Jefferson Science Associates, LLC
Managing and Operating the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility
for the U.S. Department of Energy

FY2018 JSA Initiatives Fund Proposal Summary Sheet

Proposal title Jefferon Science Associates Promising Young Scientist Program

Project Start Date (month/year) 01/2018

Project End Date (month/year) 12/2018

○ New proposal ◉ Renewal

Total funds requested $2,700

Total leveraged support / matching funds. Details of funds must be included in budget proposal. $1,200

To be completed by JSA: Total funds awarded $1,000

Principal Investigator (PI) Rakitha S. Beminiwattha

Institutional affiliation
Mailing address
Email / phone #

Louisiana Tech University
P.O. Box 10348
Campus Box 10
Ruston, LA 71272
rakithab@jlab.org 3182572435

Co-PI (if more than 1, add pages with information)

Institutional affiliation
Mailing address
Email / phone #

Check one category: If PI is a Lab employee, your identification of the appropriate Associate Director below represents the acknowledgement of that AD with your submittal of proposal. No signature required.

○ Lab employee: Identify Associate Director (email / phone)

◉ Lab user: Identify University affiliation (email / phone)
Joint appointee: identify University and Lab division association (email / phone) Louisiana Tech University

○ Other: Identify Institutional affiliation (email / phone)

Proposal: Attach file with

(1) Executive summary and technical proposal

(2) Synopsis of scientific, educational, technical, and/or business merits, and alignment with and significance to Lab's current program

(3) Proposed evaluation plan to measure success. If this is a request for renewal of funds, assessment of prior year performance,

Your proposal may include letters of endorsement and other supporting information (maximum of 12 pages including this summary sheet and budget sheet)

Budget Proposal

Proposal Title Jefferon Science Associates Promising Young Scientist Program

Principal Investigator (PI) Rakitha S. Beminiwattha

Total funds requested $2,700 **To be completed by JSA: Total funds awarded** $1,000

Item Description		Amount
Equipment. Lab users submitting proposals that include equipment to be used at the Lab must review with the appropriate Lab Associate Director. The provision of the name of the AD below represents the AD's acknowledgement. **No signature required.**		
Associate Director:		
	Subtotal Equipment	$0
Travel Support. Provide break-out of estimates for registration fees, lodging and transportation, catering, and facility charges (room rentals, AV equipment; etc.)		
Transportation to host institution (air fare and local transit) for 3 participants	$2,250	
Lodging at host institution for 3 participants	$450	
	Subtotal Travel	$2,700
Supplies		
	Subtotal Supplies	$0
Consultants/Subcontracts		
	Subtotal Consultants/Subcontracts	$0
Other Expenses. Examples include stipends and honoraria, prizes, awards.		
	Subtotal Other Expenses	$0
	Total Budget Proposal	**$2,700**

Budget Justification: Include narrative to explain need for each line item in the budget, showing breakdown of calculations used to arrive at the amount in each line of the budget. Note that the JSA Initiatives Fund Program does not support salaries and salary-related expenses, or indirect expenses.

Leveraged Support/Matching Funds information. Identify the source, type and amount of dollar funds from each institution. Include **separately** estimated value of in-kind support. Your identification of the authorized representative who has committed institutional support for your proposal represents the acknowledgement of that individual. If support or funds are provided by the Lab, identify the associate director (or equivalent) as the authorized representative. Information may be included on separate page.

