

Proposal Critique

Title:

Author:

Reviewer:

Rate from 1 to 10 (10 being the highest):

Technical Content:

Research Goal
Background
Proposed Work
Research Plan

Mechanics:

Clarity
Organization
Grammar
Style

Significance:

Originality
Technical Merit
Broader Impact

Overall recommendations:

Comments:

What is the main contribution of the proposed research?

Guidelines

Basic critique guidelines include the following:

- Keep your review objective.
- Pay attention to the technical organization and content of the paper.
- Comment on the appropriateness of the background, methods, approach, and plan.
- Reject well-written work that will lead to trivial or insignificant results and minor contributions to the subject area.
- Reject papers requiring extensive revisions.

The review is divided into three sections: technical content, mechanics, and significance.

Technical content refers to the understanding of the subject area and the proposed research. Does the author understand current work in the area? Does the author clearly identify an unsolved research question or an area in need of research and development? Is a research or

Paper Critique

Title of Paper: _____

Author: _____

Reviewer: _____

Guidelines:

Keep your review objective.

Pay attention to the technical organization and content of the paper.

Comment on the appropriateness of methods, analyses, results, and conclusions.

Reject well-written papers with trivial or insignificant results and minor contributions to the subject area.

Reject papers requiring extensive revisions.

Rate from 1 to 5 (5 being the highest):

Technical Content: _____

Originality: _____

Clarity: _____

Significance: _____

Overall recommendation: _____

Comments: _____

Comment on the organization and writing style of the paper: _____

What is the main contribution of this paper? _____

development plan clearly described? Is it feasible? Is a timeline presented? Is the scope of the work clearly bounded? Can the work be completed in accordance with the timeline?

Mechanics refers to the presentation of the proposal. Is the writing clear? Is it free from errors in grammar? Is it written in a professional style? Does the organization make it easy to follow the ideas presented? Is the proposal free from clichés? Is it free from unnecessary jargon?

Significance refers to the impact that the work will have if the research is successful. Is the work original? Does it make a contribution to the field? Is the research technically important or is it trivial? Does it have the potential to impact a large audience either directly or indirectly? Is the research worth conducting?

Presentation Critique Form 1

Name of Speaker:

Date:

On the scale of 1 to 10, where 10 is the highest evaluation, please rate the speaker. In each possible case, note positive and negative remarks that lead to your rating.

Criterion	Rating	Comments
Quality of slides (graphs/figures clear and understandable; text is readable and clear; audio-visual components used effectively)		
Scholarly, informative content		
Interesting, concise, easy to follow and understand		
Centralized focus		
Engaging audience (looks for understanding, maintain eye contact, moves around)		
Appropriateness of detail		
Intriguing (audience interested in finding out more on their own)		
Ability to answer questions		
Overall Evaluation		

Presentation Critique Form 2

Name of Speaker:

Date:

Points	Items	Comments
	Organization (10 pts) * 2	
	Quality of overheads	
	Parallel structure	
	Consistent fonts	
	Organization and flow	
	Content (10 pts) * 4	
	Centralized focus	
	Major points covered	
	Appropriateness of detail	
	Understandability	
	Understanding of project	
	Correct use of terminology	
	Extemporaneous speaking (10 pts) * 3	
	Ability to field questions	
	Content	
	Straightforwardness	
	Professionalism (10 pts)	
	Good pace	
	Minimal extraneous motion	
	Eye contact	
	Language	
	Dress	
	Other (extra credit)	

Overall evaluation:

Recommendations: