| Requirements | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Good | Outstanding |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Presentation Introduction<br><br>/8 | • Does not indicate subsystem (i.e. "our design")<br>• States subsystem in the abstract (i.e. "subsystem A")<br>• Does not include an overview<br>• Fails to use MTS principles | • States subsystem by name (i.e. "demodulator")<br>• Provides generic overview<br>• Use of MTS principles is ineffective / inappropriate for audiences | • Specific, memorable, and engages the audience<br>• Establishes presentation frame<br>• Content-specific overview<br>• Clear, specific purpose<br>• Appropriate use of MTS principles for audiences | • *As per good* + Audience is interested to learn what the presenters have to say and understands the presenters' distinct purpose |
| Content and Organization<br><br>/18 | • Does not clearly connect design details to high-level architecture<br>• Presentation lacks framing<br>• No lead apparent<br>• Purpose of presentation is unclear<br>• Testing results are disconnected from design decisions and/or requirements<br>• Design status is vague or unconvincing<br>• Absent discussion of design process, either implicit or explicit<br>• Information lacks messages<br>• Evidence and claims are disconnected or lacking | • Framing indicates salient information<br>• Buries lead<br>• Discusses high-level architecture and design details but relevance of some information is unclear<br>• Information is relevant but somewhat disconnected from purpose or presentation frame<br>• Significance of technical details is unclear<br>• Unit testing results are discussed in relation to requirements or design decisions<br>• Summarizes design status<br>• Design process is apparent<br>• Uses messages to lead information<br>• Claims are sometimes/mostly supported with evidence | • Framing explicitly indicates salient information and its treatment / interpretation<br>• Lead is obvious and present throughout<br>• Balanced discussion of high-level architecture and relevant design details as per presentation frame<br>• Information is relevant to purpose and detailed<br>• Explicitly states/explains significance of technical details<br>• Audience-appropriate use of MTS principles to explain technical concepts where useful<br>• Credible and compelling explanation of unit testing results and related successes and or challenges in the design process (with ref to design decisions and requirements)<br>• Memorable summary of design status, emphasizing distinctive achievements and design decisions<br>• Discussion addresses key aspects of the design process (Altium, physical, etc)<br>• Messages are clear and explicit<br>• Evidence is used persuasively | • *As per good* + Presents detailed aspects of design while overcoming the curse of knowledge. The audience feels like they learned something about your design without being condescended to. |
| | • Organization is not discernable<br>• Order of information is confusing and increases cognitive load<br>• Over or significantly under time | • Points mostly occur in logical order<br>• structure is mostly implicit<br>• Meets time constraints | • Content has flow (reflected in explicit structural cues and strong transitions)<br>• Points are presented in a logical order<br>• Manages time effectively | • *As per good* + Organization corresponds to meaningful presentation frame |
| Quality of Slides<br><br>/18 | • Missing headers or other strategies that perform a similar function<br>• Slides are disjointed from talking points<br>• Images and text are not well-designed or used for the presenters' purpose<br>• Poor sizing: key text / graphics are difficult to read<br>• Unclear reading path<br>• Does not apply visual grammar principles effectively<br>• Does not reference sources used<br>• Slide design is inconsistent | • Uses headers where warranted<br>• Slides relate to talking points<br>• Images support intended message but may introduce distractions<br>• One of text or graphics is insufficient or excessive<br>• Sizing: Key text/graphics are easy-to-read but incidental text/graphics are difficult<br>• Reading path is discernable with effort<br>• Uses visual grammar principles but inconsistently<br>• Proper research references<br>• Slide design is inconsistent | • Uses message-based headers where warranted<br>• Slides support and add to talking points<br>• Images highlight and amplify intended message and limit distractions<br>• Effective balance between text & figures<br>• Effective sizing: text and graphics are easy-to-read<br>• Skillful use of visual grammar to communicate meaning<br>• Clear reading path<br>• Proper research references<br>• Mostly consistent slide design | • As per good + slides enable audience to focus on presenter's speech, introducing elements that improve or enhance understanding |
| Conclusion/Take-away statement<br><br>/6 | • Tells audience presentation is at an end by saying 'that's it" or "that's all"<br>• Does not summarize the presentation effectively<br>• No takeaway message<br>• Fails to give conclusion (timing) | • Provides summary<br>• Provides a takeaway, though it may be vague or rephrases the summary<br>• Structures conclusion to suggest presentation is at an end | • Summarizes key content<br>• A memorable takeaway point that is relevant to the audience's interest in the project<br>• Ties in any major themes introduced | • *As per good* + leaves audience convinced of the recommended course of action and confident in the team |

**Individual Grade: /40**

| Q/A | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Student** | **Grade** | **Comments** |
| A | /20 | |

| Student | Requirements | Unsastisfactory | Satisfactory | Good | Outstanding |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A /20 | Vocal Delivery | • Mumbles<br>• Too quiet; missed content<br>• Monotone<br>• Frequently too fast to follow<br>• Verbal fillers become distracting | • Enunciation somewhat unclear<br>• Occasionally hard to hear<br>• Modulates intonation<br>• Too fast to follow at times<br>• Frequent verbal fillers | • Clearly Articulated<br>• Audible<br>• Intonation is engaging<br>• Appropriate pace<br>• Minimal verbal fillers | As per good + enhances content |
| | Engagement with audience | • No eye contact, brief glances, or makes eye contact only with assessor<br>• Mostly faces screen or away from audience<br>• (if applicable) Direct addresses are not audience-appropriate | • Occasionally makes eye contact<br>• Faces the screen often<br>• (if applicable) Addresses audience | • Distributes and maintains eye contact<br>• Faces audiences most of the time and the screen where helpful<br>• (if applicable) Direct audience addresses are successful | As per good + develops strong connection with audience |
| | Preparedness | • Mostly reads from notes | • Uses notes as a support<br>• No notes but appears scripted | • Extemporaneous natural style but appears prepared | As per good + enhances content |
| | Team Dynamics | • Out of sync with team<br>• Limited speaking or excessive time speaking<br>• Appears unfocused when not presenting | • Appears coordinated with team<br>• speaking time somewhat imbalanced<br>• Mostly focused when not presenting | • Some explicit displays of coordination with team and uses handoffs<br>• Takes equitable speaking time<br>• Appears focused when not presenting | |
| | Body | • static OR distracting gestures<br>• posture closes speaker off or diminishes presence<br>• Does not use available space to establish presence | • non-distracting physical gestures;<br>• non-distracting posture;<br>• neutral use of space | • Purposeful non-distracting physical gestures;<br>• Confident, comfortable posture;<br>• use of space signals attention | As per good + Owns their space |