See relevant section in the proposal description for budget justification and leveraged support information

Jefferson Science Associates Initiatives Fund
Promising Young Scientist Program, 2018

R. Beminiwattha (PI)[1], E. Brash[2], W. Deconinck[3], D. Dutta[4], J. Mammei[5], D. McNulty[6], and K. Slifer[7]

[1]Louisiana Tech University, P.O. Box 10348, Ruston, LA 71272;
rakithab@jlab.org, 318-257-2435
[2]Christopher Newport University, Department of Physics, Computer Science & Engineering, 1 Avenue of the Arts, Newport News, VA 23606;
brash@jlab.org, 757-594-7451
[3]College of William & Mary, P.O. Box 8795, Williamsburg, VA 23187;
wdconinc@jlab.org, 757-221-3539
[4]Mississippi State University, P.O. Box 5167, Mississippi State, MS 39762;
ddutta@jlab.org, 662-325-3105
[5]University of Manitoba, Department of Physics, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 2N2, Canada;
crowder@jlab.org, 204-474-6195
[6]Idaho State University, Department of Physics, Campus Box 8106, Pocatello, ID 83209;
mcnulty@jlab.org, 208-282-4901
[7]University of New Hampshire, Department of Physics, 9 Library Way, Durham, NH 03824;
karl.slifer@unh.edu, 603-722-0695

Funding Cycle: 01/01/2018 to 12/31/2018
Funding Request: $2700

Executive Summary

Since 2009 the JSA Promising Young Scientist program has been supporting the career development of postdoctoral researchers affiliated with Jefferson Lab. We have supported two dozen young researchers in preparing for tenure-track faculty positions in academia and for staff scientist positions at national laboratories by providing them with feedback on application materials, by giving them valuable interview opportunities, and by improving their colloquium presentation skills. Over 70% of the past participants have secured permanent employment as tenure-track faculty members or staff scientists and they credited this program with their success.

The program's long term goal is to help re-invigorate the tradition of the general audience accessible colloquium by nuclear physicists, which is crucial to ensure that nuclear physics retains funding and support from the larger community.

This proposal is a continuation of the successful JSA Promising Young Scientist program that has run almost continuously since 2009. The program covers part of the expenses for colloquia given by postdoctoral researchers at participating host institutions (with matching financial and in-kind contributions by the host institutions).

1 What's New?

Since this program originally started in 2009, several changes have been implemented based on feedback from participants and host institutions, and after discussion with members of the Jefferson Lab Users Group Board of Directors and Jefferson Science Associates. We also summarize them here.

Host institutions are now on average further away from Jefferson Lab than in the earlier years of this program (when UNH was the only remote host institution while JLab, W&M, and CNU were local host institutions). This has resulted in an increase in travel expenses requested of the JSA Initiatives Fund. To continue the program with the same number of participants each year, we are increasing the matching contribution from the host institution by making them partly responsible for lodging and wholly responsible for refreshments and dinner. The JSA Initiatives Fund support is now leveraged significantly more by the host institution contributions compared to earlier proposals (a third of the expenses of this program are carried by the host institutions).

Due to lower participation in the last couple of year, we are paying special attention to the advertising of this program. We are expanding the advertising by including direct emails to all possible participants and by aligning the application dates better with the preferred schedules of postdoctoral researchers. We are also printing posters and display around the lab to advertise the program.

To increase the quality of the colloquium talks, we now require submission of an early draft version of the talk before scheduling the colloquium. Applicants who are selected to participate in the program send an annotated general seminar talk to the selection committee, detailing any changes they will make in order to turn the talk into a suitable colloquium. This allows us to pinpoint early-on which participants may need particular guidance in the crafting of an accessible colloquium talk.

2 Synopsis

The colloquium plays a central role in ensuring that the developments of nuclear physics are shared with the broader research community and the general public. It is the primary means that we have to communicate our science with our non-nuclear colleagues in academic institutions and at national funding agencies. Effective colloquia can convey the excitement of new results, increase the odds of recruiting top students to the field, and ensure that the public has a clear understanding of what is being accomplished with public research funding. Unfortunately, many researchers fail to craft accessible colloquia, and alienate general audiences by presenting talks more akin to seminars for specialists. In particular, this is not a skill that graduate students and postdoctoral researcher have had many opportunities to develop since they predominantly present to their research peers.

The Promising Young Scientist program assists junior nuclear physicists (and other Jefferson Lab-affiliated scientists) in crafting accessible colloquium talks. This has the immediate benefit of increasing the candidate's chances of securing permanent academic employment[1] due to the central role the colloquium plays in most hiring processes. It also has the long term benefit of improving the nuclear physics community's ability to communicate our exciting physics to the general public.

