Design Review 2:

Presentation Evaluation

Qualitative review of presentations to provide constructive feedback

Presenting Team: Lost Express_____

Reviewed by: PiWatcher_____

Date of Review: 03/05/2021_____

Presentation being reviewed: Design Review 2_____

PART I: The Presentation **Content** (we'll get to video tech and delivery later):

A: Problem Statement: How did the team do on this critical first leg of the talk?

·   Did the talk: Clearly describe the project?

Project was clearly stated and described what they are solving and why they are solving it.

·   Make it clear why this project is important by connecting it to its real-world importance/impact?

They discussed the currency implementation of how their client is doing things then go into how their project will improve the current workflow they have.

·   Did the intro move smoothly from big picture to what the client does to what the client's problem challenge is generally; to what specific problems the client has?

Yes they introduced the client and what he does, then go into the problems the client is having with the current implementation with a visual aid.

B). Solution Overview: Did the talk then make it clear what they are building and why/how it solves the problems outlined in the last step? Did the talk:

· Say what exactly is being built: a web app, a mobile app, a linux package, etc.

Yes, they discuss how they are building a web application that will be linked on another website to display their data.

· Give you a good solid idea of what their solution looks like and what its overall approach to solving the problem is?

Yes, they had an entire slide dedicated to what their solution was and what problems it solved. This accompanied with the presenter gave a well thought out review.

· Go through and highlight the key features, convincing that they directly solve the client's needs outlined before.

Yes, they highlight the key features that they need to solve their client's needs such as an interactive web application supplied with role-based permissions and interactive graphs.

C. The MAIN BODY of the talk: Hopefully the presentation team has you clear on the project and it's motivation and fully hooked on their cool solution concept. Now it's time for them to give you the detail. Exactly what goes in this BODY section depends on the focus of the DR: for DR2, we are focused on describing the software design and architecture that resulted from your design process, ending with some discussion of coding progress. How did talk do with this flow:

· Review the key requirements driving the project. This is typically a one-slide condensation of the key requirements they developed last term, with verbal content smoothly reminding us of how requirements were acquired and what the highlights are.

They talk about each key requirement they need and go into detail of how it is being used and connects their project together.

· Review the overall architecture of their solution, including a review and brief justification of the technologies that they used.

This was accomplished through the use of multiple slides. Each technology was given reasoning for why it was chosen over other technologies.

·   THE MEAT: The presentation should now dig more into the design details. This might start with a big UML diagram to give an overview of the end result, but should then dig into only one or two modules just to give you a taste of what the completed design looks like at the lowest level. They could then refer listeners to the written doc for full details on all modules. The key question: Did you come away feeling that their *design process* was orderly and complete, and that the resulting design appears robust and solid.

Yes, the design process was orderly and complete, however it was hard to grasp the overall design of the architecture with the limited UML diagrams that were provided.

·   Review some challenges they faced and how they solved them? In this stage of the design process, you'd expect to hear about challenges related to coding and implementation.

This was done very well, giving examples of technologies they used that didn't work and how they have now moved onto these new technologies that prove to be more promising thus far. They also mentioned ongoing problems and how they plan to solve them.

·   Review their project development timeline. The idea is to orient you in the process as a whole, and give you a clear sense of where the team is on the key tasks. You should get a quick but clear impression of the main tasks, as well as future upcoming tasks. Do you get a clear sense that they are ahead/on-time/slipping?

Yes, the timeline is well thought out, hitting every problem they have addressed previously and given a timeframe in which they plan to see these done.

D. The cherry on the cake: How was the conclusion?   Did it leave you feeling impressed and satisfied? Specifically, did the talk:

·   Loop back in the conclusion to remind you of the big picture importance of the problem/project: motivations, the key problems the client had and the key product features that address them?

They go into the shortcomings of the current workflow of the client's problem and how their product will overcome and or address those problems.

·   Review the highlights of this particular DR: Review what they've accomplished in the design phase (problems solved, UML specs produced, etc.) and where they are now, i.e., how's the coding coming along.

Did not go over where they are currently and what still needs to be done.

· Nice to end with getting back to the client: how has the client been involved, are they happy with progress, etc.   End by saying something like "we hope to show you the completed prototype in a few weeks", i.e., positive ending.

Mentioned how they hope to have a prototype in the coming weeks but was lacking on what the client thinks about the progress and how involved they are.

PART II: The Presentation DELIVERY

We've talked about content completeness and flow. But how was the delivery in this new video format? Did the team rise to the challenge? This is where you can really help the team with their video technique and technologies.

> **A: The Basics:** Start by just rating each of the following on a scale of 5(best) to (1) worst. Plus give 1-2 sentences to explain the rating.

· Visibility of slide content

Slide content is visible and easily readable.

Scale: 5

· Quality of speaker audio (clarity, volume, etc.)

The quality of the speaker audio was clear and the volume was perfect. It was easy to understand what everyone was saying and made it easier to consume the information.

Scale: 5

· Visibility of the speaker, if/when images of the speaker were integrated. To what extent was the speaker visible (resolution, size, placement of image). Give a '1' if no speaker images were integrated.

Speaker was visible and the placement of the video was consistent on all the slides. However, on the schedule slide, the video feed blocked a portion of the Gantt chart.

Scale: 4

·   Quality of transitions between speakers and/or parts of the talk.

Transitions between slides were sufficient. However, you can set up the next person's part by saying "And now __PersonsName__ will describe our __SlidePart__".

Scale: 4

B: Recommendations for improvement. Briefly comment on specific technical items or areas where you feel the team could focus to make their video presentation feel more smooth and professional. Remember, we're focusing on delivery here, not content. Try to give at least two specific recommendations that you feel would most help.

- **Transitions can be better to set up the next person more effectively.**
- **Watch where you place the video feed in these slides, it blocks some of the content of the slides sometimes.**

C: Evaluative Estimations: Think about the presentation again. As a summary of all your comments, what grade would you give the team on this attempt? Score using A-F, with +/- on any grade allowed. Note that you are not giving "THE grade" (their team mentor does that), you're just giving an overall indication of how you'd rate it.

·   Grade for Slides, Flow, and Content (Part 1): **A**

·   Grade for Technical Video Presentation (Part 2): **A**

OVERALL, we'd give this presentation a: **A**