MESSAGE • DESIGN • DELIVERY
10 Differences That Make the
Slide Design Guidelines

Audience members can't read your slides and listen to you speak at the same time. This checklist will help you design a slide deck that supports your audience's desire to learn from your presentation. Thus, it will encourage you to use few words and engaging graphics to reinforce the message you deliver.

Graphics

Pictures/graphic elements are present
Multimodal learning increases long-term memory retention. Visual content is necessary. Choose pictures or graphics related to your topic. Graphics include data display.

Images are high-quality
Purchase, take, or make high-quality images. Blurry or watermarked images decrease presentation quality. Consider drawing graphics. Stick figures are okay. Clip art is not okay. Review the quality of scanned or posted images; often quality is low and print is too small to see on screen. If needed, resize your graphs and diagrams in your slide software, making them as big as possible.

Images are free of clutter
Eliminate gradients, textures, or images as backgrounds.

Images are large
Expand images to touch slide border or add a.

Images direct toward text
Eyes in a photo, for example, should look inward at text and have a directionality implied in their positioning that would lead the reader’s attention from the image toward the text.

Some elements are repeated
Repetition of some graphic elements adds unity to the piece and makes work more memorable. Careful not to exceed it – too many elements can add clutter or complication.
1. Bullets

Kill
What is Consulting About?

Consulting is about building relationships.

- Stop talking / Start listening
- Become part of the community you want to serve
- Create value-added for customers
- **Emphasize results, not activities and tasks**
- Recognize that you are in the *marketing business*, not the consulting business
The slides are an inspiring visual.
Consulting is about building relationships.

Stop talking / Start listening

Become part of the community you want to serve

Create value-added for customers

Emphasize results, not activities and tasks

Recognize that you are in the marketing business, not the consulting business
The best advice I’ve heard is “one idea per slide.”
Building Relationships
Stop talking / Start listening
Stop talking / Start listening

Serve your community
Collaborate
2. Bleed Images
Cooperative Extension Evaluation
Cooperative Extension Evaluation
Cooperative Extension Evaluation
Cooperative Extension Evaluation
Capturing Indicators of E.T.

Thinking

Self Report

Doing

Observation
3. Get Graphics
High quality visuals are needed.
Our Insights

Little girls don’t like focus groups.
Our Insights

Candy helped.
Kids loved it. Parents complained. Get permission.
Good quality photography for slides **cost money.**
Find images with...

all these words: girl nature

don't use these words:

don't use these words:

Then narrow your results by...

image size: Larger than 640×480
aspect ratio: any aspect ratio
colors in image: any color

type of image: any type
region: any region

Site or domain: free to use or share

SafeSearch: free to use or share, even commercially
file type: free to use, share or modify

usage rights: free to use or share
girl nature

About 562 results (0.28 seconds)

Larger than 640×480 > labeled for reuse
Young girls don’t like focus groups.
We asked questions while engaged in program activity.
They didn’t notice. We still got parent permission.
4. Build Concepts
TIMELINE - YEAR 1

- 1/11/10 – Met with co-PI and faculty member
- 1/29/10 – Evaluation proposal submitted
- 3/30/10 – Contract secured (3/1/10 to 3/30/10)
- 4/30/10 – Present to National Review Committee
Create visuals that support participants in processing the information.
Year 1: 2009-10

| Meet co-PI & faculty | OCT | NOV | DEC | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | JUL | AUG | SEP |
|---------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
|                     |     |     |     | ☀️  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
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Proposal Submission

V. Peer-review Selection: Which Topical Interest Group (TIG) or Committee would you prefer serve as the primary reviewing body for your proposal? Please note that AEA reserves the right to redirect proposals among reviewing bodies as needed.

Please choose for me the best group or committee

VI. Session Title: Enter the TITLE for your proposed session into the following box. Please spell out abbreviations and acronyms:


VII. Session Abstract: Cut and paste your session abstract of 150 words or fewer (including any and all references, footnotes, etc. - do not exceed 150 words in this box) into the following box. Your abstract will be sent to reviewers and read by the public as it is submitted, although it may be truncated if over 150 words. Thus, please create your abstract in a word processing program, check its spelling and grammar, and paste it into the box below.


