

GEOGRAPHY 4451 — GEOGRAPHY OF RISK AND HAZARD

Evaluation of oral presentation (these are the things I am looking for)

You should speak for a minimum of 15 minutes and a maximum of 20 (you will be cut off if you go on longer!) not counting any time taken by general discussion. You will be graded for:

Quality of presentation: Speak clearly, not too many meaningless interjections (“like”; “you know” etc) and without the voice rising at the end of every sentence. Face the class and make frequent eye-contact (to check that everyone is still awake). Do not keep talking while facing the screen. Make sure you are not talking too fast – it is better to say less but ensure that everyone can follow you.

Use of visual aids: All papers will need these, especially if there are maps, tables, diagrams or illustrations that will help understanding. You should have the title and author of the paper being critiqued and the main headings of your presentation on the screen. Do *not* put everything you have to say on the screen and then read it off. Keep your visual points short and expand on them as you talk. If you really need a longer quote on the screen, leave it for the class to read.

Feel free to add your own visual aids if you think they will help (eg a general location map of the area under discussion).

Content: Are the significant points in the paper got across clearly to the class? Did you miss (or misunderstand) any important points? Do not try to summarise *everything*: the critical task is to pick out what really matters. This is where a brief summary on overhead can help. Do not go into details of statistical tests or mathematical models.

Evaluation: Do you have something meaningful to say about the paper – how the research could have been done better; how the data could have been better presented?

Questions: Did you come up with a useful set of questions that should have started a good discussion (even if they did not).

Evaluation of written critique

These should be 2-3 pages (500-750 words) long. Somewhat longer critiques of longer or more complicated papers will be accepted; shorter ones than two pages are unlikely to be found satisfactory. Grading is similar to that for the oral presentation (in this instance poor presentation – sloppy production and lots of spelling/typing errors – will lose marks). Use the following subheadings:

Definition of problem

Explanation of methods

Discussion of findings

Conclusions

Evaluation

In both cases use of the Kariel guide as a template is strongly advised.