

## Standard talks: How would you rate the standard (20-minute) talks you attended?

	Excellent	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor	Rating Average	Response Count
Standard talk rating:	10.7% (14)	32.8% (43)	45.0% (59)	11.5% (15)	0.0% (0)	2.57	131

Standard talk comments: 59

answered question	131
skipped question	8

## Page 1, Q5. Standard talks: How would you rate the standard (20-minute) talks you attended?

1	While the material was very good I felt there was too much to cover in too short an amount of time. Right you start to get into it the talk is over. Also it would have been nice to get the presentations ahead of time.	Apr 20, 2011 7:07 AM
2	they were very informational and comprehensive. Very good.	Apr 14, 2011 5:50 PM
3	I think overall the only thing I am not please about is that year after year some good tals get rejected just because they are not sponsors, and then I see some presenters that have 3 talk and are horrible presenters and are only their because they are sponsors.	Apr 14, 2011 12:14 PM
4	God thing that talks are short, but sometimes the subject might require longer talks.	Apr 14, 2011 1:20 AM
5	It's just way too short.	Apr 11, 2011 3:42 PM
6	didnt attend	Apr 8, 2011 3:22 PM
7	There was too much variety in the usefulness/prep of the sessions	Apr 6, 2011 4:56 PM
8	There is no time, better 30 min.	Apr 6, 2011 1:26 PM
9	The EclipseCon committee put a lot of pressure on the quality of the talks, but I was generally unsatisfied by the contents, execution, etc of most talks. I did not vote "-1" few of the talks I didn't find satisfying at first because I wanted to feel the general level of the presentations, and I was generally disappointed. Of course, there are exceptions, but... : * some slides were not cut properly for the dedicated time slot * some speakers (not only the non-natives in English, but mostly) did not prepare their talk enough to captivate the audience. I am not talking about accent here, rather about some presenters merely reading their	Apr 6, 2011 11:46 AM

**Page 1, Q5. Standard talks: How would you rate the standard (20-minute) talks you attended?**

	slides and not providing an added value to their talks. You could just read their talks on slideshare in 5 minutes and get the same benefit. * but the *main point* was that few talks scratched beneath the surface. So there are obviously some "bad" presenters, but I believe the main problem was the timeslots. 20 minutes were just not enough to show something "deep". I felt like the 40 minutes of extended sessions should be the standard time slot, but obviously in some cases it could be a waste...	
10	Most were excellent. Some were weak and not very worthwhile (actually I'm thinking specifically of the JasForge talks, apologies to the presenter).	Apr 6, 2011 3:53 AM
11	Overall, I felt so-so about these. Some were good simply for the introduction to something I might not otherwise have known about or had a chance to have a good introduction too. Sometimes these sessions felt so rushed that I felt I came away more frustrated than having actually learned anything useful.	Apr 5, 2011 3:41 PM
12	20 minutes wasn't enough time for most presenters to make an impact and many presenters went over their time.	Apr 5, 2011 8:38 AM
13	I don't understand why some people have several talks, while some of those talks are not exceptional and others are rejected and could be very interesting. Do you have quota ?	Apr 5, 2011 7:19 AM
14	Almost impossible to cover enough ground to satisfy my curiosity :-)	Apr 5, 2011 7:14 AM
15	Too short! The Introduction to OSGi was particularly disappointing. Although the presenter was very polished and the first 10 or 15 minutes were superb, the core material at the end went by too quickly, so I learned almost nothing and there was no time for questions.	Apr 5, 2011 7:05 AM
16	No online coding in talks in general. This is really really boring	Apr 5, 2011 7:04 AM
17	Fairly good but 20 minutes is almost always too little. Especially if the speaker is good :)	Apr 5, 2011 6:22 AM
18	I found that the 20 minute talks were too short to provide any real depth, but I did like the fact that some of them gave really good introductions to some valuable eclipse-based tools.	Apr 5, 2011 5:46 AM
19	20 minutes tend to be a little too short, almost all of the time. The presenters want to cram everything they've got into it, leaving no room for questions or mishaps. Quality wise, it varied. To generalize: the content is usually better than the delivery.	Apr 5, 2011 5:43 AM
20	20 minutes is a little too short for any technical depth.	Apr 5, 2011 5:37 AM
21	Format is too short	Apr 5, 2011 4:48 AM
22	Somewhere between "good" and "poor". Many of them were much to stressed, and should've been 45-minute talks instead.	Apr 5, 2011 2:15 AM
23	it's hard to get your message across in just 20 mins.	Apr 5, 2011 1:44 AM
24	It would be good to make a sanity check on each persons presentation skills. Maybe supply a template to help each speaker getting started.	Apr 5, 2011 1:33 AM