VIII. Relevance Statement: Using 500 words or fewer (including any and all references, footnotes, etc. - do not exceed 500 words in this box), describe the relevance and importance of your proposal to the field of evaluation, specifying its implications for evaluation theory or practice, and value to the audience. State how the session described in the abstract adds to knowledge in the evaluation field and reflects relevant standards of quality in evaluation theory, methods, or practice.
V. Peer-review Selection: Which Topical Interest Group (TIG) or Committee would you prefer serve as the primary reviewing body for your proposal? Please note that AEA reserves the right to redirect proposals among reviewing bodies as needed.

Please choose for me the best group or committee

VI. Session Title: Enter the TITLE for your proposed session into the following box. Please spell out abbreviations and acronyms:


VII. Session Abstract: Cut and paste your session abstract of 150 words or fewer (including any and all references, footnotes, etc. - do not exceed 150 words in this box) into the following box. Your abstract will be sent to reviewers and read by the public as it is submitted, although it may be truncated if over 150 words. Thus, please create your abstract in a word processing program, check its spelling and grammar, and paste it into the box below.


VIII. Relevance Statement: Using 500 words or fewer (including any and all references, footnotes, etc. - do not exceed 500 words in this box), describe the relevance and importance of your proposal to the field of evaluation, specifying its implications for evaluation theory or practice, and value to the audience. State how the session described in the abstract adds to knowledge in the evaluation field and reflects relevant standards of quality in evaluation theory, methods, or practice.
V. Peer-review Selection: Which Topical Interest Group (TIG) or Committee would you prefer serve as the primary reviewing body for your proposal? Please note that AEA reserves the right to redirect proposals among reviewing bodies as needed.

- Please choose for me the best group or committee

VI. Session Title: Enter the TITLE for your proposed session into the following box. Please spell out abbreviations and acronyms:

- Insert Charming Title Here

VII. Session Abstract: Cut and paste your session abstract of 150 words or fewer (including any and all references, footnotes, etc. - do not exceed 150 words in this box) into the following box. Your abstract will be sent to reviewers and read by the public as it is submitted, although it may be truncated if over 150 words. Thus, please create your abstract in a word processing program, check its spelling and grammar, and paste it into the box below.

VIII. Relevance Statement: Using 500 words or fewer (including any and all references, footnotes, etc. - do not exceed 500 words in this box), describe the relevance and importance of your proposal to the field of evaluation, specifying its implications for evaluation theory or practice, and value to the audience. State how the session described in the abstract adds to knowledge in the evaluation field and reflects relevant standards of quality in evaluation theory, methods, or practice.
V. Peer-review Selection: Which Topical Interest Group (TIG) or Committee would you prefer serve as the primary reviewing body for your proposal? Please note that AEA reserves the right to redirect proposals among reviewing bodies as needed.

Please choose for me the best group or committee

VI. Session Title: Enter the TITLE for your proposed session into the following box. Please spell out abbreviations and acronyms:

VII. Session Abstract: Cut and paste your session abstract of 150 words or fewer (including any and all references, footnotes, etc. - do not exceed 150 words in this box) into the following box. Your abstract will be sent to reviewers and read by the public as it is submitted, although it may be truncated if over 150 words. Thus, please create your abstract in a word processing program, check its spelling and grammar, and paste it into the box below.

Be Descriptive and Concise
Cut to the Chase

VIII. Relevance Statement: Using 500 words or fewer (including any and all references, footnotes, etc. - do not exceed 500 words in this box), describe the relevance and importance of your proposal to the field of evaluation, specifying its implications for evaluation theory or practice, and value to the audience. State how the session described in the abstract adds to knowledge in the evaluation field and reflects relevant standards of quality in evaluation theory, methods, or practice.
5. Use Guides
The Role of Evaluation in Your ATE Grant

Peggie
How do you think about evaluation?

