**PROJECT PRESENTATION ASSESSMENT FORM**

Department of Mechanical Engineering

Semester: Jan - April 2020

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | |
| Group/Students: |  | | | |
| Evaluator Name: | | Signature: | Date: |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria (Part 1)** | | **No information provided**  **(0 Point)** | **Does not meet expectation**  **(1 Point)** | **Meet the expectation**  **(2 Points)** | **Exceeds expectation**  **(3 Points)** | **Points** |
| **Individual and Team Work**  **(CLO4/PLO9)**  **(5%)** | **Gracious Professionalism /**  **Programme Diversity**  **(3%)** | Team members show little/no respect for each other, team members compete with each other to be heard during judging and no diversity between engineering programme enrolled. | Team members show limited respect for each other, team did not help each other and from 2 different engineering programme enrolled. | Team members show respect for teammates, team implies that they have helped each other and from 3 different engineering programme enrolled. | Team members give concrete examples of respect for teammates, team members give concrete examples of how they have helped each other and from 4 or more engineering programme enrolled. |  |
| **Roles & Responsibilities**  **(2%)** | No clearly defined roles, very uneven distribution of work, team members not collaborative. | Loose role assignments, uneven work distribution, team members will help each other, if asked. | Clearly-defined roles, team members understand each other's roles, but focus on their own, work is distributed fairly, team members will help each other without being asked. | Clearly defined roles, team members understand each other's roles, team member can fill each other's roles if needed, workload is fairly distributed, team members assist each other without being asked. |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Student 1 | Student 2 | Student 3 |
|  |  |  |
| Student 4 | Student 5 | Student 6 |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria (Part 2)** | | **No information provided**  **(0 point)** | **Does not meet expectation**  **(1 point)** | **Meet the expectation**  **(2 Points)** | **Exceeds expectation**  **(3 Points)** | **Points** | | | | | |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| **Communication**  **(CLO5/PLO10)**  **(10%)** | **Presentation Approach**  **(3%)** | Appearance, body language or gestures not appropriate. | Appearance, body language or gestures need improvement. | Appearance and mannerisms are appropriate. | Appearance and mannerisms are presented with professional demeanor and personal style. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Q&A Quality**  **(3%)** | The student responded to the Q&A poorly. | The student responded to the Q&A in a passive manner without confident. | The student responded to the Q&A correctly. | The student proactively response to the Q&A correctly, effectively with confident. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Delivery & Speaking Skills**  **(4%)** | Significant mumbling and incorrect pronunciation of terms.  Voice level too low or too high.  Monotonous, no eye contact, rate of speech too fast or too slow. | Occasional mispronunciation of terms.  Little eye contact, uneven rate, only little expression. | Voice is clear and at a proper level. Most words pronounced correctly.  Some eye contact, steady rate, excessively rehearsed. | Clear voice and correct, precise pronunciation of terms.  Good eye contact, steady rate, enthusiasm, confidence. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Assessor comments (if any):