**Project Name:**

**Reviewer:**

**Date:** **Time: Section:**

# **Team Presentation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Exceeds Expectations 93-100 (A), 90-92 (A-)*** | ***Meets Expectations 87-89 (B+), 83-86 (B),  80-82 (B-)*** | ***Fair 77-79 (C+), 73-76 (C),  70-72 (C-)*** | ***Needs Improvements 67-69 (D+), 65-66 (D)*** | ***Unacceptable Below 65 (F)*** | **Numeric Score** |
| **Introduction (10%)**   * Stakeholders * Sponsor’s motivation * Customer needs * Customer benefits | It was very clear why this project is important for the stakeholders. | It was usually clear why this project is important for the stakeholders. | It was somewhat clear why this project is important for the stakeholders. | It was unclear why this project is important for the stakeholders. | It was not conveyed why this project is important for the stakeholders. |  |
| **Problems (15%)** • Project History • Semester goals • Technical problems   to be solved | It was very clear what the team plans to do and why. | It was usually clear what the team plans to do and why. | It was somewhat clear what the team plans to do and why. | It was clear what the team plans to do and why. | It was not conveyed what the team plans to do & why. |  |
| **Requirements (15%)** • Functional • Non-Functional  - Performance, Size,   and Usability   * Justification | Requirements and justification were very clear. | Requirements and justification were usually clear | Requirements and justification were somewhat clear. | Requirements and justification were not clear. | Requirements and justification were not presented. |  |
| **Technical Approach (25%)** • Choice of Core   technology • System Architecture • Feasibility | Technical approach is very clear and appears to be sound. | Technical approach is usually clear and appears to be sound. | Technical approach is somewhat clear and appears to be sound. | Technical approach is unclear and/or questionable. | Technical approach was inappropriate or not presented. |  |
| **Progress and Plan (15%)**   * Preliminary Results * Awareness of open Issues * Next steps | Much progress was made. Next steps were realistic and clearly defined. | Good progress was made. Most of the next steps were realistic and clearly defined. | Some progress was made. Many of the next steps were realistic and clearly defined. | Slight progress was made. Some of the next steps were realistic and not well defined. | No progress was made. Next steps were unrealistic, unclear, or not presented. |  |
| **Poster (20%)**   * Contents * Structure / Reading * Visual presentation * Grammatical and spelling errors. | Information was complete, clear, and very easy to follow. There were no writing errors. | Information was complete, usually clear, and usually easy to follow. There were minimal writing errors. | Information was complete, somewhat clear, and flowed well. There were some writing errors. | Information was unclear. There were noticeable writing errors. | Information was incomplete. |  |
| **What aspects of the project were impressive? (required)** | | | | | | |
| **What are possible opportunities for improvement? (required)** | | | | | | |

**Project Name:**

**Reviewer:**

# **Individual Presentation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Exceeds Expectations 93-100 (A), 90-92 (A-)*** | ***Meets Expectations 87-89 (B+), 83-86 (B),  80-82 (B-)*** | ***Fair 77-79 (C+), 73-76 (C),  70-72 (C-)*** | ***Needs Improvements 67-69 (D+), 65-66 (D)*** | ***Unacceptable Below 65 (F)*** |
| **Technical Understanding (50%)**   * **Information** - Accuracy - Completeness | Speaker demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of technical details **and** the overall project. | Speaker demonstrated a proficient understanding of technical details **and** the overall project. | Speaker demonstrated a limited understanding of technical details **and** the overall project. | Speaker did not demonstrate an understanding of technical details **or** the overall project. | Speaker does not understand technical details **and** the overall project. |
| **Presentation (50%)**   * **Verbal** (volume, tone, pace, fillers, etc.) * **Non-Verbal**  (gestures, posture, eye contact, etc.) * **Openness**  - Defensiveness - Argumentativeness | It was effortless to understand; there were no distracting mannerisms. | It was usually easy to understand; there were no distracting mannerisms. | It was somewhat easy to understand; there were few distracting mannerisms. | It was difficult to understand; there were some distracting mannerisms. | It was very difficult to understand; there were many distracting mannerisms. |

## **Students**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **First Name &  Last Name** | **Technical Understanding** | **Presentation Points** | **Comments (Required)** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Any additional comments about the project?**

|  |
| --- |
|  |