PRESENTER: Miguel Yochicahl

3MT TITLE: Are Robots the Future for Elderly Care?

CATEGORY 1: COMPREHENSION AND CONTENT

Strong 7 6 (5) 4 3 2 1 Weak

Y / N	Did the presentation provide an understanding of the background and significance to the research question being addressed while explaining terminology and avoiding jargon?
Y / N	Did the presentation clearly describe the impact and/or results of the research, including conclusions and outcomes?
Y / N	Did the presentation follow a clear and logical sequence?
Y / N	Was the thesis topic, research significance, results/impact and outcomes communicated in language appropriate to a non-specialist audience?
Y / N	Did the presenter spend adequate time on each element of their presentation - or did they elaborate for too long on one aspect or was the presentation rushed?

CATEGORY 2: ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION

Strong 7 6 5 (4) 3 2 1 Weak

Y / N	Did the oration make the audience want to know more?
Y / N	Was the presenter careful not to trivialise or generalise their research?
Y / N	Did the presenter convey enthusiasm for their research?
Y / N	Did the presenter capture and maintain their audience's attention?
Y / N	Did the speaker have sufficient stage presence, eye contact and vocal range; maintain a steady pace, and have a confident stance?
Y / N	Did the PowerPoint slide enhance the presentation - was it clear, legible, and concise?

TOTAL SCORE

Category 1 + Category 2 = _____ / 14

ADDITIONAL NOTES:

What did you like about the presentation? the significance was well explained, it was easy to follow the presentation

What could be improved about the presentation? the pace and engagement with the audience could have been better, not enough has been said about the actual process and outcomes of research

3MT THREE MINUTE THESIS
FOUNDED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND

UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM | westmere
University Graduate School

PRESENTER: Miguel Xochicale

3MT TITLE: Are Robots the future of Elderly care?

CATEGORY 1: COMPREHENSION AND CONTENT

Strong   7   **(6)**   5   4   3   2   1   Weak

(Y)/ N	Did the presentation provide an understanding of the background and significance to the research question being addressed while explaining terminology and avoiding jargon?
(Y)/ N	Did the presentation clearly describe the impact and/or results of the research, including conclusions and outcomes?
(Y)/N	Did the presentation follow a clear and logical sequence?
Y //N	Was the thesis topic, research significance, results/impact and outcomes communicated in language appropriate to a non-specialist audience?
Y /N	Did the presenter spend adequate time on each element of their presentation - or did they elaborate for too long on one aspect or was the presentation rushed?

CATEGORY 2: ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION

Strong   **(7)**   6   5   4   3   2   1   Weak

Y / N	Did the oration make the audience want to know more?
Y / N	Was the presenter careful not to trivialise or generalise their research?
Y / N	Did the presenter convey enthusiasm for their research?
(Y)/ N	Did the presenter capture and maintain their audience's attention?
Y / N	Did the speaker have sufficient stage presence, eye contact and vocal range; maintain a steady pace, and have a confident stance?
Y / N	Did the PowerPoint slide enhance the presentation - was it clear, legible, and concise?

TOTAL SCORE

Category 1 + Category 2 = 13 / 14

ADDITIONAL NOTES:

What did you like about the presentation?

Easy to understand, inspirational. Relatable.

What could be improved about the presentation?

PRESENTER: MISHER XOCHICALE

3MT TITLE: ROBOTS AS CARERS

CATEGORY 1: COMPREHENSION AND CONTENT

Strong   7   (6)   5   4   3   2   1   Weak

(Y)/ N	Did the presentation provide an understanding of the background and significance to the research question being addressed while explaining terminology and avoiding jargon?
(Y)/ N	Did the presentation clearly describe the impact and/or results of the research, including conclusions and outcomes?
(Y)/ N	Did the presentation follow a clear and logical sequence?
(Y)/ N	Was the thesis topic, research significance, results/impact and outcomes communicated in language appropriate to a non-specialist audience?
(Y / N)	Did the presenter spend adequate time on each element of their presentation - or did they elaborate for too long on one aspect or was the presentation rushed?

CATEGORY 2: ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION

Strong   7   (6)   (5)   4   3   2   1   Weak

Y / N	Did the oration make the audience want to know more?
(Y)/ N	Was the presenter careful not to trivialise or generalise their research?
(Y)/ N	Did the presenter convey enthusiasm for their research?
(Y)/ N	Did the presenter capture and maintain their audience's attention?
(Y / N)	Did the speaker have sufficient stage presence, eye contact and vocal range; maintain a steady pace, and have a confident stance?
(Y / N)	Did the PowerPoint slide enhance the presentation - was it clear, legible, and concise?

TOTAL SCORE

Category 1 + Category 2 = 5/11 / 14

ADDITIONAL NOTES:

What did you like about the presentation? CLEAR, LOGICAL PRESENTATION - THOUGHT - PROVOKING TALK

What could be improved about the presentation?
MAYBE A LITTLE RUSHED - YOU HAD PLENTY OF TIME LEFT. ALSO MAYBE YOU DON'T NEED THE SMALL PICTURES ON YOUR SLIDE - JUST USE THE MAIN PICTURE - IT SAYS EVERYTHING.

THREE MINUTE THESIS

FOUNDED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND

UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM | westmere University Graduate School

PRESENTER: MIQUEL XOCHICALE

3MT TITLE: ROBOTS OF THE FUTURE OF ELDERLY CARE.

CATEGORY 1: COMPREHENSION AND CONTENT

Strong   7   6   (5)   4   3   2   1   Weak

(Y)/ N	Did the presentation provide an understanding of the background and significance to the research question being addressed while explaining terminology and avoiding jargon?
(Y)/ N	Did the presentation clearly describe the impact and/or results of the research, including conclusions and outcomes?
(Y)/ N	Did the presentation follow a clear and logical sequence?
(Y)/ N	Was the thesis topic, research significance, results/impact and outcomes communicated in language appropriate to a non-specialist audience?
(Y)/(N)	Did the presenter spend adequate time on each element of their presentation - or did they elaborate for too long on one aspect or was the presentation rushed?

CATEGORY 2: ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION

Strong   7   (6)   5   4   3   2   1   Weak

(Y)/ N	Did the oration make the audience want to know more?
(Y)/ N	Was the presenter careful not to trivialise or generalise their research?
(Y)/ N	Did the presenter convey enthusiasm for their research?
(Y)/ N	Did the presenter capture and maintain their audience's attention?
(Y)/ N	Did the speaker have sufficient stage presence, eye contact and vocal range; maintain a steady pace, and have a confident stance?
(Y)/ N	Did the PowerPoint slide enhance the presentation - was it clear, legible, and concise?

TOTAL SCORE

Category 1 + Category 2 = ___11___ / 14

ADDITIONAL NOTES:

What did you like about the presentation? INTERESTING PRESENTATION START EXPLAINING PROBLEM. DISCUSS PROJECT WELL. GOOD SLIDE

What could be improved about the presentation? LOST FLOW A FEW TIMES. COULD HAVE LINKED HIS WORK TO ADVANCES.