## **CSCI-471 Professional Communications**

## Research Presentation Evaluation Form – Video Presentations

Your Name: Nikhil Raina

Speaker: Ghaznavi AbuBakr Topic: Text to Speech Transfer Learning

## **Instructions**

You should have access to the videos you have been assigned to review for the class.

Do not compare this presentation to any other presentation. Evaluate each one independently. As you watch each video, be prepared to rate it on four categories: **Visuals, Content, Organization,** and **Presentation Style.** You will also provide an **Overall Assessment.** In each category, you will enter a number from 0 to 100 that represents your opinion for the given component. You will also have a short section to give commentary for each category. Numerical ranges and suggested meanings are:

95 - 100	Excellent or outstanding
85 - 94	Very good (minor improvements needed)
75 - 84	Good (more significant improvements needed)
50 - 74	Fair (barely adequate; major improvements needed)
0 - 49	Extremely poor (unacceptable)

Under each of the four categories are sets of *descriptors*. Each has a scale of "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree"; replace the  $\Box$  with an 'X' based on how well the performance adheres to the descriptor. Your selection for a descriptor should reinforce or inform your numerical rating of the category. You may also select 'n/a' if a descriptor does not apply to the current presentation. Generally, checking "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" would signify something positive, well done, or that added to the video; checking "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" would signify something neutral; checking "No opinion" would indicate you were neutral with respect to that dimension of the talk. There is also a space in each section where you can leave feedback specific to that category. Under your overall assessment, there are additional questions to answer. Strive to make all of your feedback as helpful as possible.

Overall Assessment	Score <u>90</u> /100		
Did the presentation reflect adequate preparation?	Yes	No	
	$\boxtimes$		

Visuals and V	deo	Score_94_/100
Strongly Disagree Somewhat Disagree No Opinion	Somewhat Agree Agree N/A The Speaker's	Comments: The way of the presentation, that is with the content and the visuals that were being used was very engaging. I believe that the visuals were an important add on to the presentation as without them it would have been difficult to make sense and to be on the same "page" as the presenter.
	□	
	□ □ visuals were complete	
	□ □ visuals were accurate	
	□	
	□	
	□	
	□	ting
	□ □ audio quality was not distract	ting
Content		Score_89_/100
Strongly Disagree Somewhat Disagree No Opinion	S A Somewhat A Strongly Strongly S A Strongl	Comments: The examples were shown via results and through visuals that were present in all slides. It made understanding the importance of the text-to-speech system clear. I think there could have been more amount of explanation that could have been given while speaking. It felt like I would have liked to know more about the context. The video
	□ □ sufficient content provided	could have been extended for a min or two min more by adding more details and slides. The overall structure ensured that the added slides
	□ □ appropriate explanations	would add more value to the content.
	☐ I sufficient examples provided	
	□	

Orga	anizat	ion	on Score_ <u>84_</u> /100				
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	No Opinion	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	₹ Z The Speaker	Comments: I think he could have added at most 2 min in his presentation. I feel that there could be more explanation in at the start where he could mention relevant knowledge for the user to know. I think that scientific significance slide could have had more weight by giving one or two examples to show the value than just mentioning that it has value.	
			Х		☐ gave an outline or agenda		
					provided transitions between ideas		
					organized their content logically		
				$\boxtimes$	summarized their main points		
				$\boxtimes$	☐ clearly introduced their topic		
	$\boxtimes$				□ made good use of time		
			$\boxtimes$		☐ offered conclusions		
Pres	entat	ion (	Style		Sco	re_88_/100  Comments: He appeared to be monotonic. There didn't seem	
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree state	No Opinion	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	₹ Z The Speaker	re_88_/100  Comments: He appeared to be monotonic. There didn't seem much voice modulation while explaining the content. This did brush off some amount of enthusiasm, that might have been there. But there just wasn't a good enough proof to show that. In his criticism, he mentions that the paper was a little confusing to understand for people lacking some knowledge. I think it would have been a good idea to mention some amount of information or a brief overview of relevant diction within the paper that would allow the user to better understand the content.	
			-		✓   Z   The Speaker   □ Introduced themself	Comments: He appeared to be monotonic. There didn't seem much voice modulation while explaining the content. This did brush off some amount of enthusiasm, that might have been there. But there just wasn't a good enough proof to show that. In his criticism, he mentions that the paper was a little confusing to understand for people lacking some knowledge. I think it would have been a good idea to mention some amount of information or a brief overview of relevant diction within the paper that would	
☐ Strongly Disagree	□ Somewhat Disagree	□ No Opinion	□ Somewhat Agree	□ × Strongly Agree		Comments: He appeared to be monotonic. There didn't seem much voice modulation while explaining the content. This did brush off some amount of enthusiasm, that might have been there. But there just wasn't a good enough proof to show that. In his criticism, he mentions that the paper was a little confusing to understand for people lacking some knowledge. I think it would have been a good idea to mention some amount of information or a brief overview of relevant diction within the paper that would allow the user to better understand the content.	
□ □ Strongly Disagree	□ □ Somewhat Disagree	□ □ No Opinion	□ □ Somewhat Agree	X □ X Strongly Agree	The Speaker Introduced themself  Dressed appropriately Avoided distracting mannerisms & filler	Comments: He appeared to be monotonic. There didn't seem much voice modulation while explaining the content. This did brush off some amount of enthusiasm, that might have been there. But there just wasn't a good enough proof to show that. In his criticism, he mentions that the paper was a little confusing to understand for people lacking some knowledge. I think it would have been a good idea to mention some amount of information or a brief overview of relevant diction within the paper that would allow the user to better understand the content.	
□ □ □ Strongly Disagree	□ □ □ Somewhat Disagree	□ □ No Opinion	X 🗆 🗅 Somewhat Agree	□ × □ × Strongly Agree	The Speaker Introduced themself Dressed appropriately Avoided distracting mannerisms & filler Appeared Enthusiastic	Comments: He appeared to be monotonic. There didn't seem much voice modulation while explaining the content. This did brush off some amount of enthusiasm, that might have been there. But there just wasn't a good enough proof to show that. In his criticism, he mentions that the paper was a little confusing to understand for people lacking some knowledge. I think it would have been a good idea to mention some amount of information or a brief overview of relevant diction within the paper that would allow the user to better understand the content.	
□ □ Strongly Disagree	□ □ Somewhat Disagree	□ □ No Opinion	□ □ Somewhat Agree	X □ X Strongly Agree	The Speaker Introduced themself  Dressed appropriately Avoided distracting mannerisms & filler	Comments: He appeared to be monotonic. There didn't seem much voice modulation while explaining the content. This did brush off some amount of enthusiasm, that might have been there. But there just wasn't a good enough proof to show that. In his criticism, he mentions that the paper was a little confusing to understand for people lacking some knowledge. I think it would have been a good idea to mention some amount of information or a brief overview of relevant diction within the paper that would allow the user to better understand the content.	

		Χ	☐ Appeared poised & confident
Χ			☐ Avoided monotone delivery?
	Χ		☐ Spoke loud enough
Χ			□ Defined terms when needed

What did <sup>•</sup>	you like most about t	this presentation?
-----------------------	-----------------------	--------------------

I truly enjoyed his visuals throughout the presentation. They were not only engaging but the enhanced my understanding towards the topic that he was talking about. I was able to channel a more "correct" way of thinking than of just imagining what he was talking about. Especially when the visual contents were in a gif brought more amount of engagement from my side to know more about the topic. The visual content was not only engaging, but they were highly informative about the about the content that was being spoken about. It seemed like perfect props that allowed him to justify his material clearly. I think that without the visuals, it would have been rather difficult to understand what was being said.

What is the most significant thing that this speaker could improve upon?

In his criticism slide, he mentions that the paper was a bit difficult to understand for people who aren't well-versed in Machine Learning and Natural Language processing. I think it would have been better if, before the goals slide, he introduced or spoke briefly about what kind of knowledge would be required in order to understand what he would be talking about. Giving a brief idea about crucial topic or concepts that are relevant in understanding the topic at hand can be crucial as it allows the user to better formulate his or her thought process and understanding of the content that is being shown and spoken about.