[1]We are mindful that this program benefits primarily the postdoctoral researchers who are interested in academic careers, although any postdoctoral research is welcome to participate in the program.

In addition to providing opportunities and feedback to postdoctoral researchers in crafting appealing colloquium talks, we give extensive feedback on their application materials: a cover letter, curriculum vitae, list of publications, research and teaching statements, and a colloquium abstract. Postdoctoral researchers rarely gain experience in writing compelling research proposals and research statements, and frequently need to focus their documents away from past research and towards future projects. Teaching statements, which are becoming more important in a cut-throat job market, often need significant rewriting to include recent evolution in teaching pedagogies away from purely lecture-based instruction. The colloquium abstracts we receive, often written based on a seminar abstract, are frequently still filled with Jefferson Lab jargon. The extensive feedback from the Promising Young Scientists committee is in particular helpful for postdoctoral researchers who cannot take advantage of university career mentoring opportunities by virtue of being stationed at Jefferson Lab.

2.1 Job Interviews and Colloquia at Host Institutions

Before the application process, we advertise this program through the JLab user group mailing lists, the dedicated postdoctoral researcher mailing lists and posters displayed across the JLab. We will also contact postdoctoral researchers individually to introduce them to this program and encourage postdoctoral advisors to participate their postdocs. We hope that this will increase the number of applications to the program and make it more competitive.

During the application process for this program applicants submit a dossier of documents commonly requested for academic faculty or staff scientist positions: *a cover letter, a curriculum vitae, a list of publications, research and teaching statements, and a colloquium abstract.* All applicants receive individual feedback from the members of the selection committee on the materials they submit. Although the call for applications is phrased as a competition to motivate high-quality submissions, it is our intention to accept all applicants within the constraints of the budget. With an average of four applications received per year, this has always been possible until now.

If we were to receive more applicants than can be supported, then we will need to select the applicants for whom the Promising Young Scientist will provide the most immediate benefits, while strongly encouraging other applicants to apply in the next year based on the feedback given. While the process of giving feedback on a colloquium talk is time-consuming, we would rather not have more than one participant per host institution per year.

Selected participants are invited to one of the host institutions where they meet for *one-on-one interviews with faculty* including the department chair. Visits culminate in the *presentation of a colloquium* to a general audience including undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty members outside of nuclear physics. The speaker is expected to craft a talk which will be accessible to this broad audience. Depending on the candidate's career goal and preferred institution type, the candidate may deliver *in addition* either a seminar for specialists, or a teaching demonstration on a topic of their choice. At Mississippi State University, for example, job interviews typically include the teaching of an introductory physics class.

To help the participants with the preparation of their colloquium, we request that they send to the selection committee an annotated general seminar talk that they have given previously, detailing any changes they will make to turn the talk into a suitable colloquium. The host institution is only decided on after this step is completed, to reduce the risks of an ill-prepared colloquium talk. The host provides additional guidance and feedback in the weeks leading up to the visit.

Audience members are provided with an anonymous questionnaire through which they provide

constructive criticism of the colloquium. At the conclusion of the visit, the candidate is provided with an aggregated summary of the audience response along with comments solicited from the one-on-one interviews. This feedback provides guidance on which aspects of their presentations and interviews went well, and which elements should be improved. Ultimately, this process provides participants with an advantage when competing for permanent positions, and helps ensure that they will effectively communicate their nuclear physics research to general audiences.

After the interview, the host institution provides a written report or has an in-person discussion with the participant. This includes post-interview feedback, comments on Colloquium, and the feedback on teaching an introductory course (if the host institution provided the opportunity).

The appendix section A.2 includes an example of the post-interview feedback provided as part of this program. Not every host institution provides the feedback in a similar written format and some host institutions prefer to meet with the participants in person or over the phone one or two weeks after their visit.

