Peer Review

# Goals of our peer review

1. **Strengthen your community**
   1. Be constructive yet supportive. Being “blunt,” even if well-intentioned, can be harsh and therefore, sometimes, *destructive*. Give helpful suggestions, give praise.
   2. Emphasize positives, too. Receiving all negative feedback (change this, fix that, re-do this segment) can make people feel negatively about their work. If something was done well but could be changed, tell them what they did well *and* what could potentially be improved.
   3. Use “I” statements, not “you” statements. Saying “I had a hard time understanding concept X” is much more friendly than saying “you did not explain concept X” very well.
2. **Be specific and actionable**
   1. After reading comments, the presenter should IMMEDIATELY know how they can improve. Give suggestions and create actionable steps with your feedback.
3. **Improve *your* meta-presentation skills** (i.e., see other people present, think about their overall presentation, and consider how to improve the whole presentation overall)
   1. After watching/listening to a presentation, take a step back and ask yourself:
      1. What was supposed I supposed to learn
      2. What did I actually learn
      3. How can the presentation better align (i) and (ii)
   2. Identify things that worked well and did not work well in others’ presentations to inform how to better present your own work.
      1. E.g., presenter #1 told a riveting story that grabbed my attention.
      2. E.g., presenter #2 focused too much on breadth that I didn’t have a clear take-away

# Questions to guide your peer reviews

The major (bolded) headings here represent categories scored in the rubric (see next page). Use these guiding questions, among others, to help presenters create a more effective presentation.

* **Clarity of ideas**
  + Is the main ideas or purpose of the podcast clear and easy to follow?
  + Was it clear that the podcast had an audience? Was it a suitable audience?
* **Conciseness**
  + Could the podcast be streamlined or more efficient?
  + Are there sections where too much detail detracts from the main points?
  + Could any points be stated more succinctly?
* **Organization**
  + Does the podcast follow a logical structure?
  + Is there a clear introduction, body, and conclusion?
  + Are there good transitions from idea to idea or is it abrupt?
* **Psychological application**
  + Does the presentation apply psychological (I/O) concepts to a real-world issue?
  + Are there theories, ideas, constructs, concepts, etc. from our class/field that are successfully integrated into the presentation?
* **Professionalism**: both content and delivery
  + NOTE: Being “professional” is subjective and can often tap into harmful stereotypes. Be extremely careful not to comment on a person’s looks, accent, annunciation, dress, etc.
  + Does the presenter maintain a professional tone? Pacing?

**Podcast rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category | 1 - Inadequate | 2 - Needs Improvement | 3 - Adequate | 4 - Good | 5 - Excellent |
| Clarity of Ideas  20% | Ideas are unclear and difficult to understand throughout the presentation. | Ideas are mostly unclear, with frequent lack of explanation. | Some ideas are clear, but key points require further explanation. | Most ideas are clear, with minor areas that need more clarity. | Ideas are exceptionally clear, with thorough explanations that make complex concepts understandable. |
| Conciseness  20% | Presentation is lengthy, with significant filler and off-topic information. | Some conciseness, but multiple sections contain unnecessary detail. | Presentation is somewhat concise, but could be streamlined in places. | Mostly concise, with only minor sections that could be shortened. | Exceptionally concise, with all content relevant and to the point. |
| Organization  20% | Lacks a logical structure; ideas are presented in a confusing order. | Organization is inconsistent, with some sections out of order. | Presentation has a basic structure, though transitions are sometimes unclear. | Mostly well-organized, with minor improvements needed in flow. | Well-organized and logical, with a cohesive flow and smooth transitions. |
| Psychological Application  30% | Minimal application of psychological concepts; little relevance to the topic. | Limited application, with concepts that lack depth or relevance. | Some application of psychological concepts, though with limited depth. | Good application, integrating relevant concepts into examples. | Excellent application of psychological concepts, with in-depth, relevant integration of theory into real-world scenarios. |
| Professionalism  10% | Unprofessional tone and delivery; visuals and formatting are distracting. | Somewhat unprofessional in tone or delivery, with noticeable issues. | Presentation is moderately professional, though lacks polish. | Generally professional, with a few minor issues in tone or visuals. | Highly professional in tone, visuals, and delivery, with a polished and confident presentation. |