



Best PhD Presentation Award, AES 2019 – Evaluation form

Dear conference participant,

Please, consider contributing to the AES Best PhD Presentation Award by filling in the evaluation form on the other side of this sheet for the PhD presentation(s) you will hear in this Contributed Paper session. Your feedback is highly valuable to the early career researcher and for the decision of the Award.

To ensure fairness, PhD students are asked NOT to complete these evaluation forms.

Yours sincerely,

Neil Chalmers, Jorie Knook and Clare Dias

Please return this evaluation sheet by placing it into the box at the reception desk by Tuesday 17.15 (16th April)

| | | | |
|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Your name: | | | |
| Session: | Date: | Time: | Room: |
| Name of presenter: | | | |
| Title of talk: | | | |

Please rate the talk by **ticking** the appropriate box in each row (Please be reminded that this prize is judged on the **presentation** only, not the written paper – if that is available.). Please add up your scores in the ‘Total’ column.

Example: With regards to “Organisation”, if you thought that the presentation was average (2 marks) for “Logical, clear line of reasoning” and good (3 marks) for “Internal consistency of arguments” then that section would be awarded a total of 5 marks (2 + 3) out of a possible 10.

| Judging criteria | | Weak (1) | Average (2) | Good (3) | Very good (4) | Excellent (5) | Total |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|----------|-------------|----------|---------------|---------------|-------|
| Organisation | Logical, clear line of reasoning | | | | | | /10 |
| | Internal consistency of arguments | | | | | | |
| Depth of content | Importance/clarity of research question | | | | | | /25 |
| | Explanation of key concepts, theory | | | | | | |
| | Drawing upon relevant literature | | | | | | |
| | Clarity of methodology and results | | | | | | |
| | Meaningful conclusions | | | | | | |
| Presentation style | Presentation is appropriate for the target audience | | | | | | /15 |
| | Paced for audience’s understanding | | | | | | |
| | Audible | | | | | | |
| Verbal interaction | Clarifies, restates and responds to questions | | | | | | /10 |
| | Summarizes when needed | | | | | | |
| Communication aids | Tables/figures are self-explanatory and visible | | | | | | /10 |
| | Details are minimized, main points stand out | | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | /70 |