

ENGG105 Design Proposal Presentation Assessment Criteria (Milestone 4)

Class:		Team Name:		
Member Names:				
Reviewer Details:				
Area	Good	Acceptable	Poor	Mark
Visual aids	Visual aids support the presenter(s) by adding clarity to the presentation. Do not distract from the presentation or cause confusion. Use of figures/tables/physical objects shows creativity. If powerpoint is used, slides are clear and uncluttered, not text heavy.	Visual aids are unappealing or of lower quality, but still add clarity to the presentation. If powerpoint is used, slides are mostly clear and relevant.	Visual aids do not support the presenter(s) well. Presenter(s) read directly off slides/aids.	<i>Good (>7)</i> <i>Acceptable (5-7)</i> <i>Poor (<5)</i> /10
Cohesion	Clear and logical flow of ideas. Transitions between presenters are well executed. Time shared evenly, presentation does not run over time and 1 minute warning is clearly not needed. Presentation appears well planned. Message is clear and convincing.	Good flow of ideas. Most transitions between presenters are smooth. Time is shared well. Presentation does not run over time, but may require wrapping up. Message is clear, but not convincing.	Poorly structured presentation. Transitions between presenters are awkward, or not well planned. Presentation runs more than 2 minutes short, or needs to be cut off by the tutor due to going too far over time.	<i>Good (>10)</i> <i>Acceptable (7-10)</i> <i>Poor (<7)</i> /15
Design proposal	Proposal responds to the client brief. Design solution(s) are presented and clearly originate from the design brief. Proposed solution(s) is well thought through and appears viable with some further detailed design work. Shows creativity and/or innovation	Proposal responds to the client brief. Design solution(s) are linked to the design brief. Proposal overall is sound, but may require some further development to demonstrate viability. Appropriate application of a well known solution.	Proposal does not clearly respond to the client brief. Proposed design solution(s) are not well developed and require significant further work before a determination of viability is possible.	<i>Good (>22)</i> <i>Acceptable (15-22)</i> <i>Poor (<15)</i> /30
Demonstration of design <i>* Model may be physical, virtual, or mathematical.</i>	A model is presented that effectively demonstrates feasibility and appeal of the design proposal. Model shows significant effort input and supports the presentation well. Shows creativity and/or sound logical thinking.	A model is presented to demonstrate feasibility or appeal of the design proposal. Model shows significant effort input, but may not add much value to the presentation (or vice versa).	A model is presented to demonstrate a component of the design proposal. Model shows a lack of effort generally and does not add value to the presentation.	<i>Good (>22)</i> <i>Acceptable (15-22)</i> <i>Poor (<15)</i> /30
Discussion period	All team members appear confident and well informed when responding the questions.	Most team members appear confident and well informed when responding the questions, and responses are shared by the team.	Team is not confident in responding to questions, or one member appears to dominate the discussion period.	<i>Good (>10)</i> <i>Acceptable (7-10)</i> <i>Poor (<7)</i> /15
Total				
Time Penalty: 10 marks subtracted for each minute over time (rounded to nearest minute)				
Final mark				

Clarification of key terms

- *Viable* – a solution that would be workable with additional expert input, well founded. Designs with complete detail to a standard ready for implementation are not expected.
- *Model* – A physical scaled model of the proposed design, a virtual model using CAD or simulation software, or a mathematical model that demonstrates the relationship between inputs and outputs. The model presented may also be a combination of these as appropriate to demonstrate the design proposal.
- *Appeal* – attractiveness of the proposal to the audience and client.

Additional Feedback: