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1. Background

The Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem (BOBLME) Project has been supporting communications workshops since July 2010. Unlike earlier workshops, with applicants from the eight countries surrounding the Bay of Bengal, this course was co-sponsored and hosted by the Marine Biological Association of India (MBAI). It was aimed at early-career Indian marine scientists, with the overall objectives of: building communication capacity; improving presentation skills; and increasing confidence in talking with the media. The MBAI put out a call for applicants and short-listed potential participants. Twenty (20) trainees from eight cities and 14 agencies/universities were selected on the basis of their preparedness (analysed data sets) to participate in the workshop (Appendix I).

2. Introduction

The Scientific Presentation Workshop was held from 18 to 21 November in the Hotel Beaumonde Fern Ecotel Kochi, India. This was a follow-on from the Scientific Writing Workshop held at the Hotel Travencore from 13 to 16 October. The workshops were supported by Dr Chris O’Brien (Regional Coordinator, Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem (BOBLME)) and organised by Dr K. Sunil Mohamed (Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute (CMFRI)). The workshop was designed and conducted by Dr Peter Rothlisberg (Australia) with the assistance of five in-region Mentors: Dr Sevvandi Jayakody (Sri Lanka); Dr W.M.H. Kelum Wijenayeke (Sri Lanka), Dr E. Vivekanandan (India); Dr S. Ajmal Khan (India) and Dr V. Kripa (India).

2.1. Objective

The objective of the workshop was to provide training to enhance effective communication of the results of research projects to stakeholders and the broader scientific community through oral presentations. Here we built on the manuscripts prepared at the October Scientific Writing Workshop. Many of the participants were able use the month between workshops to complete their manuscripts by consulting with co-authors and supervisors as well as some of the workshop mentors.

2.2. Approach

The course was designed to be an interactive –‘learn-by-doing’ – workshop. The first 2 days of the 4-day workshop were divided into short lectures (25%) and practical exercises (75%) with the ultimate aim to produce a 5 minute scientific presentation by the end of the second days (Appendix II. Course Agenda).

Participants were paired with a peer – a ‘Buddy’ – to provide feedback on various stages of the development of their presentation. Further, participants were assigned to a Mentor (one of the five in-region Facilitators) for feedback and advice throughout the workshop (Appendix III. Participants,
Buddies & Mentors). The Student to Mentor ratio was 4:1 which allowed a very high degree of interaction. The third and fourth days were spent delivering and videotaping the presentations and providing feedback to participants from peers and mentors. This year BOBLME hired a professional company to produce high quality videos. Each participant received an electronic copy of their presentation. In addition, there were short tutorials on preparing posters for scientific meetings and dealing with the media. Participants were also given a hand-out of a selection of slides of the main presentation (Appendix VIII).

3. Workshop effectiveness

Participants were very enthusiastic, arriving early each morning and staying beyond the appointed finish time each day. Uptake of the workshop material was very high. This was surprising, given the different levels of experience and preparedness of the participants, with the majority gaining a great deal of insight into the presentation process. The amount of interaction amongst the participants and with mentors and facilitators was greatly enhanced compared to the Scientific Writing Workshop the previous month. This is probably due to enhanced familiarity with and growing confidence by participants.

Participants were asked to create a 5 minute presentation (solid blue line) based on the manuscript developed at the previous workshop. The overall average of the 20 presentations was 6.7 min (dashed blue line). On the first day the first 10 talks had a mean time of 7.8 minutes and a range from 5.8 to 12.6 minutes. Clearly, these speakers had not paid enough attention to the given time limit. We talked about the importance of keeping to time and challenged the 10 speakers on the following day to do better. The mean time for day two was 5.6 minutes with a range of 4.6 to 7.4 minutes – one talk was exactly 5 minutes and 3 others were within 15 seconds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Time (min)</th>
<th>target = 5.0 min</th>
<th>mean = 6.7 min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After each talk participants gave feedback to each speaker using a Video Playback Reflection form as a guide (Appendix IV). The command of the English language was variable, but by and large the delivery of talks was very proficient and articulate. Use of PowerPoint technology was also of a high standard, in some cases very high. Beyond not meeting the time limit, the most common feedback from and to participants was the need for better ‘engagement’ between the speakers and the audience. While all participants spoke without notes, most had to turn their backs on the audience and speak to their slides – a little or a lot. This diminished audience engagement which is often the biggest difference between a good and a bad presentation. Better engagement comes with confidence (organisation, preparation, and practice) and then experience. This was acknowledged by participants and increased confidence was evident even during the 4-day workshop – both in the presentations and offering feedback (Appendix VII. Participant feedback comments).

