PRR 351 TALKS
Student Peer Critique Guidelines

You will evaluate your peers' talks as/after they are presented. At the top of a separate page for EACH presenter, write the speaker's name and topic. Then, using the following list as a guideline, describe:

- The most effective, best parts of the talk,
- Helpful suggestions for what and how the speaker might improve next time.

Remember, COMMENTS are the important part of this critique. JUSTIFY your comments and give concrete suggestions so they are helpful to your peers.

**Talk Elements: Introduction**

Did speaker arouse your interest or curiosity (assuming the perspective of identified audience)? How/what technique used?
Did speaker announce/introduce topic/subject clearly, effectively? (what type of "grabber"):?

**Talk Elements: Body**

Did speaker appear well prepared (content and delivery)?
Was the topic presented in an organized, logical fashion, with clear links between various points?
Did talk have continuity?
Was the major point of the talk easily identifiable? (What was it?)
Did the talk hold YOUR interest? (assume you are a member of the target audience)
Did speaker stay focused on the topic OR did they stray/ramble, or seem to just be "winging" it (ad libbing)?

**Talk Elements: Conclusion**

Was there a definite conclusion?
What technique was used to conclude the talk? (what type of "grabber"):?
Did the talk end on time?

**Personal Presentation Characteristics**

Appearance (appropriate & neat dress, professional aura, hair neat and out of eyes, etc.)
Posture
Enthusiasm / passion / confidence
Grammar / saying "uh" & "um"
Articulation, enunciation (incl. ---ing vs. --in'; "going to" vs. "gonna")
Voice volume, tone, pitch / variation
Pacing (feet), rocking or leaning (distracting?)
Mannerisms and hand gestures (were they supportive or distracting?)
Did speaker have good eye contact with all of audience? was head up? did they present without use of notes?

**Support Materials -- AV**

What support materials were used? Including PowerPoint?
Were support materials appropriate to topic, audience, context?
Were support materials effective and well designed?
Could different or additional AV materials have improved presentation?
Were support materials of professional quality? How could they be improved?

**Meeting Objectives, Consistency With Planning Document**

Did talk contain content and other elements specifically to address objectives?
Was talk consistent with all elements as described in planning document (audience characteristics & needs, context, setting, information system linkages, etc.)?

**Evidence of Accommodating Persons with Disabilities**

    Also identify introducer

    See next page for example of format.
EXAMPLE OF 1/4-PAGE PEER CRIT FOR TALKS

You should complete one for each of your fellow lab classmates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lab #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presenter's Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk Topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Points:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggestions for Improvement:

Name of introducer: