**Brady**

Brady presented with a goal of obtaining MacBook Pro machines as the development environment for himself and his teammates. I noticed that he transitioned with “So” a few times, but sparsely. He moved around enough to not seem stationary and stayed in an area of visibility not behind the podium, though this movement seemed constrained to a small radius close to the podium and communicated a general nervousness. Brady included in his visuals graphs that show how much time and therefore money was lost to the company because of the downtime experienced by developers running servers on Windows machines. These visuals were clear in the message they were meant to deliver, yet Brady relied more on his vocal content than on those visuals to execute that delivery, which I appreciated. Overall, I think this was a good presentation.

**Paige**

Paige presented on the benefits of moving her organization’s technical infrastructure to the “cloud” using Amazon Web Services. She began by going directly into the benefits of a cloud infrastructure versus one maintained “On prem.” I had two issues with this approach: first she did not clarify on the meaning of “On [the] prem[ises]” until the end and second she did not provide any preliminary context on what the cloud is or what issue it solves. When she did get to that point, she presented visuals that supported her arguments nicely, but she forgot to include any sources. I liked that she explained technical terms like “load balancer.” Her cost slide was fairly hard to read, and she dictated costs and savings to the cent, which I felt was more of a mouthful than necessary. I liked that she showed big-name companies that had migrated their tech infrastructure to AWS, and it was an effective argument, but it wasn’t necessary to list all of those companies listed on the slide – it was a lot and she tried to do so, though she backed out about halfway through.

**Seth**

Seth’s presentation was about using LastPass for credential vaulting. He started with the problem, easily crackable passwords, before introducing the solution. I felt that this was effective. Unfortunately, this energy didn’t carry through his presentation because he spent a lot of time with his eyes in his notecards. This resulted in a very monotonous and robotic speech at times and long periods of dead air at others. There was also a point where he said “as you can see here, this is a graph.” In general, this raised the feeling that the presentation was not well-rehearsed. An additional issue I had is that the text of the “critical breaches” visual slide showed text that was too small for me to read.

**Jack**

Jack’s presentation was about acquiring hearing protection for factory floor workers at Lennox. The first thing he did was apologize for his introduction, which essentially became his introduction. If one needs to apologize for a part of their presentation, they probably should just not include it in the first place. After the introduction, Jack went directly into statistics without any other context. The graphic on sound intensity was very small and I could not read it, and I found that this was a recurring theme throughout most text in the presentation. He eventually came back and provided an issue for why regular earplugs are not good enough. In fact, I really liked that as he posed arguments against the various types of ear protection, they were crossed out on the PowerPoint slide. After having been planted behind the podium, he entered into the conclusion phase with “so in conclusion” and gave what I deemed an excessively wordy point-by-point overview. The last slide was a generic “Questions” slide which I noticed had a completely different theme from the rest of the presentation, which I did not like very much.

**Ethan**

Ethan’s presentation was about using Salesforce Pardot to boost efficiency of certain business tasks. He began with “Hello and good morning. Uh…” then proceeded to greet the audience in what seemed to me to be a very professional manner. He gave a bullet-point overview of the topics he would cover, which I felt was lacking. Over the period of his presentation, I noticed a couple of things. First, I felt like he had his back to the audience to read from his slides about half of the total time he presented for. Second, after his introduction, which carried a decent air of enthusiasm, his tone dropped and remained low and monotonous for the remainder of the presentation. He also started to get stuck on his lines a lot starting at about the middle of his presentation. In terms of activity, he did move around albeit minimally, but at least he stood behind the table and as opposed to behind the podium.

In terms of his visual content, I would probably have to rate Ethan’s the lowest. I say this because his slides broke a lot of rules that I consider to be basic when considering the literature, we have read. On most of his slides, he either had bullet point lists or paragraphs of information about each subtopic or argument. A lot of his slides included pictures with text as well, but the text of the visuals was not readable because so much space was being taken up by unnecessary walls of text. Particularly, I felt this took away most from the “how can Pardot help us” and “pricing plans” slides. Unfortunately, he did not go out with the kind of bang he began with, ending very abruptly.

**Brian**

Brian’s presentation was about obtaining quality office chairs for his work environment. For an introduction, he presented the problem of the back-pain epidemic before presenting office chairs, which I liked. He detracted from this great introduction with a bullet-point outline of his presentation, which I found was a recurring theme in his presentation including his conclusion. I liked the graphics and statistics he included, especially the “cost of pain” item, but I found the text contained within them was consistently too small to read. In general, I felt like his delivery was solid in terms of speech, but he needs to really focus on improving visuals.

**Nicholas**

Nicholas arguing for obtaining professional licenses for the ReSharper addon for Microsoft Visual Studio. His delivery was below average on this one. I felt like he was planted halfway behind the podium, and most of the time he was speaking was spent looking at his cards or at the floor. He introduced ReSharper with “ReSharper is a software” which I had to pseudo-fact check as a grammatical error:

<https://english.stackexchange.com/questions/52418/is-a-software-really-never-correct>

He then made it to the “Code Analysis” slide on which he managed to stay for at least two minutes. As for his visuals, I felt as though, even if they were not explicitly included, his slides effectively all contained bullet-point lists – minus the actual “bullets.” He also included a table on the “Cost vs. Benefits” slide which was filled with text that was too small to read.

**In General**

When it comes to visuals, many of the presenters (apparently including myself based on P3 feedback) are missing the mark when it comes to making sure text is large enough to read from a distance. This issue, alongside those of stationary presenters and presenters’ heads down in notecards, is where I hope to see improvement from just about everybody in the upcoming P4 performances.