**Board Presentation Evaluation Framework**

**For Session 4 Practice Exercise**

**Presentation Evaluation Criteria**

**Executive Presence & Delivery (25 points)**

**Excellent (23-25 points):**

* Confident, authoritative delivery appropriate for board-level audience
* Clear, concise communication with strategic vocabulary
* Maintains executive composure under questioning
* Demonstrates command of material without over-reliance on notes

**Good (18-22 points):**

* Generally confident with minor hesitation
* Mostly clear communication with occasional technical jargon
* Handles questions adequately
* Shows good familiarity with material

**Needs Improvement (10-17 points):**

* Uncertain delivery, lacks executive presence
* Communication unclear or too technical for board audience
* Struggles with questions or shows limited material knowledge
* Over-dependent on slides or notes

**Strategic Content & Structure (25 points)**

**Excellent (23-25 points):**

* Follows clear executive narrative framework (Context→Insights→Implications→Actions→Outcomes)
* Leads with strategic conclusions and recommendations
* All content directly relevant to strategic decision-making
* Logical flow that builds toward clear action items

**Good (18-22 points):**

* Generally follows narrative structure with minor gaps
* Mostly strategic content with some operational detail
* Clear recommendations with adequate supporting logic
* Good flow with occasional tangents

**Needs Improvement (10-17 points):**

* Lacks clear structure or narrative flow
* Mix of strategic and operational content without prioritization
* Unclear or weak recommendations
* Confusing presentation sequence

**Use of Data & Evidence (25 points)**

**Excellent (23-25 points):**

* Data supports strategic arguments without overwhelming audience
* Appropriate use of visualizations to reinforce key points
* Acknowledges uncertainty and limitations honestly
* Connects quantitative analysis to business implications

**Good (18-22 points):**

* Generally good use of data with minor presentation issues
* Visualizations mostly support the narrative
* Some acknowledgment of limitations
* Decent connection between analysis and conclusions

**Needs Improvement (10-17 points):**

* Data presented without clear connection to arguments
* Poor or confusing visualizations
* Fails to address uncertainty or data limitations
* Weak link between analysis and strategic conclusions

**Strategic Thinking & Decision Support (25 points)**

**Excellent (23-25 points):**

* Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of strategic trade-offs
* Addresses competitive implications and market dynamics
* Considers resource allocation and implementation challenges
* Provides clear criteria for measuring success/failure

**Good (18-22 points):**

* Shows good strategic awareness with minor gaps
* Some consideration of competitive and market factors
* Generally realistic about implementation
* Basic success metrics provided

**Needs Improvement (10-17 points):**

* Limited strategic perspective, focuses on operational details
* Minimal consideration of competitive or market dynamics
* Unrealistic about implementation challenges
* Lacks clear success criteria

**Specific Evaluation Questions**

**For Each Presentation:**

**Executive Presence:**

* Did this feel like a board-level presentation?
* Would you trust this executive to represent these findings to external stakeholders?
* How did they handle questions and challenges?

**Strategic Value:**

* Did you understand the strategic implications within the first 2 minutes?
* Were the recommendations clear and actionable?
* Did the analysis support confident decision-making?

**Data Sophistication:**

* Was data used effectively to support arguments?
* Did you trust the analytical foundation for the recommendations?
* Were limitations and risks addressed appropriately?

**Board Readiness:**

* Could Grace Kennedy's board make decisions based on this presentation?
* What additional information would board members likely request?
* How well would this executive handle board-level scrutiny?

**Feedback Framework**

**Structured Feedback Process (5 minutes per presentation):**

**Round 1: Peer Feedback (3 minutes)** Each audience member provides:

* **One Strength:** What worked particularly well?
* **One Enhancement:** What specific improvement would increase impact?
* **Board Perspective:** What would a board member's biggest question be?

**Round 2: Facilitator Coaching (2 minutes)** Focus on:

* Executive presence and communication style
* Strategic thinking depth and sophistication
* Readiness for real board presentation scenarios
* Specific techniques for improvement

**Sample Feedback Language**

**Effective Feedback Examples:**

* "Your opening clearly established the strategic context. Consider leading with your recommendation to grab attention immediately."
* "Strong use of data to support your argument. The board would likely ask about competitive response scenarios."
* "Excellent executive presence. You might strengthen the business case by quantifying the risk of inaction."

**Less Helpful Feedback Examples:**

* "Good presentation" (too vague)
* "You should have more data" (not specific enough)
* "I liked your slides" (focuses on wrong elements)

**Post-Presentation Discussion Framework**

**Group Reflection Questions (10 minutes after all presentations):**

**Strategic Communication:**

* Which presentation most effectively translated analysis into strategic insight?
* What techniques made the difference between good and excellent presentations?
* How did the best presentations handle uncertainty and risk?

**Executive Development:**

* What did you observe about executive presence and board-readiness?
* Which presenter would you most trust to represent your strategic analysis?
* What specific skills separate strategic communicators from operational reporters?

**Application to Real Work:**

* How will you change your approach to strategic presentations?
* What standards will you set for analysis presented to you?
* How will you develop your team's strategic communication capabilities?

**Individual Development Planning**

**Self-Assessment Questions:**

After receiving feedback, each participant should consider:

**Immediate Improvements:**

* What one change would most improve your next strategic presentation?
* Which specific feedback will you implement within 30 days?
* How will you practice strategic communication skills?

**Skill Development Priorities:**

* Do you need to focus on executive presence, strategic thinking, or data communication?
* What resources will help you develop these capabilities?
* How will you measure improvement in strategic communication?

**Team Impact:**

* How will you raise the standard of strategic presentations in your organization?
* What feedback will you give to improve your team's strategic communication?
* How will you model executive-level strategic thinking?

**Facilitator Evaluation Notes**

**Common Patterns to Address:**

**Frequent Strengths:**

* Strong analytical foundation from previous sessions
* Good familiarity with Grace Kennedy strategic context
* Confidence in financial and operational expertise

**Common Development Areas:**

* Leading with analysis instead of conclusions
* Too much detail for board-level audience
* Uncertainty about handling strategic questions
* Insufficient attention to competitive implications

**Coaching Opportunities:**

* Executive presence and authoritative delivery
* Strategic framing and narrative structure
* Balancing confidence with acknowledgment of uncertainty
* Connecting analysis to actionable strategic decisions

**Success Indicators:**

* Presentations feel appropriate for actual board review
* Strategic recommendations are clear and well-supported
* Executives demonstrate confidence in their analytical leadership
* Questions and discussion focus on strategic implications rather than methodology

**Key Message:** "You're not just presenting analysis—you're providing strategic leadership. Your credibility comes from synthesizing complex information into confident strategic direction while acknowledging uncertainty and risk appropriately."