


## 2. 20 minutes presentation was:



Note: No respondent said it was too long.

### Comments:

This was perfect! I think it was a good time that kept most presenters on task.

5-10 additional minutes would be helpful.

Some were so interesting that I wished they went longer! However, I understand it would be impossible to get through the entire day if that was the case.

Almost every presentation I saw used the whole 20 minutes, with no time (or at least not adequate time) for questions or follow-up. Also, very difficult to transition from one speaker to the next.

Would be nice to see some longer blocks (not necessarily all but some) to allow more interaction/discussion type presentations.

20 minutes strikes a nice medium to ensure more people have a chance to share their work within a reasonable day.

I would give only about 5 more minutes for presentation and maybe cut down the number of presentations a bit. I know I rushed through my presentation too quickly, mainly because I was trying to cover too much. I missed certain presentations I would have liked to have heard because of conflicting times with other interesting presentations.

It was nice to have quick presentations, but it was too short for our group. That's more our fault than yours, of course. Generally, I appreciated the abbreviated nature of the presentations.

Perfect timing. I think it worked out really well for both presenter and listener!

I am used to 15 minutes per presentation at conferences, so 20 minutes was a nice treat without dragging on.

Twenty minutes was usually enough to allow the speaker to present her main ideas. Only one or two speakers really needed more time to do a better job. The short time slot forced all speakers to skip much of the background material that isn't relevant to the main point they want to make, for which I was grateful. In the future, a time slot from 20 minutes to a half-hour would be acceptable.

Not enough time to go into detail.

Because two of us were sharing the presentation time, it was difficult to fit our presentation into 20 minutes (or really 15 minutes, with 5 for questions!). Maybe 30 minute sessions would work better? Or people presenting in teams could have longer sessions?

As a presenter with no formal ethics background, I liked the 20-minute format because it was less intimidating. However, it seemed like many presenters were pressed for time, which limited the post-presentation Q&A and discussion time. I really think the 20-minute format kept things moving quickly, though, and made the overall time of the conference just right.

Sharing each session with one other panelist and perhaps having 3 options might be a nice alternative.

It would have been nice to have just a few minutes more for content and/or question & answer.

20 minutes is long enough to introduce a topic, but not long enough to do meaningful teaching development.

30 mins might allow for a little more content coverage. But, I loved how many different areas were covered!

A longer keynote at the beginning or end would be nice to bring us all together in addition to the shorter presentations.

Little bit short. A lot of presenters run out of time for the discussions.

Twenty minutes is common at conferences but most of the presenters seemed to have a little more to say. The problem with lengthening the time is you lose presentation slots.

20 minutes was very good, and the listener can focus on the presentation if it is 20minutes long, also the presenter can focus on what they want to say the most.

20 minutes is OK for a TED talk. But it's not good for interaction. If you want the audience to be able to interact with a speaker, you need a much longer timeframe. In just about every session, there were people with questions who didn't have time to ask them.

I really liked that the presentation moved along – it was more interesting that way. If I wanted to ask someone another question I could catch them later in the conference.

Felt a bit rushed and wanted to add more to the talk.