Guide for Giving Effective Feedback to Presenters (i.e. Your Teammates During Practice Runs)

Use the general presentation skills rubric to organize your feedback. Here are pointers for the written comments:

1) Identify real strengths before identifying areas of potential improvement.

2) Describe what you have observed. Make it clear that it is your own perspective or reaction that you are offering.

3) Be specific. Give an example if possible.

4) Suggest actions or changes rather than tell the speaker what to do. Use words like “perhaps” or “maybe” or phrase your suggestion as a question. Make sure the speaker could make suggested changes (e.g. it is not fair to point out someone’s accent: they cannot change that but you could ask for more visual aids or a slower pace).

5) Limit your feedback. What did the speaker do really well? What changes might yield the biggest improvement?

Example A: You incorporated excellent outside sources (not just required reading): I was particularly impressed with your discussion of Slide 10 (market shares as calculated by the opposing parties and their role in the merger simulation model). You may consider changing some slide titles to headline the main points, adding citations, and, most importantly, increasing the economic analysis in your part of the presentation. Also, given that you are the lead presenter in your team, the overall coherence would be helped by adding an overall presentation outline that you discuss and subsequent presenters refer back to.

Example B: For the final two slides, you used a good pace and you (appropriately) spent considerable time. Slide 38 added a helpful summary table of the results. Slide 39 “Doubts on the Data” showed clear attempts at original analysis: you may consider expanding on the second bullet. However, in the first part of your presentation you went a bit too fast on the equations and tables (e.g. I don’t think you mentioned the s.e.’s or statistical significance).

Example C: You took on one the harder jobs in your team, tackling Goolsbee and Petrin (2004). Further, you made multiple significant improvements after your first try including a much clearer discussion of the sensitivity analysis and discussion of the endogeneity of price. However, there was still some confusion about the Cournot versus the Bertrand model: maybe you could review class notes and readings to revise and clarify this important part?

Example D: In the two practice runs you showed a big improvement. Your first try at the presentation lacked an outline, was missing some key points, and relied too heavily on a single source (i.e. summarized the required reading) without offering economic analysis or bringing in other sources. Also, key results were insufficiently explained. However, your next try showed marked improvements: you now have a clear outline and a much stronger introduction. Further, Slides 4 and 5 dramatically improve the discussion of the antitrust market and tackle the issues of the geographic and product markets. However, the explanation of the “cellophane fallacy” was not clear and some other points could have been explained (e.g. you mentioned the 8.49% number on Slide 5 without saying where it came from). But, the economic analysis overall is increased including a discussion of the Williamson trade-off.

Example E: Your portion of the team presentation was well-planned. You have a good presenting pace and a naturally strong vocal delivery. However, your presentation came across as a summary of the supplemental reading and did not offer much original/critical analysis and economic insights/application. But, you did do some research to bring in sources on the industry. I was particularly impressed with Slide 53 (graphics comparing 1997 and 2013), which was perfect for supporting the points you wanted to make. However, you rushed through your introduction and ended a bit abruptly. Given that you are the last presenter in your team, it would help the audience if you reinforced the key points made during the presentation overall.