3 Participating Institutions

Since the first run of this program in 2010, the number of participating host institutions has steadily increased. This allows us to accept more applicants into the program, and to host them at the type of institution in line with their interest. The original host institutions, Christopher Newport University (E. Brash) and the University of New Hampshire (M. Holtrop, and K. Slifer), were joined in early 2011 by the College of William & Mary (W. Deconinck), later by Mississippi State University (D. Dutta) and Idaho State University (D. McNulty), in 2012 by the University of Manitoba (J. Mammei, a former participant in the program) and last year Louisiana Tech University (R. Beminiwattha, another former participant in the program).

Due to the frequent stationing of postdoctoral researchers at Jefferson Lab, a local presence is a benefit during the preparation of the colloquia (for practice talks, and in-person review and feedback on application materials). The proximity of several of the participating institutions aids significantly with this.

4 Program Evaluation and Past Performance

At the start of this program in the spring of 2010, we established application criteria, the structure of visits, a method for feedback to be provided to the applicant, and a method for the applicant to provide feedback on the program. Through a website (`https://wiki.jlab.org/cugwiki/index.php/JSA_Promising_Young_Scientist`) we promote the program and attract applicants. We invite applications to the program in the spring with several postings to the JLab CUGA mailing lists and posters displayed in the Lab. The selection process during the summer allows enough time to schedule the colloquia during the fall semester, and allows for applicants to receive feedback in time for the job application season in the fall. For a complete list of past participants, see table 1.

As mentioned in section 2.1, the interviewers and colloquium audience provide feedback to the participants. In appendices A.2 and A.3 we provide a sample of this feedback. As we strive to im-

[1] As referred to in Appendix A.1, John Leckey was originally scheduled to present a colloquium at Christopher Newport University, but this was rescheduled to the University of Manitoba to avoid interference with an actual faculty search at Christopher Newport University.

Table 1: Overview of participants in the Promising Young Scientist program. The participant's institution at the time of selection ("Home"), and the host institution ("Host") are listed, along with the participant's current affiliation. In 2016 the program took a yearlong break, so no new names are added.

Year	Participant	Home	Host	Subsequent Position and Affiliation
2010	Huey-Wen Lin	JLab	UNH	Asst. Prof. at Michigan State University
	Guy Ron	LBNL	UNH	Asst. Prof. at Hebrew U., Jerusalem
	Robert Bennett	ODU	UNH	Adj. Asst. Prof. at Old Dominion University
	Kijun Park	JLab	W&M	Postdoc at Jefferson Lab
2011	Juliette Mammei	UMass	W&M	Asst. Prof. at U. of Manitoba
	Jean-Francois Rajotte	MIT	MSU	Postdoc at McGill University
	Dru Renner	JLab	CNU	Postdoc at Los Alamos National Lab
	Bo Zhao	W&M	ISU	Asst. Project Scientist at U.C. Irvine
2012	Pedro Jimenez-Delgado	JLab	ISU	Professional Risk Managers' International Association
	Narbe Kalantarians	Hampton	UNH	Asst. Prof. at Virginia Union University
	John Leckey	Indiana	UofM	Staff Scientist at NASA
	Seamus Riordan	UMass	MSU	Staff Scientist at Argonne National Lab
	Vince Sulkosky	MIT	W&M	Visit. Asst. Prof. at Longwood University
2013	Elena Long	UNH	UofM	Asst. Prof. at UNH
	Mehdi Meziane	Duke	ISU	Instructor at Culver Academies
	Peter Monaghan	Hampton	UNH	Asst. Prof. at Christopher Newport University
	Christopher Monahan	W&M	MSU	Asst. Prof. at Rutgers University
	Key Moriya	Indiana	W&M	International Monetary Fund
	David Wilson	JLab	CNU	Postdoc at Cambridge University
2014	Simona Malace	JLab	W&M	Staff scientist at JLab
	Justin Stevens	MIT	UofM	Asst. Prof. at William & Mary
	Jixie Zhang	ODU	ISU	Postdoc at University of Virginia
	Paul Mattione	CMU	UNH	Postdoc at Jefferson Lab
2015	Rakitha Beminiwattha	JLab	MSU	Asst. Prof. at Louisiana Tech University
2017	Joshua Hoskins	W&M		Application process ongoing
	Wes Gohn	FermiLab		
	Carlos Gayoso	W&M		

prove this program, we solicit comments from the participants on their experiences. In appendix A.4 we provide a sample of this feedback.

Based on feedback received from participants in the program, we have shifted the application deadline from later in the summer to the Users Group Meeting (this allow scheduling interview prior to Spring job application deadlines). Starting with previous cycle we are working to develop and collect online resources for applicants: we are using the User Group wiki to collect useful guidelines for application materials, along with sample application dossiers. Feedback from the host institutions and concerns about the preparation of some colloquium talks has lead us to streamline the preparation process, and require participants to outline their plans for the colloquium presentation.

Several past participants have by now secured tenure-track positions, several past participants are now research professors at leading universities, and other past participants went on to become assistant project scientist in radiological sciences or staff scientists at NASA Langley (see table 1).

Every year at-least one applicant has secured tenure-track position and the applicants attributed this program as very important preparation step before the job interviews. In appendix A.1 a 2012 article from Jefferson Lab's OnTarget newsletter is reproduced. It includes interviews with past participants in the program and is still relevant today.

Due to many issues in academia including competitiveness and lack of opportunities, there is less and less interest in postdocs looking for academic jobs. We believe that this problem is the main reason we see a drop in the applications for our program. While we are addressing issues to improve the turnout for the program, we believe that the program must continue to help few applicant who apply. These applicants will find our program extremely helpful in securing a job in academia.

5 Budget Justification

The expenses for each visit include $750 for transportation (airfare and local transit) and $150 for lodging (average of 1 and 2 night stay at $100 per night).

The host institution contributes financial matching funds of: $100 for catering of refreshments for the colloquium audience, $100 for lunch for the candidate and 3 guests, and $200 for dinner for the candidate and 3 guests.

The host institution provides in-kind support of approximately 7 person-hours per participant of time spent with institution representatives during the mock interview process (faculty members, chair of the department, representative of the dean or administration); approximately 10 person-hours per applicant for constructive feedback and comments on the application materials and colloquium presentation; approximately 3 person-hours of local administrative logistical assistance (setting up travel and lodging, organizing the purchase of colloquium refreshments, establishing the candidate's visit schedule, and advertising the colloquium). This adds up to 20 person-hours per participant.

The total cost per visit of each candidate is estimated at $1300. The host institution absorbs $400 of mostly food-related expenses. The remaining $900 is requested from the JSA Initiatives Fund. We request support for 3 postdoctoral visits over a one-year period to be split among the participating institutions. The number of recipients reflects the number of postdoctoral visits per year that have been supported in the recent years.

This adds up to a **request of $2700** for the period from January 1, 2018, until December 31, 2018. The leveraged support by the host institutions is $1200, equivalent to a third of the total expenses. The JLab will provide advertising support by designing and printing color posters which will be around $300.

A Supporting Materials

A.1 JLab OnTarget Newsletter, Deborah Magaldi (August 1, 2012)

Program Helps Young Scientists Prep for Academic Job Market

Source: `http://wwwold.jlab.org/news/OnTarget/2012/2012-07/index.html`

The academic job market is very competitive and applying for a faculty position requires a range of skills that many young scientists haven't explicitly been trained in, such as grant writing, management, and public communication and interview skills. Now, a program supported by the JSA Initiatives Fund is helping these young researchers work on the skills crucial for a successful job search.

The JSA Promising Young Scientist program helps postdoctoral researchers develop and fine-tune a range of skills necessary for succeeding in the tight academic job market, according to Wouter Deconinck, assistant professor of Physics at the College of William & Mary and principal investigator of the program.