Evaluation
Working with an Evaluator

Lori
Internal – External Evaluation

**Monitor …**
- Who is the project reaching/serving?
- How many?
- What is their satisfaction?

**Advise…**
- Is the project on target in terms of addressing needs?
- Is the project taking advantage of known best practices?

**Assess**
- What is the project’s impact?
- What is the quality of the project’s deliverables?
Using the ATE Evaluation Resource Center

Peggie

www.evaluate.org
Visit Us Online

Evaluate promotes the goals of the Advanced Technological Education program by partnering with ATE projects and centers to strengthen the program's evaluation knowledge base, expand the use of exemplary evaluation practices, and support the continuous improvement of technician education throughout the nation.

About Us | Annual Survey | Resource Library | Community | Events

VISIT OUR RESOURCE LIBRARY

Evaluate's resource library contains materials related to evaluation theory, methodology, practice, and use. We have selected materials that are especially pertinent to the evaluation of ATE projects and centers. We invite you to help us expand the library by recommending or submitting evaluation resources you have found useful in your evaluation work.

Connect to our Community.

Take a look at our quarterly Conduit Newsletter.

www.evaluate.org
Activities
Demonstrations
Checklists & guidelines
Supplementary media content
Preconference trainings

Short-Term
More informed presenters
Increased expectation for good presentations

Intermediate
Better presentations

Long-Term
Clearer decision-making
Stronger programs & policies
Clearer decision-making

More informed presenters

Increased expectation for good presentations

Better presentations

Clearer decision-making

Stronger programs & policies
Demonstrations

90-minutes each

Message
Design
Delivery
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<td>Stronger programs &amp; policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary media content</td>
<td>Preconference trainings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Increased expectation for good presentations

Intermediate
- Better presentations
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- Clearer decision-making
- Stronger programs & policies
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6. Scaffold Communication
Renal Vascular Access Program

Promotes an integrated system of renal vascular access services.

Primary goal - proactively plan for vascular access creation with arteriovenous fistula (AVF) as best practice standard & continuously improve towards 90% prevalent AVFs. Will markedly reduce urgent implementation of inferior vascular access methods (i.e. arteriovenous graft and/or central venous catheter) for dialysis.

Secondary goal - timely access to surgical management for patient with failing accesses.
Renal Vascular Access Program

- Click to add text
The Interior Health Authority Renal Vascular Access Program (RVAP) promotes an integrated system of renal vascular access services. The primary RVAP goal is to proactively plan for vascular access creation with arteriovenous fistula (AVF) as the best practice standard and continuously improve towards 90% prevalent AVFs. Achieving this goal will markedly reduce the urgent implementation of inferior vascular access methods (i.e. arterio-venous graft and/or central venous catheter) for dialysis. A secondary goal of the RVAP is the timely access to surgical management for patient with failing accesses.
Renal Vascular Access Program

Goal 1
Renal Vascular Access Program

Goal 1
**Evaluation Summary**

Renal Vascular Access Program

June 2010

The Interior Health Authority Renal Vascular Access Program (RVAP) promotes an integrated system of renal vascular access services. The primary RVAP goal is to proactively plan for vascular access creation with arteriovenous fistula (AVF) as the best practice standard and continuously improve towards 90% prevalent AVFs. Achieving this goal will markedly reduce the urgent implementation of inferior vascular access methods (i.e., arteriovenous graft and/or central venous catheter) for dialysis. A secondary goal of the RVAP is the timely access to surgical management for patients with failing accesses.

**Evaluation Purpose & Methods**

- The purpose of this evaluation was to examine how the Renal Vascular Access Program has been implemented to date and identify opportunities for its continued improvement.
- Evaluation Methods:
  - A detailed evaluation plan was created by IH Evaluation Dr. Jennifer Miller and the RVAP team.
  - The evaluation used quantitative and qualitative data from a variety of sources to answer each of the evaluation questions.
  - Data collection methods included document review, review of select PROMIS (external, Provincial Renal Agency) and OR Manager (internal) data and a clinical staff survey.

