

Guidelines for Critiquing Presentations

**Your goal as a reviewer is to give specific advice about how this talk could be better if it was given a second time.**

For numerical score for each area, try to use the following guidelines:

**5** means that the choices about “content” etc. were equivalent to the best possible choices by anybody on this subject. Use of this value will be rare.

**4** means that most of the choices were excellent, but some small changes could have had a significant impact on the audience.

**3** means that the presenter made some good choices, but didn’t always think ahead about how the audience would interpret their words, images, etc.

**2** means that the choices made were barely sufficient to enable the audience to follow along.

**1** means that the presenter clearly didn’t consider the audience while preparing this talk.

**Content**

*This category mostly refers to choices about what to include and exclude.*

Title: Was the title either too general or too specific? This is not a very important criteria.

Level: Did the speaker misunderstand the level of the audience’s prior knowledge?

Vocabulary: Was the language either too informal or too technical?  
Were jargon terms adequately explained?

Conclusion: Was the problem solved?  
Was the significance of the work made clear?

**Delivery**

*This category mostly refers to choices about what was said and how it was said.*

Knowledge: Did the speaker seem to understand the subject?

Enthusiasm: Did the speaker seem to care about the subject?

Confidence: Did the speaker convey nervousness?

Vocals: Was the speaker loud enough to be heard clearly?  
Was the speaker monotonous?

Did the speaker mispronounce or stumble over words?

Pace: Did the speaker talk too fast or too slow?

Notes: Did the speaker refer to notes too often?

Did the speaker ever get lost?

Emphasis: Did the speaker stress the most important ideas?

Body: Did the speaker make any very distracting gestures?

Did the speaker slouch?

Did the speaker pace?

Was the speaker dressed appropriately?

Contact: Did the speaker maintain eye contact with the audience?

**Visual Aids**

*This category mostly refers to choices about what to show and how they are shown.*

Quantity: Were there too many aids to be understood during the talk?

Effectiveness: Did the aids complement the vocal presentation without being redundant?

Did the speaker address the important features of each visual aid?

Were the graphics too crowded?

Were the visual aids visual rather than merely textual?

Were animations used when appropriate?

Clarity: Were the graphics (and text, including plot axes values) large enough?

Were the graphics inadequately labeled or even cryptic?

Did the graphics have sufficient contrast?

**Organization**

*This category mostly refers to choices about what to show first, second, third, etc.*

Introduction: Was a specific problem, purpose, or goal stated?

Flow: Did information proceed in a logical sequence?

(i.e., goal, experiment, expectations or theory, conclusions)

Did the presentation tell a story with a beginning, middle, and end?

Length: Was the talk too long or too short?

Interpretation: Was each measurement, technique, and graph clearly connected to the main goal?

Conclusion: Was the significance of the work made clear?