"The program helps our junior nuclear physicists work on their public speaking, communication and job interview skills as well as with preparing application materials such as their resume, CV (or Curriculum Vitae), a teaching statement and a research statement, and crafting and delivering a colloquium," Deconinck notes.

"Crafting and presenting an accessible colloquium-level talk," he points out, "is likely the most important aspect of the academic job interview process. This program provides the participants with guidance and feedback so they can successfully develop, organize and deliver an outstanding colloquium."

The postdoctoral fellows selected for the Promising Young Scientist program get feedback and guidance from the program's committee on their application packages and their colloquium presentations. Each individual goes through a "mock" interview at one of the participating institutions, which includes giving his or her colloquium.

"Our primary goal is to improve the young scientists' odds of getting permanent faculty and staff positions," Deconinck emphasizes, "and in the process, we hope to re-invigorate the tradition of the colloquium geared to a general audience, which will help improve the understanding of and appreciation for nuclear physics research."

He maintains, "This public accessibility is crucial to ensure that nuclear physics retains funding and support from the larger community.

"We just finished this year's selection, and we have selected five promising young scientists who will each be invited to a university," Deconinck said on behalf of the selection committee. Those selected will give a colloquium in the coming fall or early spring of 2013.

- John Leckey, a postdoc at Indiana University, working on the Gluonic Excitations Experiment, or GlueX, in Hall D, has been invited to present a colloquium at Christopher Newport University.

- Seamus Riordan, a postdoc at the University of Massachusetts, working on parity violation and nuclear structure experiments in Hall A, has been invited to present a colloquium at Mississippi State University.

- Pedro Jimenez-Delgado, a postdoc at Jefferson Lab, working on parton distribution functions in the Theory and Computational Physics group, has been invited to present a colloquium at

Idaho State University.

- Narbe Kalantarians, a postdoc at Hampton University, working on the Super High Momentum Spectrometer drift chambers for Hall C and the DarkLight experiment in the Free-Electron Laser facility, has been invited to present a colloquium at the University of New Hampshire.

- Vince Sulkosky, a postdoc at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, working on short-range correlation experiments in Hall A, has been invited to present a colloquium at the College of William & Mary.

"I think we provide a great service to our postdocs, and they are grateful for the opportunity to practice skills that you otherwise only use when you are in a real job-search situation," Deconinck said. "Previous participants have said that this experience helped them tremendously in their first job interviews!"

Jean-Francois Rajotte, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, participated during the 2011-12 academic year. Afterward, he said, "I feel lucky to have been selected for the JSA Promising Young Scientist program. I don't see how else I could have learned about the faculty application process in such a concrete way. I am thankful to the physics department of Mississippi State University, especially professors Dipangkar Dutta and Gautam Rupak who welcomed and guided me for three days on their campus. Several professors spent time with me discussing their research and their life as faculty members. In addition to the colloquium, I also gave a lecture at the undergraduate level, another useful experience that does not come often to a postdoc."

"This program not only offers valuable entries for my CV, it is also informative about the life of a professor and reveals a 'behind the scenes' look at a faculty position interview," Rajotte added. "I recommend everyone who is considering an academic career to apply for the program."

Another participant from last cycle, Juliette Mammei, also had very positive comments about the program.

"I have only been a postdoc for two years, but people told me to 'Apply early and often' so I decided to apply for several tenure-track faculty positions at universities that I felt would be a good match for me," she said. "I also applied for the JSA Promising Young Scientist program, and was very happy to be accepted."

"Before I even gave my colloquium," she continued, "I had already received valuable feedback on my research plan and teaching statement, which were part of the application for the program. I was invited to give a colloquium at William and Mary. Afterward, some of the audience members gave me constructive criticism; they were very encouraging and helpful. In addition to getting feedback about the colloquium, the department also conducted a 'mock' interview, with visits to various faculty members as well as an interview portion with faculty who had volunteered to serve as a 'search committee'. The whole experience gave me confidence by letting me know what to expect during my subsequent interviews."