**Evaluation Questions**

Three evaluation questions emerged over the course of, and collectively guided, the evaluation:

1. How did the Renal Vascular Access Program (RVAP) implement its program?
2. How well is the RVAP currently meeting its original program goals and desired outcomes?
   - Linked to Program Goal 1: To proactively plan for best practices for individual patient vascular access and continuously improve towards 90% prevalent AVFs.
   - Linked to Program Goal 2: To provide timely access to surgical management for failing accesses.
3. What are the lessons learned (i.e., what's working well and what are the opportunities for improvement) by the RVAP thus far?

Find other IH Evaluation Reports and Resources at http://inet/infoResources/evaluation/Pages/default.aspx

Interior Health
Renal Vascular Access Program

Evaluation Report

Published: July 8, 2010

Now with lengthy technical appendix!
7. Detail Data
Evaluator Breakfast Preferences

- Just a pile of bacon: 20%
- Bagel: 10%
- Fruit salad: 10%
- Don't eat breakfast: 10%
- Cereal: 15%
- Pancakes: 15%
- Eggs: 20%

Color codes:
- Eggs
- Pancakes
- Cereal
- Don't eat breakfast
- Fruit salad
- Bagel
- Just a pile of bacon
## Evaluator Breakfast Preferences

One in ten fellow evaluators do not consume adequate energy for their first meal of the day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breakfast Choice</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just a pile of bacon</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereal</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancakes</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't eat breakfast</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagel</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit salad</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 in 10 don’t eat breakfast.

- Eggs
- Just a pile of bacon
- Cereal
- Pancakes
- Don't eat breakfast
- Bagel
- Fruit salad
8. Match Fonts
CULTURAL RESPONSIVENESS

- Fluid
- Ethical imperative
- Essential for validity
Sans serif
Screen reading, headings

Serif
Narrative reading on paper
Cultural Responsiveness

Fluid
Ethical imperative
Essential for validity
Same Header Font as Slideshow

**Fluid**
Same “narrative” text as that which was used in the slideshow. Baskerville, to be exact. It is a serif font – better for reading at length on paper. Not so good for reading on screen.

This narrative font does not appear in the slideshow.

**Ethical imperative**
Same “narrative” text as that which was used in the slideshow. Baskerville, to be exact. It is a serif font – better for reading at length on paper. Not so good for reading on screen.

This narrative font does not appear in the slideshow.

**Essential for validity**
Same “narrative” text as that which was used in the slideshow. Baskerville, to be exact. It is a serif font – better for reading at length on paper. Not so good for reading on screen.

This narrative font does not appear in the slideshow.
CULTURAL RESPONSIVENESS

- Fluid
- Ethical imperative
- Essential for validity

Same Header Font as Slideshow

Fluid
Same "narrative" text as that which was used in the slideshow. Century Gothic, to be exact.
Notice the very round letter shapes. The lowercase o is a perfect circle.

Ethical imperative
Same "narrative" text as that which was used in the slideshow. Century Gothic, to be exact.
Notice the very round letter shapes. The lowercase o is a perfect circle.

Essential for validity
Same "narrative" text as that which was used in the slideshow. Century Gothic, to be exact.
9. Combine Color
A Story of Impact

“MICASA: Farm Worker Family Cohort”

Agricultural Research Center
A Story of Impact
MICASA: Farm Worker Family Cohort
Welcome to the 2011 Disabilities and Other Vulnerable Populations TIG Business Meeting

American Evaluation Association: Values and Valuing
November 4, 2011
Universal Design for Evaluation

June Gothberg
National Secondary Technical Assistance Center
Western Michigan University

Jennifer Sullivan Sulewski
Institute for Community Inclusion
University of Massachusetts, Boston
Your Results:

Original Image

A Story of Impact
MICASA: Farm Worker Family Cohort

Deuteranope Simulation

A Story of Impact
MICASA: Farm Worker Family Cohort
10. Close Down
Thank You!