues				
Ability to function independently				
Bench Skills				
Ability to design well-controlled experiments				
Ability to interpret data				

Circle One:

Yes / No Attended and participated in lab meetings.
Yes / No Apparently attended appropriate seminars.
Yes / No Apparently read about relevant research in current journals, etc.

Please answer the following questions on a separate sheet and attach to this form.

1. Briefly describe the rotation project.
2. Was sufficient progress made toward the initial goals? Please elaborate.
3. Describe strengths of this student's research and abilities.
4. Describe weaknesses of this student's research and abilities.
5. Based on your observations, will this student be ready to begin thesis research by the end of Year 2? Please elaborate.
6. Based on your observations, will this student be able to complete a Ph.D. thesis project? Please elaborate.
7. Overall evaluation / additional comments.

GRADE

REVIEW

Was this evaluation reviewed with the student? _____ Yes _____ No

_____ Student's initials (indicating evaluation was reviewed)

BIOCHEMISTRY AND MOLECULAR BIOLOGY
Journal Club Presentation Evaluation

GENERAL

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Sufficient background material was presented.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. The introduction answered the question, "Why were the experiments done?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Specific observations from prior research were described.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. A brief description of the experimental system was provided.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Only images / experiments critical for understanding the paper were presented.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Conclusions from the individual experiments were summarized well.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. The main conclusion was presented clearly.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Presenter distinguished what was shown from what was speculated by the authors.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Presenter suggested the next important experiments to perform.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. I am familiar with this field.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

CONSTRUCTIVE COMMENTS

EVALUATOR ☐ Student ☐ Postdoc ☐Faculty

_____
Date