

ABT 301 Critiques of Student Presentations

Each student in ABT 301 is required to make a *practice* oral presentation and a subsequent *formal* oral presentation. The required *format* for the oral presentation can be found at the ABT 301 homepage at the link entitled "**Formats for Proposals and Presentations**".

In addition to making their own presentations, each student will be required to serve as a Student Evaluator for the presentations of *two* students. Service as an Evaluator will involve:

- attending the *practice* presentations of *two* student presenters.
- providing a *written evaluation* of the *practice* presentations.
- attending the *formal* presentations of the *two* students.
- providing follow-up *comments* regarding the *formal* presentations.

These written critiques must contain the information outlined below, follow a standard format (see attached sample form), and must be type-written (12 point font, 1" page margins). An electronic form can be down-loaded from the ABT 301 homepage at the link entitled "**Presentation Schedule**".

The purpose of these evaluations is to help the presenter improve their slide preparation and presentation technique and to give the evaluator additional insight into presentation preparation. Evaluators should make note both of aspects that *facilitated* communication as well as aspects that *impeded* optimal communication. All comments should be constructive and professional; derogatory or mean-spirited comments are unacceptable. Please use full sentences. Evaluations performed by students will *not* be used to assign a grade for the presentation, so be completely honest and critical when providing a critique.

Evaluations will be graded on their thoroughness. Student evaluations should *not* be so general and vague that they are of little or no value to the presenter; they should have *specific* comments and make specific recommendations.

***Each set of critiques must be submitted electronically (as MS-Word file attachments to the appropriate instructor)
within 48 hours of the presentation.***

Note that late submissions will be assessed a grade penalty.

The following information must be included in each critique:

Presenter's name and presentation title

Evaluator's name

Date of presentation

A **Qualitative** (Part 1) **Quantitative** (Part 2) evaluation of the presentation.

Part 1: the **Qualitative** evaluation should include written comments regarding each of the evaluation criteria. The purpose of this section is to help the presenter improve their future presentations. Evaluators should make note of both positive aspects as well as things that could have been improved. *All comments should be constructive and professional in nature. Derogatory and mean-spirited comments are not acceptable.* Please use full sentences for Part 1.

Part 2: the **Quantitative** evaluation will involve rating each of the specific evaluation criteria (see attached sample form). Each criterion should be quantitatively rated on a scale of 10 (excellent) through 1 (poor).

Both Part 1 and Part 2 will be reviewed by the instructor. Part 1 will be passed on to the presenter. Part 2 will be used by the instructor for grading the evaluator.

As noted in the syllabus, the evaluation of the *practice* presentation should focus on the *specific strengths and weaknesses* of the presentation. The evaluation of the *formal* presentation should focus on the *relative improvement* over the practice presentation.

ABT 301
Presentation Critique Form

*Note that you should not restrict yourself to the space provided after each criterion.
Use as much space as you feel appropriate.*

Presenter: _____

Title: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

As noted in the syllabus, the evaluation of the *practice* presentation should focus on the *specific strengths and weaknesses* of the presentation. The evaluation of the *formal* presentation should focus on the *relative improvement* over the practice presentation.

Evaluations will be graded on their thoroughness. Student evaluations should *not* be so general and vague that they are of little or no value to the presenter; they should make *specific* comments and recommendations.

Part 1: Written comments regarding specific evaluation criteria

1. Spoke audibly, maintained eye contact and engaged audience

2. Visual aid design, layout, and usefulness

3. Introduced necessary background material and in such a way that experiments described later could be understood.

4. Clearly explained central hypothesis and/or goal

5. Clearly explained key experimental procedures and general rationale.

6. Clearly explained experimental results (or anticipated results for Research Proposal)

7. Clearly explained the relevance of results presented (or anticipated results) with respect to the hypothesis being tested or goal as well as implications of the work.

8. Critically addressed potential limitations and alternative strategies.

9. Provided clear and conceptual conclusions

10. Answered questions thoughtfully and critically.

Presenter: _____

Title: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

Part 2: Provide a quantitative rating for each of the evaluation criteria listed under Part 1.

Use a scale of 1 through 10 with 1 being poor and 10 being excellent.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

6. _____

7. _____

8. _____

9. _____

10. _____