**Page 1, Q5. Standard talks: How would you rate the standard (20-minute) talks you attended?**

25	In general I like that format	Apr 5, 2011 12:51 AM
26	Not so many language issues as I have run into former years. And that's a good thing!	Apr 4, 2011 11:33 PM
27	The reduced time for standard talks is also an improvement. Talks are more focused and there is enough room to attend more talks.	Apr 4, 2011 11:09 PM
28	The talks were too short and the content was shallow as a result.	Apr 4, 2011 5:16 PM
29	I found the shorter (20 minute sessions) weren't even long enough to cover the very basic content the speakers had hoped to deliver. There were 2 days of nothing but short sessions in which very little was learnt. The first day was by far the best!	Apr 4, 2011 4:46 PM
30	Usually too short to present more than an overview of the technology. If the presenter is not excellent and well prepared, this is just too short.	Apr 4, 2011 3:24 PM
31	-It's difficult to convince everyone with a succinct description of your product or idea. Some interesting, some on occasion a bit boring when the context is skipped and the case is restricted to that confined world, some presenters can use better and concentrated material etc... In general every standard talk was interesting (for 20') and we're looking forward to hear more next time.	Apr 4, 2011 2:39 PM
32	I found it was difficult to get much out of the shorter talks. I think that some of these might work better combined into a panel approach. For example, you might put together an hour panel where people working on different approaches to EMF-based visual tools discussed their approaches and then shared ideas and insights into general model based editing issues, hopefully bringing in more audience participation.	Apr 4, 2011 2:34 PM
33	Given what can be done in 20 minutes, many people did a good a job of whittling down their talks to manageable chunks. Many people failed, however.	Apr 4, 2011 2:14 PM
34	20 mins is too short, maybe 30 would be better	Apr 4, 2011 1:58 PM
35	I think that grouping 3-4 of these together into a track and then having the 10 minute break would make more sense.	Apr 4, 2011 1:54 PM
36	20 minute is a good format.	Apr 4, 2011 3:27 AM
37	Not bad if you have no clue about the subject. But still, 20 minutes are not enough, it's just good enough to scratch the surface.	Apr 2, 2011 5:17 PM
38	Some of the content was really interesting, but they were just too short.	Apr 2, 2011 10:32 AM
39	It was hit or miss - some were great, some were weak.	Apr 1, 2011 6:44 AM
40	20 minutes is a great length for talks	Apr 1, 2011 5:53 AM
41	20 minutes is perfect! More of these. 10 minutes is too little - have tried that - and 30-40 minutes often is used for more introduction by the presenter...	Apr 1, 2011 1:47 AM
42	Most of them were great!	Mar 31, 2011 9:02 PM
43	Highly variable quality	Mar 31, 2011 7:23 PM

**Page 1, Q5. Standard talks: How would you rate the standard (20-minute) talks you attended?**

44	Too short of a time span for many of the talk. Would have preferred more 40 minute lectures. Not all the lectures provided slides to take with you.	Mar 31, 2011 6:36 PM
45	20 minute talks rarely conveyed sufficient information that could not easily be obtained via the web page. All talks should be at least 40 minutes.	Mar 31, 2011 5:49 PM
46	Need to make sure they stick to demos, something that will stick with the audience in such a short time.	Mar 31, 2011 3:55 PM
47	Quality was all over the map. Some short talks left me wanting more. The Intro to GEF talk, for example, could have gone on a lot longer. Unfortunately the presenters had a book they were hawking, and I felt like if they hadn't been pushing a book it could have been a good extended talk. Some short talks seemed too focused on a specialized subject. I recognize the need to accommodate the diversity of the Eclipse world, but I think the quantity vs. quality balance has started to favor quality over quality.	Mar 30, 2011 2:09 PM
48	20 minutes are just not enough to get into any detail. I can read a blog or wiki if I want this level of information. The presenters were usually good and made the most of the precious time.	Mar 30, 2011 1:42 PM
49	I think the time was a little short for most talks. I do not know if the presenter timing was not good enough or the sessions should have been long talks.	Mar 30, 2011 7:10 AM
50	Many talks were clearly not rehearsed as they were trying to convey too much information for the 20 mins available. Presentation slides were often bullet-points and code samples that were too small to read.	Mar 29, 2011 9:59 AM
51	Many presenters spent too much time giving generic, introductory information. Showing source code is good, but sometimes the presenter just scrolled thru live code and didn't really tell what it contained. The best presenters extracted snippets of code and highlighted key parts.	Mar 26, 2011 10:32 PM
52	Most of the standard talks I saw were good. Presenters still need to work on their key messages. A little too much fluff still.	Mar 26, 2011 7:25 PM
53	20 minute just wasn't enough time to convey material. Every 20 minute presenter was VERY rushed to deliver basic information - The 40 minute presentations were more suitable.	Mar 26, 2011 6:15 PM
54	The 20 minute talks were sometimes rushed for the content, lessening the chance to take away something useful.	Mar 26, 2011 10:58 AM
55	Some days were a bit fragmented with weird subjects, but I know you're trying to be diverse. Some subjects just can't be effectively conveyed in 20 minutes, too, so you might want to try and work with those presenters ahead of time.	Mar 26, 2011 10:57 AM
56	While the talks were good, I think that 20 minutes was just not enough for most talks. A 30 minute format would be better.	Mar 25, 2011 10:16 PM
57	Too short usually.	Mar 25, 2011 12:03 PM
58	The 20 minute format was too short, absolutely too short.	Mar 25, 2011 11:09 AM
59	I sometimes found the audience quite passive. Even in 20 minutes talks, I would have expected more interaction and audience involvement.	Mar 25, 2011 6:26 AM