4. Workshop feedback

At the completion of the workshop, participants were asked to fill in a Feedback Form to gauge satisfaction with and suitability of elements, along with suggestions for changes to future workshops (Appendix V. Course feedback form). All Participants returned the form. A tabular summary of the feedback is provided in Appendix VI and written comments are in Appendix VII.

Overall the feedback was very positive. Most (97.5%) participants “Strongly agreed” or “Agreed” to all six questions about suitability and organisation of the Workshop (Appendix VI. Tabulation of workshop feedback results). Two respondents ‘Disagreed’ and one ‘Strongly disagreed’ implying that ‘The workshop had not assisted in my presentation skills and in the preparation of talks and media interviews.’ I must confess I have never had a participant ‘Strongly disagree’ before and because she signed the form I was able to look into this participant’s feedback and performance more carefully. In her written feedback (see Participant 6, Appendix VII for verbatim transcription) she comments that the talks are too short – and nothing else. Ironically, this participant delivered her talk in 4’59” – virtually 5 minutes exactly – so she met the challenge like no one else. Therefore, I am at a loss to understand her rating, because she met the challenge and made very complimentary remarks to me personally. Perhaps it was a misinterpretation of the Feedback form. The challenge of the 5-minute presentation was also mentioned by a few participants. While the 5 minute presentation length is arbitrary, it allows 20 talks to be heard and analysed in the time allowed (2 days); and is a demanding challenge on time management. All respondents would recommend the course to a colleague.

All 20 respondents ranked the workshop elements 1 to 7, with 1 being the most valuable element (Appendix V & VI). Presentation Principles was the element deemed the most valuable – nine placed it top; five placed it second; and two placed it third. Four participants wanted more of this element. Presentation delivery & feedback was the next most valued and eight participants wanted more time dedicated to this element. This was followed closely by Outline & Storyboard and Concept Planning; three participants wanted more of these elements. Audience Engagement was the next most highly ranked element. Preparing Posters and Dealing with the Media were ranked least valuable; but five participants wanted more training in these elements. Surprisingly, unlike previous workshops, 10 participants also suggested a reduction in the amount of time on Media element. I have a feeling that this represents the relative age and experience of the participants. Very few of the participants are in a position to need enhanced media skills at this stage of their careers; but Participant 1 asked for some formal training in his comments (Appendix VII).

At the conclusion of the workshop all participants were given a Certificate and two books recommended at the workshops: David Lindsay’s Scientific Writing = Thinking in Words; and Garr Reynolds’ presentationzen. The participants reciprocated by giving model boats to the organisers.
5. Future presentation workshops

Overall I think both workshops went very well. Clearly the selection process used by MBAI to vet participants paid dividends. The participants were ready to prepare a manuscript and equally keen to talk about their results. I would encourage the organisers to continue to use this selection process.

The presentations were generally of a high standard. While participants were slow and even reluctant to interact and share constructive criticism with their peers and mentors at the outset of each workshop, they opened up and engaged as time went on and confidences was built; this was especially evident during the last 2 days of the Presentation workshop.

While time limitations of talks and the workshop itself were common comments I think the discipline and demands of each are worth maintaining.

6. Acknowledgements

The workshop was enhanced a great deal by the intellect and effort of the five in-region facilitators/mentors: Dr Sevvandi Jayakody; and Dr Kelum Wijenayeke (Sri Lanka), Dr E. Vivekananadan, Dr Aimal Khan, and Dr V Kripa (India). They all worked tirelessly with participants at both the Writing workshop in October, and then during the current Presentation workshop to develop the written word and bring it to the screen.
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## Appendix I  List of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution/Location</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mr Shardul S. Gangan</td>
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<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mr A. Siva</td>
<td>Fisheries Survey India (FSI), Visakhapatnam</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sivafsi2006@gmail.com">sivafsi2006@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ms Rajashree Bhoopal Sanadi</td>
<td>Fisheries Survey India (FSI), Mumbai</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rajanadi30@gmail.com">rajanadi30@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mr P. Karthick</td>
<td>Pondicherry University, Port Blair</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karthickmicrobes@gmail.com">karthickmicrobes@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mr Rajool Shanis C.P</td>
<td>Centre for Marine Living Resources and Ecology (CMLRE), Kochi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rshanis@gmail.com">rshanis@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms Sajeela K. A  
National Bureau of Fish Genetic Resources (NBFGR)  
Kochi  
sajeelaka@gmail.com

Mr. R. Mohan  
Integrated Coastal and Marine Area Management (ICMAM)  
Chennai  
rethinamohan@gmail.com

Mr. J. Ganesh  
Loyola College  
Chennai  
jvpghanesh@gmail.com

Ms Abhijna U. G  
Kerala University Trivandrum  
abhijna_ug@yahoo.co.in

Ms Reshma Dilip Pitale  
Bombay Natural History Society (BNHS)  
Maharashtra  
pitalereshma@gmail.com

Ms R. Remya  
Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute (CMFRI)  
Kochi  
remyarraj@gmail.com

Dr. Mosuru Srinivasa Rao  
Andhra University  
Visakhapatnam  
sriveer_136@yahoo.co.in

Ms Anjusha A  
National Institute of Oceanography (NIO)  
Kochi  
anjusha333@gmail.com

Ms Arya P. Mohan  
National Institute of Oceanography (NIO)  
Kochi  
aryamhn@gmail.com
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Prajith K.K</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Laly S. J</td>
<td>Central Institute of Fisheries Technology (CIFT)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:laly_jawahar@yahoo.co.in">laly_jawahar@yahoo.co.in</a></td>
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<td>Wayamba University of Sri Lanka</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hiranya_kelum@yahoo.com">hiranya_kelum@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Sevandi Jayakody</td>
<td>James Hutton Institute</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Peter C. Rothlisberg</td>
<td>Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)</td>
<td>Brisbane, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr V. Kripa</td>
<td>Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute (CMFRI) – Kochi</td>
<td>India</td>
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<td>Ms Melna Rodrigues</td>
<td>Marine Biological Association of India (MBAI)</td>
<td>Kochi, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Abhilash K. S.</td>
<td>Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute (CMFRI) – Kochi</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Nishan Sugathadasa</td>
<td>Regional Coordination Unit Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem Project</td>
<td>Phuket, Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr T. K. Pratheesh (Santosh)</td>
<td>Ocean Color Holidays</td>
<td>Cochin, India</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II  Course agenda

BOBLME – MBAI Scientific Presentation Workshop
18 to 21 November 2013 Kochi, India

Agenda

Day 1 – Define and organise the story

9.00 am  Welcome and Introduction (PR)

09.30 am  Concept planning – Define the Audience and the Story (PR)

10.00am  Individual work on Concept Plan – review by Buddy and Facilitator

11.00 Presentations of 2 minute drill/pitch

12.15 lunch

1.15pm  Organise the story – Outlines and Storyboards (PR)

1.45 pm  Individual work on Outlines and Storyboards

4.00 pm  Review of Concept Plan, Outline, Storyboard – Buddy & Facilitator

4.30 pm  Revision Outline and Storyboard

5.30 pm  Finish

Day 2 – Build the presentation

8.30 am  Qualities of good and bad presentations (PR)

9.00 am  Presentation principles (1) (PR)

10.30 am  Use of figures and tables (PR)

11.00 am  Presentation principles (2) (PR)

12.15 Lunch

1.00 pm  Individual work on presentation

3 pm  Review of presentation structure – Buddy and Mentor

5.30 pm finish
Day 3 – Deliver the presentation + Making Posters

8.30 am Individual presentations with peer and facilitator feedback
10.30 am Revision of presentations

12.15 Lunch

1.00 pm Individual presentations with peer and facilitator feedback
3.00 Revision of presentations

4.00 Making Posters (PR)

5.00 pm finish

Day 4 – Deliver the presentation + Dealing with the Media

8.30 am Individual presentations with peer and facilitator feedback
10.30 am Revision of presentations

12.15 Lunch

1.00 pm Individual presentations with peer and facilitator feedback
3.00 Revision of presentations

3.30 Dealing with the media (PR)

4.45 pm Workshop appraisal and feedback

5.00 pm finish
### Appendix III  Participants, buddies & mentors

**BOBLME-MBAI Presentation Workshop**  
18 to 21 November 2013, Kochi, India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Buddy</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Facilitators/Mentors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Shardul S. Gangan</td>
<td>Mohan</td>
<td>Sevvandi</td>
<td>Dr Peter Rothlisberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Pralaya Ranjan Behera</td>
<td>Ranjith</td>
<td>Kulum</td>
<td>Dr Sevvandi Jayakody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr L. Ranjith</td>
<td>Behera</td>
<td>Vivek</td>
<td>Dr W.M.H. Kelum Wijenayeke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Ranju R.</td>
<td>Laly</td>
<td>Ajmal</td>
<td>Dr E. Vivekanandan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A. Siva</td>
<td>Rajasree</td>
<td>Kripa</td>
<td>Dr S. Ajmal Khan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Rajasree Bhoopal Sanadi</td>
<td>Siva</td>
<td>Sevvandi</td>
<td>Dr V. Kripa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr P. Karthick</td>
<td>Ganesh</td>
<td>Kulum</td>
<td>Organisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Rajool Shanis C P.</td>
<td>Sajeela</td>
<td>Vivek</td>
<td>Dr Chris O'Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Sajeela K.A.</td>
<td>Rajool</td>
<td>Ajmal</td>
<td>Dr K. Sunil Mohamed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr R. Mohan</td>
<td>Shardul</td>
<td>Kripa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J. Ganesh</td>
<td>Karthick</td>
<td>Sevvandi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Abhijna U.G.</td>
<td>Prajith</td>
<td>Kulum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Reshma Dilip Pitale</td>
<td>Shrinivasa</td>
<td>Vivek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms R. Remya</td>
<td>Preetha</td>
<td>Ajmal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Mosuru Srinivasa Rao</td>
<td>Reshma</td>
<td>Kripa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Anjusha A.</td>
<td>Arya</td>
<td>Sevvandi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Arya P. Mohan</td>
<td>Anjusha</td>
<td>Kulum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Prajith K.K.</td>
<td>Abijiana</td>
<td>Vivek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Laly S.J.</td>
<td>Ranju</td>
<td>Ajmal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Preetha G. Nair</td>
<td>Remya</td>
<td>Kripa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix IV  Video playback reflection form

![Video Playback Reflection Form](image)

Make a note of what you and others observed about your performance in the presentations, with a particular focus on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Energy</th>
<th>Stance</th>
<th>Use of Gestures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Projection</td>
<td>Vocal Tone</td>
<td>Vocal Articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Range</td>
<td>Vocal Pace</td>
<td>Use of Pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience Engagement</td>
<td>Value of Storytelling</td>
<td>Value of Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Message</td>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
<td>What you were feeling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

©AGSM 2009  CSIRO Leading the Research Enterprise
Appendix V  Course feedback form

BOBLME-MBAI
Scientific Presentation Workshop
18 to 21 November 2013, Kochi, India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback form</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The workshop was well organized.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workshop met my expectations / needs.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workshop has assisted me in my presentation skills and in the preparation of talks and media interviews.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructions and examples were clear and understandable.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The format of the workshop was relevant and well organized.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The time allocation for the workshop components was appropriate.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you recommend this workshop to your colleague?</td>
<td>Yes ☐</td>
<td>No ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which aspect of the workshop did you find most valuable (please rate in order with 1 as the most valuable)

- Concept planning and focus
- Outlines and storyboard
- Presentation principles
- Audience engagement principles
- Presentation delivery & feedback
- Preparing Posters
- Dealing with the Media
Which session would you have liked to have had more time for?

Which session would you have liked to have had less time for?

Additional comments or suggestions about this workshop.

Name: (Optional)..................................................................................................
## Appendix VI  Tabulation of workshop feedback results

BOBLME-MMF Scientific Presentation Workshop (18 to 21 November 2013) -- Feedback numerical evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant number</th>
<th>Concept planning</th>
<th>Outline &amp; Story board</th>
<th>Presentation Principles</th>
<th>Audience Engagement</th>
<th>Presentation delivery &amp; Feedback</th>
<th>Preparing Posters</th>
<th>Dealing with Media</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Recommend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mean/Total         | 3.4              | 3.2                    | 2.2                    | 3.7                  | 3.0                  | 5.7                  | 6.8                   | 77             | 40     | 2         | 1                   | 20       |

| Rank Wanted        | 4                | 3                      | 1                      | 5                    | 2                    | 6                    | 7                     | 4              | 3      | 2         |                    | 10       |

| More               | 1                | 2                      | 4                      | 8                    | 3                    | 2                     | 8                     | 1              | 1      | 1         |                    | 10       |

| Less               | 2                | 3                      | 3                      | 1                    | 10                   | 10                    | 2                     | 1              | 1      | 1         |                    | 10       |
Appendix VII  Participant feedback comments

Participant 1 – The workshop was well organised with good group of researchers in the field of marine sciences. The organisers (BOBLME-MBAI) of the communicating workshop nicely and I hope we get another media training to make the workshop complete. The mentors presenters makes the workshop on the right path. I really learnt the way to communicate and I will get it back to our colleagues and students.

Participant 2 – First of all hearty thanks to Dr Sunil Mohammed for giving this opportunity. I am thank to Dr Peter Rothlisberg for getting the knowledge of paper writing and presentation. I think all mentors and Dr Chris, Dr Santhosh and CMFRI staff also. Last but not least I thank BOBLME and MBAI. “Everything excellent”.

Participant 3 – I think the workshop was very informative and helped a lot in building confidence level. Mentors were good facilitators as they constantly helped and kept in check of our performance level, whether if we understood our storyline well or not. They gave a lot of suggestions that included valuable criticisms. Peter Sir was an exceptional personality, I was very much impressed from the way he managed to get into our brains and worked out the questions and solved our confusions about a good scientific communication. He was very punctual and very simple. He extended his thoughts freely to us. I just want to thank all the people behind this great workshop. Feeling blessed and happy to have been here in the workshop.

Participant 4 – I truly beneficial workshop, experienced the help to make a good presentation. If some of the mentors are giving some presentations it will be more interesting to note how they are presenting the ideas.

Participant 5 – The workshop was very informative and interesting. Presentation delivery time (choice of each presenter) should be decided based also on the content and status of the preparations. Mentors should take care of the status of the preparation before the delivery.

Participant 6 – Presentation time for each candidate should be more than 5 min. Questions about scientific content are not relevant. In order to present the story of scientific paper which are complicated, 10 minutes minimum needed. So time should be given 5-10 minutes. It will take one or two minutes for a person to get comfortable with the stage and mike, so I think ten minutes (max) will be perfect. Thank you.

Participant 7 – I think this workshop is most productive. I extend my heart full thanks to Chris sir and Peter sir for your valuable suggestions and comment delivering the scientific things. I am so much happy for attending the workshop. As I can improved my presentation skill during two months period because of your contribution. I am so much impressed about the input I got during four day workshop.

Participant 8 – Well organised. Very much effective for the freshness. Great the information regarding the time management. The buddies and the mentors very much helped us to prepare the slides and presentations. Thank you.

Participant 9 – Very informative workshop. I am a more confident person now regarding public speaking and also got important tips in time management. Thank you.
Participant 10 – I learnt lot and lots of messages/tips from this valuable workshops and I have a confidence to present a paper. Especially you peoples build and mold me to be a confident person. Finally it is a fantastic workshop.

Participant 11 – This workshop made me learn very essential things about the scientific presentation. Earlier I was thinking of keeping every data & results in the PowerPoint will give more credit to the author. Now I came to know that how we have to divide different parts of the presentations on the basis of time available. And what parts of the presentation should be given importance.

Participant 12 – Everything planned well. Young scientists are ignited good perform to start writing and presentation. Thanks for the opportunity. Thank you very much.

Participant 13 – Workshop was very well organised. I would like to say that there was very less time given for PowerPoint presentation. The comments suggested by mentors was incorporated in the slides during last minute. So there were some discrepancies occurred in style and font size of the material. Overall the workshop was very well organised. Comments received from the mentors were very very useful. And this workshop has boost our confidence a lot.

Participant 15 – Great experience, more than a workshop!!! All feedbacks about the presentation may be a driving force for me to improve in the future....

Participant 16 – I attended first this like workshop. It is only one workshop, I fully utilized the time. I have got a lot of tips to improve the presentation. Every mentors are very helpful. I have got my good feedback from my friend when showed my presentation (video). He compared my old presentation. Really it is very very benefit for me. I hope I can share the good of valuable experience with my friends. One suggestion: Presentations workshop should be want one week. It will help repeat the presentations and improve our presenters skill.

Participant 17 – Helped very well to understand the shortcoming of our presentation style. It is my second experience like this. This is with good peer and facilitator feedback. It increased the confidence for future presentation. Overall it is excellent.... I will recommend it to my friends.

Participant 18 – I am very happy to have been participated in both of the schedule of the workshop. A little bit of suggestion that I have to put forward is the suggestion given by the audiences regarding oral presentations has to be dealt with all of us. And make it more interactive. Interactive sessions has to be incorporated in order to brush up more ideas and improve some more confidence level. Thanking you. Yours faithfully.

Participant 19 – The workshop fulfilled the necessity of my expectations and overall they organised well. I would like to suggest something regarding the time allotment for presentations. I feel the time allotment for presentations instead of 5 minutes 8 minutes could be more recommendable because it is easy to explain the story for the long duration research works. I would like thank to the organizing committee and funding bodies for providing this wonderful opportunity for me. I personally thank to all mentors and participants for their support during this workshop.

Participant 20 – Excellent – Excellent – Excellent
Appendix VIII  Main training presentation hand-out

Science Presentation Workshop
Peter Rothlisberg
18 to 21 November 2013
Kochi, India

Setting the stage
How you engage
Message
What's your point?
Audience
Why does it matter?
Impact!

The Power of a Story
Conflict
Contrasts
Problem, Cause, Solution
Emotions

"Forget PowerPoint and statistics, to involve people at the deepest level you need to tell stories"
Robert McKee

Define the Story
Core of message/story
Focus
Too much for one presentation?
Tailor message/story to Audience!
Conclusion: Take home message

Define the Story (2)
Need
Approach
Supporting evidence
Evaluation
Conclusion

"I don't know where our ideas came from but it wasn't a laptop"
John Cleese

Define the Story (3)
2-minute drill – narrative
Too long?
Too much?
Unfocussed?
Did they get it?
Who's confused?
Content tighter & clearer – to you & listener
Early exposure – vulnerable & confronting
Example
Most important information first provides framework for detail that follows

**Organise the Story**
- Roadmap – Story board
- Set out sections:
  - Need
  - Approach
  - Supporting evidence
  - Evaluation
  - Conclusion – take home message
- Fill in sections:
  - 2 to 5 points → possible text slides
  - Possible graphs, tables, illustrations

**Slide design – more analogue**

**Slide sorter**
Building the Presentation

You’ve focused the Story  
You’ve known the Audience  
You’ve got the Roadmap  
You know the Venue  
You have a Time limit  
**NOW it’s time to build the Presentation**

Qualities of good/bad talks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>Read slides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging</td>
<td>Incoherent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humorous</td>
<td>Too fast/slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversational</td>
<td>Didn’t engage with audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>No feeling/emotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credible</td>
<td>Wrong slides – voice/ slides disconnected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong visuals, limited text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presentation principles (1)

Presentations don’t need slides  
Simplicity & Clarity = Impact  
Slides MUST complement not compete  
Use a Handout for detail  
Most pub tables & graphs unsuitable  
Graphs > tables  
Stick to time  
**Never need to apologise**

Publication vs. Presentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audience – narrow/expert</td>
<td>Audience – broader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td>Listen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences, paragraphs</td>
<td>Phrases, dot points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time – labs (hours)</td>
<td>Time – little (4 sec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance – arm’s length</td>
<td>Distance – metres to vast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detail</td>
<td>Broad brush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Supporting evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tables &amp; Figures</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion &amp; Conclusion</td>
<td>Take home message</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six x six ‘rule’

- No more than six dot points
- No more than six words/point
- No more than six dot points
- No more than six words/point
- No more than six dot points
- No more than six words/point

**Banana prawn stock collapse: 3 hypotheses**
Report of the BOBLME-MBAI scientific presentation workshop

**Less is More**

**Information hierarchy in Notes Page view**

- Headline
- Graphic
- Narrative

**Climate change & sea level rise**

People  Place  Change

**Simplicity!**

*Hara hachi bu*

Eat only up to 80% full.