"I went for my first real interview a week after I gave the colloquium at William and Mary," Mammei said. "A month after the JSA Promising Young Scientist mock interview and practice colloquium, I went for an interview at the University of Manitoba, and am proud to say that I will be starting there as an assistant professor this fall."

A.2 Examples of Open-Ended Feedback from Interviewers

Interviewer 1: *As a non-expert in nuclear physics, I wanted to learn about the "big-picture" in this field during my meeting with [candidate]. My impression is that [candidate] was neither clear nor convincing about the current status/understanding of the composition of nucleons from the experimental viewpoint. [Applicant] often referred to models and theory but less to what has been learnt/proven from experiment.*

Interviewer 2: *I think [candidate] is quite ready for real job interview. I was impressed with how freely [candidate] was able to discuss long-range plans for nuclear physics and a possible role in it, [candidate] also seem to plan possible funding opportunities. I'd recommend [candidate] to be better prepared to discuss teaching philosophy, plans for student/postdoc involvement and mentoring.*

A.3 Examples of Feedback from Colloquium Audience Members

The following questions are used to gain feedback from the colloquium audience members. All questions use a Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), and include room for written comments. The candidate is provided with the average/median and spread on the results and the typed comments.

1. The presentation was at an appropriate level for a colloquium.
2. There was an appropriate amount of material covered in the talk.
3. The subject matter was interesting.
4. The speaker's delivery was clear an understandable.
5. The speaker demonstrated mastery of the subject matter.
6. The speaker answered audience questions effectively.
7. Overall I enjoyed this colloquium.

Audience member 1: *I have an overall positive impression of his talk, although there are areas in which he could improve, for example, spending more time on explaining graphs, symbols and quantities on the axes especially in a colloquium for non-experts.*

Audience member 2: *The introduction was nice, although a bit more background on parity and parity-violation would help. Immediately after the intro the speaker jumped to very technical talk, with lots of jargon and technical terms, almost impossible for non-experts to follow.*

A.4 Examples of Feedback from Program Participants

The following questions are used to gain feedback from the participants in the program. The first six questions use a Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree); the last question is open-ended.

1. This experience gave me a better understanding of the goals of a colloquium.
2. This experience will help me to craft better colloquia in the future.
3. I found the scheduled meetings with faculty/administration useful.
4. I found the audience feedback data to be useful.
5. I found the interview feedback data to be useful.
6. I believe this experience will improve my chance at permanent employment.
7. Please discuss any valuable 'lessons learned' from this experience.

8. Please provide comments on how to improve the program.

Candidate 1 (2012): *As a lesson, now I understand what will be asked and how I should be prepared during the man-to-man interview. [. . .] It is useful to have this feedback, especially negative feedback, because there I can make an improvement.*

Candidate 2 (2013): *I really appreciated the opportunity to have a dry run at an interview without the interview pressure. This is a fantastic program.*

Candidate 3 (2014): *I found the program to be very useful, since as job candidates we know we need to prepare a colloquium talk, but have no idea how to explain our results to non-experts, and furthermore, have no idea how much time it takes to write such talks. In this regard, the program was extremely useful, since now I have a talk that is completely presentable, and has gone through the internal review processes.*

For other aspects of the program, I found the "grilling" by more senior faculty to be very useful, and also the knowledge that people expect you to have a plan for 2 years, 5 years, and further for your research. Just going through all of those questions and understanding which parts of my research plan were still lacking was a very good experience. Also, talking to people outside of the field and knowing what kind of concerns they have for incoming faculty not related to them was also very nice.

For talking to the experts, I think just the exposure of meeting people who are within the same field (JLab) but not within the same sub-field was very nice, and the trip was extremely useful even just in that regard (many thanks to all the faculty that made time for me).

I think the program is very nice as it is, I heard from one faculty member that perhaps giving the same talk at another institution would improve the overall quality even more, but that may lead to a lot more overhead for both sides. I have found my experience to be great overall, and would recommend applying for this program to other postdocs seeking faculty positions.