CSCI-471 Professional Communications

Research Presentation Evaluation Form – Video Presentations

Your Name: Nikhil Raina

Speaker: Jennifer Pimm Topic: Artificial Intelligence in Relation to Prosthetics

# 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  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 \_87\_/100 | |
| Did the presentation reflect adequate preparation? | | Yes | No |
|  | |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Visuals and Video** | | | | | | Score | \_91\_/100 |
| Strongly Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | No Opinion | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree | N/A | The Speaker’s... | Comments: Her explanaiton regarding the mechanial components could have a good visual component. This would help her to illustrate her exmples clearly and allow the user to get a more focused view of the imagination. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | visuals were relevant |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | visuals were complete |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | visuals were accurate |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | visuals were well integrated |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | visuals well-designed |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | visuals were easy to see |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | video quality was not distracting |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | audio quality was not distracting |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Content** | | | | | | Score | \_87\_/100 |
| Strongly Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | No Opinion | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree | N/A | The presentation had... | Comments: Mechanical Component had to much data in them. I think she could have divided that slide into two where one she discusses the theoretical approach to implement the Prosthetics in real life that is with the ‘sound limb’ system. The other could be the working of the prosthetics, that is how it works and then continue to give the examples that she gave. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | sufficient content provided |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | appropriate explanations |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | sufficient examples provided |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | the right scope for audience |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Organization** | | | | | | Score | \_83\_/100 |
| Strongly Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | No Opinion | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree | N/A | The Speaker... | Comments: The content was well spoken but it didn’t seem to be well shown. There were multiple situations where she could have divided the slides to allow more room for explanation and a better way for the user to keep track of the things being explained. Other than this, unfortunately the presentation was too small. It was grabbing a sufficient amount of interest, but I would have liked had it been a bit longer. |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | X | ☐ | gave an outline or agenda |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | provided transitions between ideas |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | organized their content logically |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | summarized their main points |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | clearly introduced their topic |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | made good use of time |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | offered conclusions |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Presentation Style** | | | | | | Score | \_87\_/100 |
| Strongly Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | No Opinion | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree | N/A | The Speaker... | Comments: Her examples didn’t seem like they were practiced well enough. She used the word ‘so’ too often that it eventually became a bit too distracting. It was a little difficult to maintain focus on the content. |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | X | ☐ | Introduced themself |  |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | X | Dressed appropriately |  |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | X | ☐ | Avoided distracting mannerisms & fillers |  |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | X | ☐ | ☐ | Appeared Enthusiastic |  |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | X | ☐ | Paced the talk appropriately |
| ☐ | ☐ | X | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Used professional language |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | X | ☐ | Appeared poised & confident |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | X | ☐ | Avoided monotone delivery? |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | X | ☐ | Spoke loud enough |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | X | ☐ | Defined terms when needed |

|  |
| --- |
| What did you like most about this presentation?  I liked how straightforward the presentation was. By the examples that were being given by the presenter, it definitely looked like the presenter was thoroughly versed in the paper that she was able to grab the main points and not beat around the bush. |
|  |
| What is the most significant thing that this speaker could improve upon? |
| Her examples were well addressed but they could be better illustrated by using more visual aid. Her way of describing her examples lacked an amount of professionalism which did sway away from the intended purpose of the presentation. To add on more, that is to be able to use the visuals better, it would have been a good idea to divide a few slides, especially the Mechanical Component and the Artificial Intelligence slides as they had more content being talked about. Due to the amount of content, it would have been a good idea to divide them into two and use more visuals like gifs or images to illustrate the presenter’s point. |