Empty space can convey a feeling of quality, sophistication and importance

**Slideument!**

**Which is better?**

Number of bikes sold 2002-2007

Over 5,000 bikes sold in 2007

*From presentationzen* (2006)
Photo or schematic?

Reference collection
"I apologise you can’t read this"

Reference collection

6 Genera 16 Species 5 Penaeus

P. esculentus Brown tiger prawn
P. semisulcatus Grooved tiger prawn
P. merguiensis Common banana prawn
P. latisculatus Western king prawn
(P. indicus Indian banana prawn)

Use of colour

Don’t EVER write in RED on a blue background
or in BLUE on a red background

Use of colour (2)

DON’T use GREEN and RED to highlight text
or GREEN and RED in a graph

Use of colour (3)

If you need lots of colours in a graph it’s probably too complicated
4 to 6 max!

http://colorbrewer2.org/
Fonts

**Style**
Serif (Times New Roman), Sans Serif (Helvetica)

**Size**
- Age of audience
- 16 18 20 24 30pt

**Weight**
- contrast, not size alone
- It's not about you, it's about them
- Case = upper/lower
- Identification

Presentation principles (2)

DON’T read – notes or slides
Include only the most important points
Speak slowly
Speak clearly

**Be natural & show interest in subject**
Engage, re-engage the audience

Confidence

- Organisation builds confidence
- Preparation builds confidence
- Practice builds confidence

Balance

Data
Facts
Content

Simplicity
Clarity
Emotion

= Engagement

Audience engagement

- Make them **comfortable**
- Use **first** and **second** person (I/You)
- **Eye contact** = honesty
- **Smile** = glad to be there
- **Inflection** & the power of the **pause**
- **Body language** = hands, gestures
- **Podium** = barrier, separation, fortress
- **Effective content**
### Punchy & Sticky

- Personal
- Unexpected
- Novel
- Challenging
- Humorous

1. Simplicity
2. Unexpectedness
3. Concreteness
4. Credibility
5. Emotions
6. Stories

(Reynolds 2011)  
(Heath & Heath 2007)

### Leave time for Questions

- Courteous – well prepared & organised
- Chance to expand talk
- Valuable feedback from audience
  - did they get it?
  - was the message clear?
  - advice for subsequent manuscript
- New lines of research, job opportunities

**Troublesome questioner?**

### Helpful hints

- Don’t use outline – Get into the story
- Avoid excessive bullet points
- Laser pointer or slide highlights
- Conclusion **not** regurgitation
  - Synthesis, Impact & Application
  - Take home message
- Ending alternatives
- Slides up your sleeve

### Opening & closing most important

- Don’t use outline – **Get into the story**
- Avoid excessive bullet points
- Laser pointer or slide highlights
- Conclusion not regurgitation
  - Synthesis, Impact & Application
  - **Take home message**
- Ending alternatives
- Slides up your sleeve

### TED

- Technology – Entertainment – Design

**Rob Harmon**

**Sarah Kay**
Report of the BOBLME-MBAI scientific presentation workshop

Posters

- Catch the eye
- Statement to arouse interest
- Justification with data
- Stimulate engagement – a conversation

Dealing with the media

- What’s your message?
- Why is it important?
- Interview preparation
- Stay on message – use bridging answers if needed
- Get media training!!

Looking back

Speaker-audience interaction = communication
You don’t need slides – they only enhance
Audience cannot read & listen at same time
Don’t confuse Slides with Notes or Handouts – beware of the Slideument!
PowerPoint is a tool not the Messenger
**Organisation, preparation, & practice** give confidence & allow a natural presentation

Impact!

- Clarity
- Simplicity

Presentation websites

**Presentationzen** by Garr Reynolds
http://www.presentationzen.com/

Seminar by Garr Reynolds
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DZ2vtQCESpk

Technology, Entertainment, Design (TED)
http://www.ted.com

Additional reading


Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Maldives, Myanmar, Sri Lanka and Thailand are working together through the Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem (BOBLME) Project and to lay the foundations for a coordinated programme of action designed to improve the lives of the coastal populations through improved regional management of the Bay of Bengal environment and its fisheries.

The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) is the implementing agency for the BOBLME Project.

The Project is funded principally by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), Norway, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, the FAO, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the USA.

For more information, please visit www.boblme.org