**Project Name:**

**Reviewer:**

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

# **Team Presentation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Exceeds Expectations93-100 (A), 90-92 (A-)*** | ***Meets Expectations87-89 (B+), 83-86 (B), 80-82 (B-)*** | ***Fair77-79 (C+), 73-76 (C), 70-72 (C-)*** | ***Needs Improvements67-69 (D+), 65-66 (D)*** | ***UnacceptableBelow 65 (F)*** | **Score** | **WTDScore** |
| **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. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |  |
| **What aspects of the project were impressive? (required)** |
| **What are possible opportunities for improvement? (required)** |

**Project Name:**

**Reviewer:**

#  **Individual Presentation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Exceeds Expectations93-100 (A), 90-92 (A-)*** | ***Meets Expectations87-89 (B+), 83-86 (B), 80-82 (B-)*** | ***Fair77-79 (C+), 73-76 (C), 70-72 (C-)*** | ***Needs Improvements67-69 (D+), 65-66 (D)*** | ***UnacceptableBelow 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** | **TechnicalUnderstanding** | **PresentationPoints** | **WeightedTotal** | **Comments (Required)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Any additional comments about the project?**

|  |
| --- |
|  |